

- (124) See Peter Cunningham, Local History of Education: a Bibliography (1976); and History of Education Society, Studies in the Local History of Education, Occasional Publication No 3, Autumn 1977.
- (125) Asa Briggs, 'The Study of the History of Education'. pp 5-22.
- (126) Ibid, p 5.
- (127) Stephens 'Recent Trends...', p 19.
- (128) David Wardle, English Popular Education 1780 - 1975, Cambridge University Press, 1976, p viii.
- (129) Dearden, Theory and Practice, p 3.
- (130) In Tibble (ed) (1966), The Study of Education, p 126.
- (131) Dearden, Theory and Practice, p 3.
- (132) Keith Dent, personal interview, Westminster College, Oxford, 29 April 1985.
- (133) The lack of a British school of radical revisionists (notwithstanding the 'left-wing' interpretations of writers like Brian Simon) is commented on, for example, by Stephens (1981), op cit, p 7, and Madan Sarup, Marxism and Education, 1978, pp 152-154. David Reeder, however, while conceding that in Britain "there has been nothing quite like the American radicalism", believes one needs to ask how deep-seated the latter is and whether it was only a temporary phenomenon ("a product of 1970s disillusionment?"), and to recognise that in Britain there has been a strong Marxist element in intellectual studies which has inevitably influenced the history of education, although only the Simons have gained prominence in this field (letter to the writer, 30 September, 1986).
- (134) Dent, interview (1985).
- (135) Webster (1976), op cit, p 209. In particular, he criticises P W Musgrave, editor of Sociology, History and Education, Methuen, London, 1970, for assuming that the pre-1800 education system was simple in form, and draws attention to recent research into this period which demonstrates that schools themselves were only part of a more general educational framework.
- (136) Ibid, p 203.

- (137) Ibid, p 203.
- (138) He is the author of, inter alia, The Training of Teachers in Cambridge University: the first sixty years 1879 - 1939, published by the Department of Education, Cambridge University, 1982.
- (139) Peter Searby, personal interview, Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge University, 28 May 1985.
- (140) Paul H Hirst, 'Educational Theory', in P H Hirst (ed), Educational Theory and the Foundation Disciplines, R K P, Henley, 1983, p 12.
- (141) Dearden, Theory and Practice..., p 3.
- (142) John Wilson, Educational Theory and the Preparation of Teachers, N F E R, Windsor, 1975.
- (143) Anthony Hartnett and Michael Naish (eds), Theory and the Practice of Education : Vol 1, Theory, Values and the Classroom Teacher; Vol 2, Academic Disciplines, Educational Policy and the Education of Teachers, Heinemann, London, 1978.
- (144) Gosden, 'Recent Developments...', p 15.
- (145) Brian Simon (1966), 'The History of Education', p 105.
- (146) Department of Education and Science, Teacher Education and Training (Report of the James Committee), 1972, p 20.
- (147) Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET), The PGCE Course and the Training of Specialist Teachers for Secondary Schools, U C E T, London, 1979.
- (148) Simon (1983), 'The Study of Education...', p 11.
- (149) See editorial by Roy Lowe, Trends in the Study and Teaching of the History of Education, History of Education Society, Occasional Publication 7, 1983, p 2.
- (150) See note 117 above.
- (151) i) Peter Gosden, 'Recent Developments in the Study of the History of Education in Teacher Education Courses', Trends in the Study and Teaching of the History of Education, History of Education Society, Occasional Publication 7, 1983, pp 14-19.

ii) Gordon Batho, 'The Current Situation in the Teaching of the History of Education in Diplomas, Masters Taught Courses and Research Degrees', in *ibid*, pp 20-28.

iii) Keith Dent, 'The Relevance of the Rear-View Mirror in Initial Training', in *ibid*, pp 29-47.

Both Batho and Dent draw on the responses to a questionnaire which had been circulated among training institutions, and which is reproduced in the Society's Occasional Publication 7.

(152) Roy Lowe, Editorial, p 2.

(153) Peter Gosden, 'Recent Developments...', p 14.

(154) *Ibid*.

(155) *Ibid*. pp 15-16.

(156) The details regarding the universities are taken from Gordon Batho, 'The Current Situation...' (1983), *op cit*. From the responses to the Society's questionnaire, it would appear that the universities most active in promoting the history of education at that time (1982) were Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London and Stirling. In some universities the history of education was merely an appendage to such courses as Management and Administration (East Anglia) or Curriculum Studies (Kent). Some universities, for example, York, responded with comments like 'some historical input possible' in taught masters' courses, while not providing even an optional course in the discipline at Diploma and BPhil levels.

(157) Batho, *ibid*, p 24.

(158) See Bradshaw and Whitbread, note 117 above.

(159) Keith Dent, 'The Relevance of the Rear-View Mirror...', (1983), p 30.

- (160) In summary, the main responses with regard to the PGCE were as follows:

	<u>CNAAs</u> <u>validated</u>		<u>University</u> <u>validated</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Does hist of ed figure at all?	10	9	28	13
Is it an essential component?	6	5	17	16
Is it an option?	2	8	14	-
Is it part of a multi-disciplinary component?	6	1	9	13

(Keith Dent, 'The Relevance of the Rear-View Mirror...' p 32.

- (161) Keith Dent, 'The Relevance of the Rear-View Mirror...', p 32

- (162) Ibid.

- (163) Ibid, pp 32-34. In summary, the main findings regarding the BEd were as follows:

	<u>CNAAs</u> <u>validated</u>		<u>University</u> <u>validated</u>	
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
Does hist of ed figure at all?	19	6	28	7
Is it an essential component?	19	5	22	12
Is it an option?	12	10	21	7
Is it part of a multi-disciplinary component?	11	7	8	17

- (164) Ibid, p 34

- (165) Ibid, pp 34-38.

- (166) Ibid, p 36.

- (167) Keith Dent, personal interview, Westminster College, Oxford, 29 April 1985.

- (168) R F Dearden, 'Philosophy of Education 1952 - 1982', British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol xxx No 1, February 1982, p 70.

- (169) Department of Education and Science, Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses, Circular No 3/84, 13 April 1984.

- (170) Ibid, p 2.
- (171) For example, Professor Ray Wilson, School of Education, University of Reading, personal interview, 26 April 1985; Dr Keith Watson, School of Education, University of Reading, personal interview, 26 April 1985; Dr David Reeder, School of Education, University of Leicester, personal interview, 12 April 1985. It is perhaps ironical that South African university departments of education are - for the present at least - freer of state intervention than their British counterparts, at least with regard to inspection.
- (172) D E S Circular 3/84, p 8.
- (173) Ibid, p 9.
- (174) For example, Ray Davies, School of Education, University of Reading, personal interview, 24 April 1985; Dr Keith Dent, Westminster College, Oxford, personal interview, 29 April 1985.
- (175) This point was made to the writer by, amongst others, Dr J S Hurt and Dr Roy Lowe, School of Education, University of Birmingham, personal interviews, 9 May 1985, and by Dr Keith Dent, Westminster College, Oxford, personal interview, 29 April 1985, who said that the local education authorities are only interested in supporting masters' courses that sharpen classroom practice'.
- (176) J W Tibble in J W Tibble (ed) The Study of Education, p 2.
- (177) Dr Harold Silver, principal, Bulmershe College, Reading, personal interview, Oxford, 30 April 1985.
- (178) Ray Davies, personal interview, Reading, 24 April 1985.
- (179) Dr R Unwin, personal interview, University of Leeds, 21 May 1985.
- (180) The sources for the material in this case study were:
 i) interviews and discussions with staff and students in the School of Education, University of Leicester;
 ii) the writer's participant observation in various teaching situations on the Leicester PGCE and other courses;
 iii) course outlines and bibliographies relating to both the 'old' and the 'new' PGCE courses at Leicester;
 (iv) the draft curriculum for the Post Graduate Course in Education, University of Leicester School of

Education, April 1985.

(181) Ibid iv) above, p 48.

(182) Presumably students will not be required to read all of these:

Origins of Mass Schooling:

Lawson and Silver, A Social History of Education in England, ch 7,8.

A Rigby and P Searby (1981), Children, School and Society in Nineteenth Century England, part 1.

P McCann (ed) (1977), Popular Education and Socialisation in the Nineteenth Century, chapters by Goldstrom and Frith.

J S Hurt (1979), Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes 1860 - 1918.

Changing image of the child:

J Walvin (1982), A Child's World: a Social History of English Childhood 1800 - 1914.

T W Laqueur (1976), Religion and Respectability 1780 - 1850.

D A Reeder (1977), Predicaments of Urban Children 1870 - 1914 in Reeder (ed), Urban Education in the Nineteenth Century.

Roots of Progressivism:

W A C Stewart and W P McCann (1967), The Educational Innovators 1750 - 1880.

H Silver (1968), The Concept of Popular Education.

R J W Selleck (1968), The New Education 1870 - 1914.

Progressive education in Britain and the USA:

L Cremin (1961), The Transformation of the School and six other titles, including the 1933 Hadow Report on Infant and Nursery Schools.

Primary School in Twentieth Century:

Eight titles are given, including the Board of Education Report of 1905 on children under 5; the 1931 Hadow Report; the 1967 Plowden Report, Children and their Primary Schools; and M Galton, B Simon and P Croll (1980), Inside the Primary Classroom.

The point should perhaps be made that Leicester has a particularly strong tradition in the history of education and the School has an excellent library,

including a special research collection on the history of education with many primary texts.

- (183) There are recent moves to regard teacher education itself as a discipline in its own right, consolidating several of the newer approaches (school-focused, problem-centred, a concentration on professional studies etc) in a structured and comprehensive way. As this trend gains strength, it is likely to further undermine the position of the separate foundation disciplines, particularly in the initial training courses. See David Hopkins and Ken Reid (eds), Rethinking Teacher Education, Croom Helm, Beckenham, Kent, 1986.

CHAPTER 3

Teacher Education and the History of Education: the USA

From the earliest decades of the nineteenth century, when colleges, academies, grammar schools, and normal schools struggled valiantly to staff a burgeoning popular school system, Americans have disagreed among themselves about the qualities of good teachers and the best modes of nurturing those qualities.

Lawrence Cremin (1)

In order to facilitate a discussion of the place of history of education in American teacher education, it may be helpful to begin by examining briefly the institutional framework within which formal teacher education began and developed in that country.

The Normal School Tradition

The first state-sponsored teacher training programme in the USA was developed by Cyrus Peirce at the normal school in Lexington, Mass, from 1839. Peirce had no doubts about where the emphasis should fall in the training of teachers: 'The art of teaching must be made the great, the paramount, the only concern'. (2) His words are strongly reminiscent of those used by Andrew Bell in connection with his training programme in England in the early 1800s and quoted at the beginning of the previous chapter. On both sides of the Atlantic therefore, there was early on a concentration on the practical aspects of the preparation of teachers. In fact, there was - in pre-Civil War days - a good deal of interaction between Britain and America on education.

The views expressed by Peirce - which represent what came to be called the normal school tradition - have been so influential that

they provide an obvious and convenient starting point in any account of the history of American teacher education. Peirce's significance has been pointed out by one recent researcher in these terms:

Peirce's program represents an important juncture in the history of education when the notions of educational leaders were being institutionalized and new images of education, schooling, teaching, and curriculum were being formed. Some current leaders in the field have called for an analysis and critical appraisal of these images. They have asked how things got to be the way they are; and why is the focus... so narrowly technical.(3)

In the normal school curriculum the emphasis was on instruction in the branches of learning which the students would teach in schools.(4) The model school was an important ingredient of the training programme: there students practised their model lessons under supervision. The general educational level of the courses in the normal school itself was secondary. They were usually one or two years in length, but many students appear to have attended for only a few months or even weeks.(5)

Between the 1860s and the 1890s there was a considerable increase in the number and the popularity of normal schools. Edwards and Richey attribute this to the introduction of 'more vital principles of learning and teaching', largely derived from the writings of Pestalozzi, and to the development of a more systematic methodology, again owing much to the same source.(6) From 1890 onwards, there was a transformation in the nature of the normal schools as the main institutions of teacher training, the major feature of which was the attainment of tertiary status - as Edwards and Richey term it, 'full collegiate rank, and, in some cases, ... graduate standing'.(7) In summary, the process whereby normal colleges became upgraded to teachers colleges involved a raising of entrance requirements, a lengthening and broadening of the curriculum, the gaining of degree-awarding status, and recognition by universities and colleges. The curriculum changes generally meant the addition of more and more liberal arts subjects to the formerly exclusively professional and practical courses. This came about partly as a result of pressure from the accrediting universities and colleges,

partly because of a growing awareness of the need to extend the cultural and intellectual backgrounds of prospective teachers. The result was an inevitable progressive over-crowding of course content, even on the four-year programmes which had become the norm.

Differentiation of courses in accordance with different types of teaching was the result. The over-crowded curricula and the move towards differentiation were to result in calls for a return to a narrower, more practical and functional concept of teacher education.(8) Borrowman sees this thrust as developing largely within the normal school tradition, although she adds that if the universities themselves, which from the latter part of the nineteenth century were to become directly involved in the professional preparation of teachers, 'had not come to value immediate utility, it is doubtful that their own teacher education programs could have evolved as they did'.(9) This latter theme will be pursued after the liberal arts college tradition in teacher education has been discussed.

In looking at the different traditions in American teacher education, one should bear in mind that the development of pedagogy, or education, as a distinct and specialised field of study in the late nineteenth century would radically affect patterns of teacher education (cf the position in Britain, as discussed in chapter 2).

The Liberal Arts College Tradition

Borrowman suggests that teacher education is among the oldest functions of liberal arts colleges and universities. She points out that the arts degree awarded by the medieval university was a certificate of admission to the guild of professional teachers and maintains that:

there are no more authentic educational traditions than that teacher education is the central responsibility of institutions of higher learning and that the liberal arts and literature constitute the ideal curriculum for teacher preparation. In these traditions, to be

liberally educated and to be prepared to teach
are equivalent.(10)

(Her personal views, strongly emerging here, are, of course, very reminiscent of certain British teacher educators: see, for example, Dearden's reference to the 'liberalising disciplines').(11)

Borrowman goes so far as to trace what were to become the foundation disciplines in the 1960s - philosophy, history, psychology and sociology - back to the pre-Civil War collegiate courses in mental and moral philosophy.(12)

Just as there were purists in the normal schools who insisted on singleness of purpose, in their case the practical preparation of teachers, so in the liberal arts colleges there were purists who resisted any watering down of their liberal studies by professional concerns.(13) The conflict between protagonists of liberal and professional education was to be a major characteristic of the subsequent history of teacher education in the USA.(14) Liberal arts lecturers tended to view the curriculum of teachers colleges and university departments of education 'as devoid of scholarship and generally worthless - a bag of tricks imparting method without content, technical skills at best'.(15) On the other hand, some teachers college faculty regarded liberal arts scholarship as irrelevant and non-functional.(16) However, within some liberal arts colleges, as in some normal schools which attained stature as teachers colleges, there were those who believed the attempt to divorce liberal and professional studies to be misguided, and they sought to reorganise the curriculum to include both liberal and professional concerns. Even within this group there were differences of opinion between those who thought the focus should be on the professional function of teaching and those who thought it should be on general social problems.

But the emergence of this bridge group did indicate that the two traditions - the normal school and the liberal arts college - were coming together. Their meeting place was in the teachers colleges and the universities.

Teachers Colleges

Efforts by the teachers colleges to upgrade teacher education were seen to be so successful that they - themselves often the result of the transformation of the old normal schools - 'could be easily transformed into all-purpose colleges and, in some instances, into universities'.(17) Although the emphasis in the teachers colleges was inevitably on the professional training of teachers, the struggle between protagonists of liberal and professional education was often waged fiercely between rival factions within the teachers colleges themselves well into the twentieth century. One historian at Teachers College of Columbia University, New York, for example, considered the insistence on 'functionalism' - that subjects studied in teacher education programmes should be of direct utility to prospective teachers - to be an abomination.(18)

The era of collegiate institutions devoted entirely to preparing teachers was not to last very long. The successful organisation of teacher education programmes in liberal arts colleges and universities gave rise to 'a growing conviction that strong liberal arts departments, co-ordinated with professional departments rather than under the control of a professional school or college, would provide a better academic component for the teacher education program'.(19) By the 1950s it was generally accepted that teacher education was best served by institutions combining the good features of the teachers colleges and those of liberal arts colleges. By the close of the 1950s the great contribution of the teachers colleges had been made, they were losing their unique character and were being absorbed into the mainstream of higher education.(20) In 1959 there were only 122 institutions categorised as 'primarily teacher preparatory'.(21) Where the title was retained, this was generally for historical reasons (as in Teachers College, which was founded in 1887 and became part of the Columbia University constellation in 1898 as a faculty with legal and financial independence).

The Universities

The evolution of the normal schools into the teachers colleges, and the transformation of the latter into all-purpose colleges or, in some cases, into universities, was accompanied by the development of education as a specific field of university study. This was to affect teacher education as radically in the USA as it did in Britain. It made possible 'the formulation of an educational science and the advancement of teacher education from practical training to professional preparation'.(22) This was not accomplished without much opposition within the universities themselves: 'the courses, the chairs, and the instructors filling those chairs were generally looked upon as something which evil times had foisted upon the university'.(23)

Towards the end of the nineteenth century the argument that education was a legitimate field of study within the framework of liberal studies, together with pressure on the universities to be involved in the professional preparation of secondary teachers, caused many of them to establish departments of education which taught 'pedagogical science'. There are many references in the literature to the low status of the new discipline in university life. In the early 1890s many members of the academic faculty at Harvard viewed the department of education 'with little more than contempt'.(24) When Ellwood P Cubberley was appointed assistant professor of education at Stanford in 1898, he was given just three years in which to make the department 'respectable'.(25) James Earl Russell, dean of Columbia University's Teachers College from 1897 to 1927, a period when it was regarded as the foremost institution of its kind in the country, described with some bitterness the scorn experienced by teacher educators in universities, and their response:

You who have experience with teacher training in university systems know what it means to be looked down upon by your academic brethren. The finger of scorn is pointed at you, they say your

work is superficial, you are not scholarly etc. All sorts of stinging terms are applied. On the other hand, the professionally minded are not loth to strike back. They call the others mossbacks, conservatives, antiques.(26)

While education departments in British (and South African) universities have certainly not been free of this problem, it would seem from the regularity with which it is raised in the American literature - and perhaps also from the vigour of the language used - that it has been more acute in that country. It has by no means been removed even in more recent days, despite several decades of outstanding scholarship by academics in different fields of education in both Britain and the USA.(27)

This negative attitude has implications for the study of education which have yet to be explored in depth. It must at the very least have sharpened the edge of what Russell saw as the 'constant conflict' between academic (or liberal) and professional elements in teacher education.(28) As Borrowman says

it may well be that the dichotomy seen by Russell was false, and that by perceiving 'the professionally' oriented people as nonacademic he encouraged them to be so, to the detriment of American education.(29)

This seems to be an important insight: much of the energy that might have been fruitfully expended on advancing the study and teaching of education must have gone futilely into both attack and defence in the 'constant conflict'. Kerr says that this is the most telling fact about teacher education.(30) The academic status of the history of education could not escape critical and even hostile scrutiny in the course of this conflict: this theme will be explored in a subsequent section of this chapter, when the position of the history of education, specifically, is discussed.

The foregoing account of the institutional framework - normal school, liberal arts college, teachers college, university - within which American teacher education has developed, provides a context for a consideration of the place of the history of education. Before turning to that topic, however, it may be useful to discuss briefly some of the most important of the influences that helped to

shape teacher education in the early twentieth century, including the work of John Dewey. These influences are also part of the context within which the history of education as a subject of study and teaching needs to be located.

The Pedagogical Science

Edwards and Richey identify various steps in the emergence of the concept of education as a science.⁽³¹⁾ Herbartianism played its part, as it had in late nineteenth century Britain, as did the child-study movement and the development of experimental psychology. In addition, the growth of scientific measurement and of mental testing were, as in Britain, important elements.

They also refer to a growing consciousness of the significance of the past, which provided support for the study of the history of education. Along with this went the development of 'professionalisation', in education as in other areas. Cohen, for example, points to the professionalisation of history as a result of the efforts, in 1884, of a group of young scholars 'fresh from historical training in Germany' (the location is, of course, significant, in view of the 'scientific' approach to the discipline developed in that country) who organised the American Historical Association (AHA) 'to propagate and give new direction to American history and history in America'.⁽³²⁾ As Cohen remarks, this signalled the shift from the amateur to the professional historian whose formative orthodoxy at the time was 'scientific history'.⁽³³⁾ This inevitably influenced approaches to the history of education as will be demonstrated later in this chapter. It was also to be a major influence in the approach adopted by the Afrikaans universities in South Africa (see Chapter 5).

Silver's comments on the role of the British universities in terms of this new position of burgeoning professions would appear to apply equally to American universities:

One of their main functions, of course, had always been to reproduce the universities themselves, by the preparation of future academics. With the emergence of an increasing number of 'disciplines' and a new emphasis on research, the harnessing of the universities to the learned and academic 'professions' became increasingly important. Various kinds of specialised training were beginning to sit uneasily alongside traditional forms of general education and demands for wider and more democratic access to higher education.(34)

This brings us back to the earlier discussion of the involvement of universities in teacher education, and the uneasy relationship that existed between the new departments of education and the liberal arts faculty.

The university - whether British or American - was a major participant in the epistemological shift of the late nineteenth century that brought in a new scientific revolution to take the place of the earlier one based on the thinking of, *inter alia*, Descartes, Galileo and Locke.(35) The new claim was that only that which could be measured was accessible to knowledge, the positivist approach. Science was seen as the only source of knowledge, and thus any attempt to understand mankind had to be through quantitative scientific methods. A consequence of this approach was that important areas of life tended to be ignored, such as questions about purpose, meaning and values. It should, however, be remembered that the new scientific approach did not by any means carry all before it and was in fact resisted fiercely by many, particularly in the humanities.

The university was inevitably affected by the positivist movement, for example in the curriculum, where the natural sciences, mathematics etc were incorporated. Literature and the humanities were put on the defensive, frequently being challenged to justify their place in the curriculum. Some in the humanities, including some in education, tried to meet the challenge by redefining their disciplines as sciences. It is interesting to note that something of this situation is recurring in the 1980s, although the nature of

the challenge has changed somewhat, from 'scientific' to 'utilitarian'.(36) This brings us back to the theme raised in the previous chapter of the influence of the state of the economy on certain university subjects. Sloan holds the view that the humanities tend to flourish during times of economic prosperity, but that in times of stagnation or recession in the economy 'the frills drop off' and the focus falls strongly on the sciences and on technology. Certainly the 'frills' tended to drop off teacher education during the hard times of the late 1970s and early 1980s in both Britain and the USA.

Turning now to Dewey, it is clear that he played an enormous role in shaping thinking about education in the early twentieth century, not only in America but also in Britain and South Africa. Connell sees him as the crucial figure until the Second World War, with his classic, Democracy and Education (1916), a key text in shaping attitudes towards education during this long period.(37)

Dewey influenced teacher education as well as other areas of education. As Borrowman puts it: 'In the twentieth century... the figure of John Dewey has lurked in the background of many proposals to reform teacher education'.(38) In the debate about the relative merits of the liberal and the professional elements in teacher education programmes, Dewey opposed any 'mechanical marking' of boundaries between the two. He looked 'to such a utilisation of the vocational trend as will serve to make the professional school itself less narrowly professional - less technically professional'.(39) Dewey believed that modern humanism was adequately expressed only 'in a vision of the social possibilities of the intelligence and learning embodied in the great modern enterprises'.(40) These 'enterprises' included business, law, medicine and education. In other words, if the professions were properly conceived they would not contain any 'mechanical' break between the liberal and the professional training that they required. This was clearly a notion of the 'integration' of these elements.

These views were incorporated in the New College Course which was experimented with at Teachers College between 1933 and 1939 and which was also adopted in various other programmes, notably at Stanford. In these programmes the intention was to develop units of instruction that centred on problems encountered in society, using problem-solving methods to deal with these. The situations were to be as concrete and practical as possible.(41) This approach was to give way after World War 2 in favour of programmes based on the foundation disciplines. As Borrowman remarks, no consensus in favour of either extreme position (a rigid separation of the liberal and the professional, or a close integration of the two) has been possible, and compromise has had to be the inevitable result.(42)

Among the reasons for this is the fact that:

the educational process is simply too involved, too little susceptible to the kind of control that scientific experimentation demands, and aimed at too many different outcomes to permit its being evaluated in terms of any single theoretical principle.(43)

At the same time faculty members in teacher education institutions, because of their very different experiences, may well have developed strong biases at such variance with those of their colleagues that compromise provides the only means of achieving co-operation.(44) The result of this would be a tendency to avoid pressing for agreement on a single over-arching principle and, instead, a willingness 'to seek agreement on secondary principles and on operational levels'. An eclectic or ad hoc approach to teacher education is very often the consequence, but this is based on certain operational assumptions: i) the importance of liberal culture; ii) the need for proficiency in a specialised area; and iii) professional competence. Borrowman's conclusion is that any theoretical structure (that is, the detailed arrangement of the curriculum, in both its liberal and professional elements, on the basis of one or two idealised principles) would necessarily ignore the practical conditions and fail to win the full loyalty of any group of teacher educators. It is thus desirable for teacher education theory to be:

tempered by a sense of reality and by a recognition that no monolithic system of thought can determine the activities of the kind of faculty members and students involved in teacher education programs.(45)

These seem to be very illuminating insights, which go a long way to answer the complaint of theorists like Wardle (quoted in the previous chapter) about the lack of comprehensive explanatory systems.(46) They may also help to answer the question why education is so often viewed as academically suspect in universities.

The foregoing discussion arose from a consideration of Dewey's views on the relationship between the liberal and the professional aspects of teacher education. In an earlier work, Dewey made it clear that he supported the development of a spirit of critical enquiry and of intellectual initiative in prospective teachers:

Students should be given to understand that they not only are permitted to act upon their own intellectual initiative, but that they are expected to do so, and that their ability to take hold of situations for themselves would be a more important factor in judging them than their following any particular set method or scheme.(47)

Dewey also saw the need for constant rethinking and renewal in education: 'The thing needful is improvement of education, not simply by turning out teachers who can do better the things that are now necessary to do, but rather by changing the conception of what constitutes education'.(48) His proposed curriculum for teacher education included a training in education 'theory' (understood as child psychology) and in history, in the subject matter of the branches of learning students would teach in school, in classroom observation, and in practical work 'of the laboratory type'.(49) As in the case of Britain, we thus see that history and psychology were considered the main theoretical disciplines to be included in teacher education courses at the end of the nineteenth and in the early years of the twentieth centuries. This will be discussed in more detail in the next section of this chapter.

These glimpses of Dewey's thinking have been presented in order to help fill out the context: the introduction of education into the university curriculum, the definition of education as a science, the continued tension between the intellectual and the vocational elements in teacher education programmes, and theories about teacher education itself. It is within this context that we may turn now to discuss the position and the role of the history of education in American teacher education.

The History of Education: the early years

Taking its lead from general history, the history of American education in its formative years was narrowly concerned with 'facts' illustrating the notion of progress and evolution in the national life. Cohen's evaluation of general history towards the end of the nineteenth century was that:

If history's general methodological orthodoxy was conservative, so was its content, which featured institutions rather than persons, the remote past rather than recent history, continuity rather than change. Historians emphasised national unity, national homogeneity, and the 'American mission'. (50)

These approaches inevitably affected the study and the teaching of the history of education. It concentrated on the school, it was concerned with the distant rather than the recent past, it sought to glorify teachers and teaching and it presented a triumphalist vision of the evolution of public education as an undisputed example of progress towards America's manifest destiny. As an academic subject, however, the history of education had its own particular problems, one of which was the scepticism and even scorn of academic colleagues. In addition, since history of education was one of the most widely offered courses in teachers colleges and in university departments of education, it faced serious problems of staffing and of availability of suitable books. All these things further affected the status of the discipline. Few institutions of teacher

education had trained historians: even Cubberley, for example, had not received historical training but was expected to teach the history of education, among other subjects, at Stanford.

The problem of texts was a serious one in the early years. Most books were general histories of European educational thought.⁽⁵¹⁾ The two native American works in common use, Boone and Dexter, were essentially chronological accounts and compilations of facts about educational institutions.⁽⁵²⁾ Dexter saw his task in very straightforward terms: 'I have been governed by the belief that the most crying need of the student of our educational history is a considerable mass of definite fact upon which to base his own generalisations'.⁽⁵³⁾ And he duly provided such a mass of fact, from *The Growth of the People's Schools*, virtually state by state, to *Education of Defectives*, and *Lyceums, Popular Lectures and Museums*. This again seems a current conception - or misconception - that the compilation of a sufficient body of 'facts' somehow results in a 'scientific' and meaningful whole.

Bailyn, writing in 1960, traced the blame for the failings in the interpretation of education in American history at that time ('its separateness as a branch of history, its detachment from the main stream of historical research')⁽⁵⁴⁾ to 'a particular juncture at the end of the nineteenth century', and in particular to a seminal book published in 1900, Thomas Davidson's *A History of Education*.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Bailyn describes Davidson as an 'exuberant polymath and free-lance educator' whose purpose was 'to dignify a newly self-conscious profession, education', using as his argument 'a heady distillation of social Darwinism' which concluded that modern education was a cosmic force leading mankind to a full realisation of itself.⁽⁵⁶⁾ (It will have become apparent that American educational historians tend to employ rather more vigorous epithets and a generally more colourful style than their British counterparts, a linguistic phenomenon that is paralleled by the contrasting degrees of argumentativeness and even vituperation which the groups bring to their respective debates).

American historians of education after Davidson certainly followed the general lines of his approach. Monroe's motivation was similar to Davidson's: he was convinced that 'a subject that could give the neophyte an everlasting faith in his profession clearly deserved a central position in the curriculum'.(57) Monroe and Cubberley began to develop a literature on American educational history in response to the existing paucity of material and in order to assist the subject to take the central position that they felt it deserved and which it duly received in normal schools, teachers colleges and university departments of education across the country. Bailyn's rather cynical interpretation of their motives - and those of other like-minded historians of the time - was that:

a subject of such importance could not be left to random development; the story had to be got straight. And so a few of the more imaginative of that energetic and able group of men concerned with mapping the overall progress of 'scientific' education... took over the management of the historical work in education. With great virtuosity they drew up what became the patristic literature of a powerful academic ecclesia.(58)

At this point it seems appropriate to look more closely at the work of some of the 'missionary' writers whom Bailyn had in mind. Of them, Cubberley and Monroe are clearly the most important in terms of their output and of their influence on contemporary American teacher education as well as on the developing discipline of history of education itself.

Ellwood P Cubberley is best remembered for his Public Education in the United States, with its extraordinarily prolix subtitle (59), part of which ('... the larger problems of present-day education in the light of their historical development') puts one in mind of Bailyn's famous aphorism that the older historians of education viewed the past as 'simply the present writ small'. The choice of phrasing for the subtitle is also explained in Cubberley's own words:

The history of education... has recently received much criticism, largely because it has

had so little relation to present-day problems in education, and because it has failed to 'function', to use a common expression, in orienting the prospective teacher.(60)

Cubberley quoted a recent study that showed that the great bulk of the material in the most commonly used textbooks was devoted to ancient, medieval and late European education, with very little attention being given to the developments of the past fifty years. What prospective teachers needed was a history of education that was practical and 'closely tied up with the social, political and industrial forces which have shaped the nineteenth century', helping them to see the problems of the twentieth in the light of their historical evolution and the probable lines of their future development.(61) Cubberley was obviously responding to demands that the history of education justify its place in teacher education programmes. In his efforts to be 'practical', Cubberley dealt with 'Our European Background' in about a dozen pages and then turned to an exhaustive treatment of the last three-quarters of the nineteenth century in the USA, his central theme the evolution of a national system of schooling. This evolution 'has been slow and thoroughly native, and ideas reaching us from abroad have been carefully examined, questioned, tried, worked over, and adapted to our conditions'. The result, in Cubberley's view, was an educational system thoroughly 'of the people, for the people, and by the people'.(62) There are a number of other premises underlying his work, all of which are stated unproblematically as if self-evident. For example, education is seen as 'the great constructive tool of civilisation' and essential for the furtherance of democracy: 'In Russia, Mexico and the Central American "republic" we see what a democracy results in in the hands of an uneducated people'.(63) Since education in a democratic society is so important for the promotion of national welfare, it follows that the teacher and the school play extremely important roles in the national service.(64) These propagandising elements in Cubberley's work were to be as firmly rejected by later historians as was his linear and chronological approach to history.

Cubberley has been totally discredited by later writers like Bailyn

(65), Cremin (66) and Katz (67) on the grounds of his narrowness, his missionary zeal and his uncritical espousal of the notion of progress in education. In Katz's view, Cubberley's work is 'a paean to the American school system, an elaborate glorification of its contemporary structure, a monument to the status quo'.(68)

However, as Cohen remarks, it is unfair to judge Cubberley only by present historiographical standards.(69) At the very least he sought to revive the history of education in general and to establish a worthy history of American education in particular. His Public Education can be seen as part of the battle against the narrowly functionalist approach which questioned the relevance of the history of education in teacher education courses by shifting the emphasis 'from Europe to America, from intellectual history to social history, from history of educational theory to history of educational institutions'.(70)

Monroe has lasted better than Cubberley, in the sense that he 'set a standard of respectability in every field of educational thought'.(71) Even he, however, was to be attacked in harsh terms by the revisionists of the 1960s. Cremin's judgment on the school of historiography represented by Cubberley and Monroe is that 'it is coercive rather than liberating history, inspiring ideological commitment rather than informing public policy-making'.(72) Bailyn saw them as parochial, displaying 'the exaggeration of weakness and extravagance of emphasis that are the typical results of sustained in-breeding'.(73) Their narrow professional interests and their desire to demonstrate 'the immemorial importance and the evolution of theories and procedures of the work in which they were engaged' caused them to direct their attention almost exclusively 'to the part of the educational process carried on in formal institutions of instruction'.(74) The climax of Bailyn's criticism is worth quoting at some length, since not only does it highlight some of the failings of the early American historians of education but, by implication, indicates an important aspect of Bailyn's own credo as an historian:

They took their task to be the tracing of the careers of the institutions, ideas or practices they knew so well. They had no capacity for surprise. They lacked the belief, the historian's instinct, that the elements of their world might not have existed at all for others... and that the real task is to describe the dawning of ideas and the creation of forms - surprising, strange and awkward then, however familiar they may have become since, in response to the changing needs of circumstance.(75)

It will be noted that these criticisms are similar to those directed by Roy Lowe at the early English historians of education - Adamson, Watson, Woodward et al - (see chapter 2).

In the early years of the century, when history of education played such an important part in the teacher education curriculum, Monroe was professor in the history of education at Teachers College, New York. One of his undertakings was to edit the Brief Course Series in Education published by Macmillan from 1907 onwards. The first title in the series was Monroe's own A Brief Course in the History of Education, which surveyed European and American education.(76) The list of titles in the series makes interesting reading now, particularly as an indication of what were seen as the priorities in the teacher education curriculum. These titles included, following on the Monroe History,

- The Teaching Process
- The Psychology of Childhood
- School Hygiene
- Principles of Sociology with educational applications
- The Psychology of Sub-normal Children
- Vocational Education
- Foundations of Method: Informal Talks on Teaching

Monroe's views on the history of education were set out very clearly in the preface to his Brief Course:

The needs of the student of the history of education are to acquire a sufficient body of fact concerning the educational practices of the past; to develop an ability to interpret that experience in order to guide his own practice; to exercise his judgment in estimating the relation existing between various theories and

corresponding practices; and, above all, to obtain a conception of the meaning, nature, process, and purpose of education that will lift him above the narrow prejudices, the restricted outlook, the foibles, and the petty trials of the average schoolroom, and afford him the fundamentals of an everlasting faith as broad as human nature and as deep as the life of the race.(77)

In pursuit of these quite extraordinarily ambitious aims which range from the practical to the mystical, Monroe provided a rapid survey of primitive education; oriental, classical, and medieval education; the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation; the Age of Reason; and then 'the psychological tendency', 'the scientific tendency', 'the sociological tendency' and, finally, 'the present eclectic tendency', i.e. the fusion of all the other tendencies!

Despite the later harsh criticisms of their work, there can be no doubting the importance of the influence of Cubberley and Monroe during the first few decades of the twentieth century. This is evident from the almost obligatory and usually adulatory references made by their successors, (reminiscent of Brian Simon's description quoted in the previous chapter, of the inter-War years in Britain when 'the earlier history of English education became bedded down into something approaching a reverent commentary on the findings of predecessors') (78) Frank Pierrepont Graves, for example, makes the point, in the revised (1936) edition of his A Student's History of Education, originally published in 1915, that Monroe's study was the first standard American work on the subject, which 'influenced all subsequent writing'(79), while writers as far apart in time as Samuel Chester Parker (1915)(80) and Francesco Cordasco (1963)(81) have felt the need to make their bows in Monroe's direction. It is necessary, however, to guard against exaggerating Cubberley's influence, despite the fact that Cremin selected him as the particular scapegoat of his generation of historians. It was largely Monroe's students who provided the following generation of historians of education.(82)

Cubberley does not seem to have felt any pressure to modify his approach in any fundamental sense as the decades passed. For the revised and enlarged edition of Public Education, which came out in 1934, he felt no need to make any significant changes to what he described as 'a history of administrative progress and curriculum change and expansion'.(83) His Readings, published in the same year, was subtitled 'a collection of sources to illustrate the history of educational practices and progress' (the word 'progress' certainly seems to be a favourite of his).(84) What is particularly interesting is Cubberley's selection of readings for the final chapter on Fundamental Principles and Problems, with its emphasis on education as social investment ('society's contribution to the education of its children is returned many fold in service, progress, and wealth'(85) - as clear an enunciation of human capital theory as any), and its ringing positivist conclusion: 'The only hope is education - widespread, thorough, comprehensive'.(86)

It may be pertinent to note here that E G Malherbe, the first major South African historian of education whose textbook to a large extent remains the standard work on the origins of formal education in this country (87), completed his doctorate in the 1920s at Teachers College where he studied under, inter alia, Professors Monroe Deway and Russell. Malherbe was inevitably deeply influenced by these men. When the position in South African universities is discussed in Chapter 5, it will be seen that the curriculum slavishly followed the model established by Monroe until the 1970s.

The History of Education: the middle period

The term 'middle period' here is used, merely as a convenient device, to refer to the period roughly between the First World War and the onset of the revisionist movement in the history of education in the late 1950s.

While Cubberley and Monroe were still holding sway there were already strong challenges for the history of education to justify

its position in teacher education programmes. As early as 1908, Henry Suzzallo of Teachers College gave notice that the discipline needed more 'professional' content, that is content relevant to teaching.(88) The dangers of a narrow utilitarianism were increased by the rise of the 'scientific' movement in education, as already described, with its emphasis on psychology, testing and measurement. As Cohen remarks, unless history of education could more clearly demonstrate its utility in the professional programme, it faced problems of survival.(89) Certainly it is clear from the literature that the history of education was becoming an increasingly unpopular course and that where it was offered as an option it was increasingly often passed over in favour of other options.(90) It may be recalled that it was in response to this situation that Cubberley tried to present the discipline as practical and relevant in terms of helping students understand contemporary problems.

New texts began to appear, challenging the sovereignty of Cubberley's book, in particular the works by Knight and Noble (91), but criticism of the history of education continued to mount, and much of the new literature remained pedestrian and out-moded. The text by Caldwell and Courtis (92), subtitled 'a message of encouragement from the past to the present', epitomises much of what later historians of education were to condemn in the 'traditional' approach. They presented the usual unqualified and unproblematical notion of progress: 'Dull and phlegmatic indeed must the person be who can read the story presented in the following pages and not be thrilled by the progress made'.(93) There was the usual paean of praise for the teaching profession: '...one can search almost in vain for adequate recognition of the value of the services rendered by teachers, of their desire and their efforts to do their best'(94), and for the modern school, which 'has ceased to be a prison and is becoming a childish utopia'.(95) Eulogy and propaganda are no substitute for genuine scholarship and it was at least partly due to the existence of these elements in the work of so many historians of education in the 1920s and 1930s that they

were subjected to the scorn of academic colleagues already mentioned in this chapter.

Eby and Arrowood (96) made valiant efforts to rehabilitate the subject. They declared that the history of education 'is by far the best means with which prospective teachers can begin the study of professional education' and dealt rather summarily with competing claims: 'there are nowadays several more popular introductory subjects, such as educational psychology, educational principles, and, more recently, a number of general orientation courses'.(97) While some of these might be of some value, none could wholly take the place of educational history, which was 'an admirable means of mental integration'. It offered two advantages to students facing a bewildering choice of courses: 'a) it follows the genetic order, beginning with education in its original simplicity and leading gradually to its more complex development; and b) ... it shows the educational process in actual operation in a definite social setting, under specific conditions of life'.(98) Their text itself is very much in the "great educators" tradition, dealing with educational thinkers up to Dewey and ending with a cyclopaedic survey of 'educational progress in the twentieth century'. By the time of the second edition, in 1952, Arrowood had disappeared (99), and Eby had somewhat moderated his earlier optimism. While 'the historical approach to educational understanding' had been accepted 'with more favour', it had become 'somewhat clearer that, as a professional preparation, history can be most helpful if pursued on the upper and graduate level'. (100) It is clear that Eby was here merely reflecting what was happening in actual practice in teacher education courses.

In 1940 Eby and Arrowood had collaborated on another venture, a textbook on ancient and medieval education.(101) They defended the study of this, while acknowledging that 'in many cases it has been entirely eliminated as part of professional preparation'.(102) Their conviction had, however, deepened 'that the historical approach is still by all odds the most valuable introduction' and

hopefully added that, 'In the last few years there has been a growing acknowledgement that the preparation of teachers has overemphasised the acquisition of methods and has neglected the basic understanding of educational theory'.(103) With hindsight, it seems surprising that this volume should have gone through eleven printings in the next 20 years, thus demonstrating that there was indeed a continuing demand for the study of ancient and medieval education in teacher education courses. But the last vestiges of the study of the remote educational past were to be generally swept away with the advent of the revisionist approach to American educational history from the late 1950s onwards. Eby and Arrowood may well have been right in claiming a pre-eminent role for the history of education in teacher preparation, but the kind of history they espoused was wrong.

During the 1930s the demand that history of education become more functional and less 'academic' in the teacher education programme gained renewed impetus from the advocates of social reconstruction and from the progressive school of general history.(104) The social reconstructionists, convinced of both the imminent demise and the inherent evil of capitalism, sought a new social order based on a co-operative economy. Schools, and thus the teachers, should be active in the achievement of the new order. This in turn placed a responsibility on teacher educators - the teachers of teachers - to abandon their traditional approaches in favour of a socio-political role. The focus on educational disciplines and the ideas of liberal education had to be discarded in favour of the new collective approach.(105)

The progressive historians (106) were ready allies of the reconstructionists. Their revolt against academic formalism and their urge to create a relevant and 'usable' history that would help to solve present problems attracted the support of many young historians who had become alienated by the hidebound approach of the AHA. By the mid-1930s the more radical historians had taken control of the AHA and set up a commission on the social studies which

co-operated with the educational radicals to outline a reconstructionist position.(107) The commission greatly strengthened the position of the social reconstructionists in education and the implications for teacher education were clear: it was a time for direct involvement in the efforts to create a new and better social order.

Both of the developments outlined here - the social reconstruction movement and the progressive movement in history - must, of course, be seen in their own historical context of the thirties with its social and economic crisis consequent on the Great Depression and with the threat of totalitarianism looming on the world stage.

The Social Foundations of Education

A major development in American teacher education in the 1930s was the emergence of the concept of the 'social foundations of education'. This concept embodied the social reconstructionist position that the teacher of teachers had a strategic role to play in the achievement of the new social order.(108) The components of the social foundations were seen as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, economics and comparative education, all of which should be taught in 'integrated' courses. Such a course was introduced at Teachers College in 1934-5, the two-semester course Education 200F, 'Social Foundations of Education', according to Cohen the most famous and influential innovation in American teacher training in the twentieth century.(109) Details of this course are given in the final section of this chapter, which discusses the changing Teachers College curriculum between 1912 and 1986. From within the social foundation disciplines issues and topics were extracted to illuminate fundamental problems of schooling and society.(110) The major exponent of the role of the history of education in the foundations of education approach was R Freeman Butts, an historian at Teachers College, whose view was that educators needed to adopt 'a frankly critical, experimental and progressive' approach while not losing sight of the historian's ideal of objectivity.(111) In

the light of this, the historian of education should aim to participate in the solution of major contemporary problems in American education, as well as contributing to the development of American history in general.(112)

It was inevitable that those wedded to the notion of a liberal education rather than to the practical preparation of prospective school teachers, even within the Teachers College faculty, were strongly opposed to the new approach. Such resistance prevented Teachers College from taking the final step on 'the creative path', from breaking fully out of teacher education orthodoxy, as Rugg saw it.(113) But, as Cohen concludes:

The foundations concept provided teachers and school administrators in the 1940s and 1950s with an enormously attractive Weltanschauung. The social reconstructionists, through social-foundations-of-education courses, brought new interest and excitement into teacher education. How inspiring it must have been for the 'teachers of teachers' to believe that they were statesmen and that even classroom teachers could play a crucial role in bringing about the new order.(114)

During the 1940s the foundations approach spread to many other teacher education institutions in the USA, most notably the College of Education at the University of Illinois, which established a Division of Historical, Comparative, Philosophical and Social Foundations of Education. All courses in this Division were to be 'functional', and history, for example, was 'intended to be a general foundation course in Education rather than an academic course in History' with the aim of developing 'professional competence to deal with important contemporary educational problems'.(115)

While it may at first glance have appeared that the concept of the social foundations of education was similar to, and perhaps a forerunner of, the discipline based approach that was described in the previous chapter as having dominated teacher education in Britain from the 1900s, it should by now be clear that the two approaches are fundamentally different. The major difference, of

course, is that the former was embodied in integrated programmes while the latter followed firmly separate and discrete disciplines. A second important difference was that the foundations of education course was seen as essentially functional and relevant to the actual classroom needs of prospective teachers, while the separate disciplines were seen as primarily theoretical, with, at the best, only an indirect application to teaching practice.

Finally, it may be noted that the foundations of education provided something of a springboard for the revisionist movement in American educational history that was to transform the subject from 1960 onwards. Before we turn to that development, however, it is necessary to sketch in the major developments in the history of education itself between 1940 and 1960.

The Post-War Years: Failure of Consensus

The threat of totalitarianism having been overcome and democracy's position apparently secured as a result of the Second World War, the reconstructionists were encouraged in their attempts to bring about a new social order through education. One means of advancing the cause was by taking control of the National Society for College Teachers of Education (the NSCTE), and the historians amongst them organised a History of Education Section (HES) with its own journal (History of Education Journal - HEJ) within the NSCTE.(116) The first issue of the HEJ made it clear that the intention was to promote the ways in which history of education might contribute to teacher education, rather than the ways in which it might contribute to scholarly research.(117) In this the HEJ was reflecting the major concern of the HES (it will be recalled that in Britain the first efforts of the newly established History of Education Society nearly twenty years later were, although from rather different motivation, also in the direction of teacher education, which, as we saw in chapter 2, drew the wrath of more 'academic' historians like Gillian Sutherland).(118) In another move that was later to be echoed in Britain, not in any sense of deliberate imitation, the HES

set up a survey, under its Committee on Historical Foundations, of the state of the history of education in the USA. The results of this survey began to appear from autumn 1955, starting with an account of recent developments in history of education as a field of study.(119) The authorship of this by Lawrence Cremin is significant as marking one of the first major entries into the debate by someone who was to become, with Bernard Bailyn, the most notable of the early revisionists, and who would later become the president of Teachers College. It is noticeable, with the benefit of hindsight, that Cremin paid scant attention, in tracing the fortunes of courses in the history of education in the first half of the twentieth century, to the work of venerated earlier historians like Cubberley and Monroe, and that he ended his paper on a strongly optimistic note.

The second part of the report, written by Archibald Anderson, appeared in the winter of 1955.(120) By now it was clear to many that the Committee was hopelessly divided between conservatives and progressives, between the professionally inclined and the academically inclined, between the supporters and the detractors of Dewey, and between those who believed in inter-disciplinary co-operation and those who defended the separate integrity of their discipline. All these divisions and the resultant conflicts were being conducted in an atmosphere charged with the current anti-communist hysteria in which defence of entrenched academic positions could become somehow confused with defence of democracy.

Tyack makes the point that 'the McCarthyite hysteria of the 1950s cast a long shadow on American scholarship in history and social science, while in England some of the most distinguished work since the Second World War has continued to explore class relationships in a sophisticated Marxian mode'. In the American situation the promise of some scholars like George Counts and Merle Curti withered, leaving the field to the more conservative, until the 1960s when the radical revisionists turned 'to a darker vision of education as class oppression and social control'. Before that, in

Tyack's view, historians in America largely ignored 'the more nuanced and culturally-sensitive versions of radical analysis that were represented by the best English and continental Marxists'.(121)

Anderson, reflecting the divisions within the history of education in his report, questioned, in suitably guarded terms, whether 'sufficient community of discourse has been established to facilitate an adequate clarification of the differences in point of view'.(122) Coming down firmly on at least one side in the multi-faceted conflict, Anderson warned that the history of education could lose its place in teacher education programmes either by being absorbed 'into the anonymity of integrated courses in social foundations' or by being discarded for being academic rather than professional.(123)

In the end, the HES leadership virtually abandoned the effort to draw up a full report and gave the concluding section over to Michael Chiappetta, a protagonist of the social foundations of education. In Cohen's words: 'Chiappetta based his justification for the place of history of education in the professional curriculum on a vulgar mix of the pedagogical theories of Dewey and the social foundations group at the University of Illinois; in so doing, he foreclosed the development of history of education as a liberal study'.(124) While Cohen may have exaggerated the importance of Chiappetta's influence, it is clear that from then on the history of education as a separate component in teacher education courses was increasingly on the defensive, although its status was to increase quite dramatically from the late 1960s.

The report of the Committee on Historical Foundations - or, rather, the failure of the Committee to arrive at a coherent consensus - 'marked the nadir of history of education as a field of study in the United States... its recommendations were echoes of reconstructionist voices of the 1930s and 1940s, which, by the mid 1950s, had ceased to speak.(125) The failure to reach consensus puts one in mind of Borrowman's views, discussed earlier, about the

difficulties in teacher education of achieving agreement on a single overarching principle and, consequently, the need for compromise.(126) The fate of the Committee on Historical Foundations seems a good illustration of this point. The detailed debate within the HES and in the pages of its HEJ raised many fundamental issues of the relationship between history of education and teacher education courses, and between educational theory in general and professional programmes. Many of these issues were, of course, not unique to America, as was illustrated in the chapter on Britain, and many were to surface again in the debates over education in the 1980s. Some remain unresolved to this day.

Revisionism

Writing in 1957 from within the traditional paradigm of 'the great landmarks of American educational history', Adolphe Meyer, professor of education at New York University, lamented the decline of educational history, once a highly regarded subject, into 'a state of comparative desuetude'. Where it was offered at all, it was offered 'with a delicate forbearance, and commonly as an elective'.

In its place, students were provided with lists of courses:
 in administration and supervision, in guidance
 and personnel in methods of teaching this and
 that, in the lower, secondary and higher
 learning, and so on to Catering I, Church Work
 II, and Body Building VI.(127)

The blame for this sorry state of affairs, Meyer concluded, could be ascribed to 'national pragmatism', with its stress on utility and its decrying of theory in the training of teachers. Also to blame were 'the historical brethren' who 'have helped no little to inculcate it'.(128) Fortunately, however, the teachers and writers of history, 'as grave and thoughtful persons', had for some time been putting their house in order through the 'New History', which was less concerned with dissecting the past than with interpreting it.(129) In his response to this New History, Meyer enunciated his own credo, as most historians of education seem to find it necessary to do, at the end of their Introduction or Preface and after they have satisfactorily demolished their opponents or chosen targets:

Educational history, I believe with the experts, is social history. Yet it is also the history of school organisation and law, of teaching methods and psychology, and of the arts and sciences. It is also, and significantly, the history of the great man, the odd man, the dreamer - even, indeed, the seer. The educational history of the American people, so conceived, is thus far more than a historic scrutiny of social case work. It is in truth the history of all the people.(130)

There is an eclectic element in this rather full-bodied prose which suggests that Meyer - and he must have been typical of many in his position - while seeking to respond positively to aspects of the New History (social history, history from below), was also anxious to retain what he regarded as valuable (organisational history, the great man approach) in what, by implication, had now become the 'Old History'.

The Liberal Revisionists

Several factors were responsible for the apparent recovery of the history of education from the parlous position it had reached by the mid-1950s. Chief amongst these was the emergence of a group of younger historians who vigorously pursued the New History, and who were in due course to be labelled the Revisionists. As will be seen later, Revisionism is a broad term embracing at least two distinct thrusts, but for the moment it will be taken to refer to the work in the history of education undertaken from about 1960 onwards by those who rejected the traditional orthodoxy exemplified by Cubberley and Monroe and others of the 'Old History', and who sought to reinterpret the past in new terms, which will be discussed below.

In a brief but seminal article, Wilson Smith identified two distinguishing traits of the new historians: their use of broader historical references, and a wider, more humanistic professional commitment.(131) The new historian, Smith added, was also likely to use new methodologies, perhaps drawing these from the social sciences.(132) Whereas the primary role of the old historian was 'functional' in the training of teachers, and they devoted much

energy to defending 'their corner of the academic profession', the new historian - while still perhaps being useful in these ways - was more interested in fulfilling his 'function' by serving intellectual and disciplined thinking while inspecting the past and probing the outer reaches of historical knowledge. (133)

Oscar Handlin identified another element of the new history, its widened scope that considered 'a broad range of relationships to the totality of culture' (a theme that was developed particularly by Bailyn and Cremin), and examined the causal connections between educational change and broad social and intellectual trends. (134) In the same issue of the Harvard Educational Review in which Smith and Handlin appeared, Richard Storr of the University of Chicago added a further dimension:

(He) may try his hand at induction, examining the whole record of human experience in an effort to discover an ingredient of it that can sensibly be described as educational. He may follow many lights - and some hunches - through the sources, in pursuit of something that he will not identify fully until the end of his research. (135)

A more open-ended approach to research, the use of new methodologies, a wider definition of 'education', an examination of the relationships between education and the broader society, a commitment to humanistic values - these appear to be some of the dominant characteristics of the early revisionists.

It would seem that the main impetus for history of education's seemingly sudden breaking out of the doldrums came from looking at the educational process itself, rather than simply at the school. This carried a number of significant implications with it, some of which are listed in the previous paragraph. Much of the best revisionist work that was to result came, as Handlin says, from 'viewing history of education as an aspect either of social or of intellectual history'. (136)

The first major revisionist text came in 1960 with the publication of Bernard Bailyn's Education in the Forming of American Society (it

may be recalled that 196. was also the year that saw the publication in Britain of Brian Simon's Studies in the History of Education, an event that marked a similar turning point in that country). Bailyn - a 'mainstream' historian and not specifically an educational historian - described his work as 'an essay in hypothetical history', of necessity based on scattered and incompletely assembled evidence.(137) His lively account of the historiography of American education is justified in the following terms, which may be taken as applying to the present study also, and even as providing its starting point:

The subject of education in American history is at one of those junctures in the development of scholarship where a retrospective analysis of the work done in the field is not only enlightening but of strategic importance for further progress. The history of educational history is, consequently, a significant topic in itself.(138)

One of the contentions underlying the present study is that the subject of education in South African history is now also at such a juncture and that a retrospective analysis may serve valuable purposes, and this analysis will be attempted in the next two chapters.

Bailyn's criticisms of the old historians like Cubberley and Monroe have already been discussed. In looking specifically at their treatment of education in colonial America, he described it as brief, and marked by 'imbalance, quaintness, and jagged discontinuities'.(139) In place of their inadequate account with its emphasis on the development of the public school, he hypothesised the need to look at 'those assumptions, experiences, and ways of thinking of late sixteenth and early seventeenth century Englishmen, stressing those features that would be most affected by the American environment', including change in family structure from extended patriarchal kinship communities to nuclear units (i.e., taking account of anthropological factors); apprenticeship; the role of the church.(140) His conclusion is that by the end of the colonial period 'this configuration of educational processes had been radically transformed'(141) and that the transformation was

irreversible - 'We live with its consequences still'.(142) (This hypothesis is, of course, suggestive in a number of ways for an examination of education in South Africa, in particular the Cape, during its colonial period).

Bailyn's phrase, 'this configuration of educational processes', was rapidly to enter the common currency of historical discourse, indicating a dramatic moving away from the former narrow focus on the agencies of formal education, in particular the public school. Bailyn himself identified some of the fields for investigation: the history of the family; the cultural decline of the early colonial period as a result of the struggle for survival and the 'racial dogmatism' of the church (once again, there are resonances for the study of education in the early colonial period in South Africa); the history of literacy; the role of printers and publishers; the changing role and status of teachers; the changing role of the state.(143) Cremin was later to provide his own list for the 'configuration': families, churches, libraries, museums, publishers, benevolent societies, youth groups, agricultural fairs, radio networks, military organisations, and research institutions.(144)

This brings one to an important problem in the study of the history of education, one that has emerged particularly in relation to America. As Silver says, 'How broad or how narrow educational history can and should be has become part of the unending historiographical debate that characterises American educational history'.(145) The problem of delimiting the boundaries of the history of education is discussed in some detail in the first chapter of this study. The broadening of the field in Britain - although not to the extent suggested by either Bailyn or Cremin - was discussed in chapter 2, while the more recent moves in this direction in South Africa will be considered in chapters 5 and 6.

Bailyn's importance in the development of the study of American educational history is generally - and generously - acknowledged by subsequent writers. Katz, for example, describes his Education in

the Forming of American Society as 'brilliant' and 'the only deliberate attempt to ask new questions and to offer a new framework for the historical study of the relation between education and society'.(146) Katz goes on to reject Bailyn's theory on colonial education in favour of a much more restricted hypothesis based on a close study of one specific example, in this case Massachusetts between 1830 and 1885, which he hoped would be 'heuristic for inquiry into the same topic in places besides Massachusetts'.(147) Katz thus did not support the kind of broad comparative anthropological framework suggested by Bailyn.

Cremin took Bailyn's 'remarkable little book' as his starting point for examining American colonial education.(148) While believing that Bailyn distinguished too sharply between the interpretations of academic and educational historians, Cremin was generally in agreement with his analysis. He also found Bailyn's definition of education 'so latitudinarian as to afford the would-be chronicler of education too few canons for the selection of his material'.(149) Cremin was himself later to stand accused of much the same fault.

In 1965, Cremin's The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley appeared. This 'lampoon', as one of his colleagues called it, effectively marked the break between the generations of American educational historians. In later works, Cremin was to make major contributions to the new history of education. In American Education: the Colonial Experience he set out what amounted to a manifesto of the early revisionists:

We do not study the history of education merely for its possible value in avoiding mistakes... though history can have such value. We study history to become aware of our presuppositions and commitments in education by examining the origin of those presuppositions and commitments. I genuinely believe that if our national leaders had had a richer and more accurate history of American education at their disposal during the last twenty-five years, they would have possessed a much greater range of options as to where to intervene for the better and how.

We study history, not because in its absence there will not be any history, but rather because in its absence we shall have a corrupt history; we shall have the myths, the distortions, and the ideologies that flourish in the absence of critical scholarship. It is this, I think, that Socrates had in mind when he taught that the unexamined life is unfit to be lived by man. And it is this that propels those of us who study the past, even though we can never know it fully. (150)

Another factor in the regaining of history of education's respectability should now be mentioned. This was the work of the Committee on the Role of Education in American History, established by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education. This committee of distinguished historians published a call for action in 1957, arising from its conclusion that the history of American education had been neglected, with serious consequences for such matters as the planning of the curriculum, the formulation of educational policies and the administration of education agencies. This should be seen, according to the committee, in the light of the continuing crisis in American education. The committee urged historians to devote themselves to close monographic study of the role of education, formal and informal, in American history; called for a new history of education that would break from particularised and narrow institutional history and concern itself with the broader subject of the impact of education upon society; and encouraged the investigation of such issues as the influence of education on economic development, social mobility, and the assimilation of immigrants. In pursuance of the Committee's recommendations, the Fund sponsored a number of influential conferences on the history of American education and offered financial assistance to those wishing to pursue research. It also partly sponsored Bailyn's Education in the Forming of American Society, the first part of which was a lengthy critique of American educational historiography. The Committee's final report, Education and American History, was published in 1965. (151)

The early revisionists clearly had a major impact on the course of the history of education in America, even if they did not

necessarily sweep all before them. The educational foundations approach lingered on in places: McGraw-Hill published a series on the Foundations in Education, and this included a volume (1965) on educational history by Adolphe E Meyer (whose rather faded eloquence we have already encountered). Meyer's aim was unabashedly traditional, 'to survey the great landmarks of Western education from antiquity to the recent past'.(152) There was also still an apparently insatiable demand for the lives and thoughts of the great educators well into the 1960s and beyond.(153) The history of educational ideas continued to feature in teacher education courses, as it had done in the early years.(154) Student texts continued to appear that were little more than potboilers along the old lines, like Cordasco's 'review manual' that skipped lightly from classical to medieval to modern times.(155) But even traditional and conservative historians were quick not to distance themselves too far from the revisionist approach. Cordasco, for example, came down very firmly on the fence, criticising both schools in gentle terms: while the old historians were 'too narrow minded and inward-looking', the new ones were too 'diffuse'.(156) Another example is Beck, whose 1965 Social History of Education was based on the assumption that prospective teachers need to understand education through the historical perspective of Western culture. While labelling himself a liberal (in fact a 'Promethean humanist'), Beck made considerable play of his revisionist approach, although he rather astonishingly applied it to a re-consideration of the 'unfair' treatment usually given to the elder sophists!(157) Perhaps the most interesting example is the famous R Freeman Butts, the elder statesman of Teachers College. In his preface to the 1973 edition of his The Education of the West, Butts referred to his earlier version, A Cultural History of Western Education, published in 1947, and claimed that in that book he had hoped to remedy 'a defect in much of the prior writing and teaching in the history of education - namely, a tendency to look upon education as an institution isolated from the major forces at work in the surrounding society and culture'. He triumphantly claimed that in doing this he had 'anticipated by a decade the revisionist movement

that swept American historiography in the late 1950s and early 1960s'. But he did admit that the earlier book 'could not anticipate the range of revolutionary changes that culminated during the 1960s, and hence the need for the 1973 edition, which he described as 'revisionist' in the most fundamental sense'.(158) Butts was not simply climbing on a bandwagon: his Education of the West is not limited to an examination of schools and other educational agencies, based on the view that education is affected by the dominating institutions and beliefs in a culture and that education in turn affects the culture. This is an interesting example of the influence of the revisionist movement extending beyond the study of American education to a study of Western education as a whole.

The early revisionists did not, of course, escape criticism. The attacks on them were sometimes expressed in characteristically robust language of American educational discourse. Brickman, for example, launched a highly polemical, knockabout assault on the revisionist general historians whom he evidently felt had little right to meddle in education. 'Our friends in the historical profession', he wrote, with Hofstadter, Metzger, Storr and particularly Bailyn in mind, 'seem to be under the impression that all one needs to know is general history' and then one can set up as an educational historian, 'with a side glance at education', drawing heavily on the secondary sources and apparently satisfied to rest upon the scholarship of real educational historians, who, in Brickman's view, were such luminaries as Cubberley, Monroe and Butts. Brickman did admit to shortcomings in the teaching of the history of education, especially in the liberal arts colleges, where the employment of untrained retired school teachers to teach the subject led to its ruination.(159)

A wavering response to this attack came from Timothy L. Smith, professor of the history of education at the University of Minnesota. Smith was equivocal: Cubberley was 'in many ways, the best general book', although 'miscast'; all young historians are

revisionist, 'simply because they feel they have something to say which the older historians have not said'. Finally, Smith took refuge in the old ploy of the uncommitted, the 'task' at hand. Let us stop squabbling, Smith said in effect, and get on with the job of exploring the great quantities of source materials which still remain untouched.(160)

Robert Mason added his mite to the hate by criticising Cremin and Bailyn for their use of 'judgment and moralistic language'. He also expressed regret at Cremin's use of a 'lampooning' title in his book on Cubberley. Perhaps significantly, the editor of the History of Education Quarterly, in which Brickman, Smith and Mason had been having their say, felt that Mason had clarified the issues and carried the dialogue further.(161)

Sol Cohen's critique seems reasoned and balanced and since it covers several of the issues already raised in this chapter may be worth considering in some detail:

Attacks on Cubberley and the 'school' of educational historiography he purportedly founded have become since 1960 the conventional wisdom. However, the treatment of Cubberley and his generation of historians of education has been unduly harsh and sometimes factually incorrect. There has been little effort to understand Cubberley's work in the context of his time, place, milieu, or training. Critics have not been content simply to point out errors, deficiencies, and weaknesses, or to say that an older generation's work is outmoded or old-fashioned in style or thought. Rather, their efforts have seemed aimed not so much at debunking as at destroying. A strange kind of overkill has been at work here.

If it was necessary to clear the way for a new comprehension of the role of education in American history, this could have been accomplished simply by ignoring the work of historians of education on school of education faculties - the 'specialists' - or judiciously separating the wheat from the chaff...(162)

Cohen also makes the point that the denigration of the old school represented by Cubberley, and the fact that the Fund for the Advancement of Education snubbed historians of education on

education faculties by excluding them from the membership of its Committee on the Role of Education in American History in favour of general historians like Bailyn, Richard Hofstadter and Arthur Schlesinger, should be seen 'as another episode in the long cold war between liberal-arts-and-sciences faculties and educationists'. The educational crisis of the 1950s had fostered a vigorous reaction against the progressive ideology developed from the philosophy of Dewey and others; this ideology had formed the basis of the educational profession for many decades and the educational historians were inevitably caught up in the rejection of it.

Changes in the professional organisation of the history of education

Cremin had been anxious to build bridges between the history of education and its parent discipline, and between history of education and the body of professional educationists.(163) His efforts in this regard came to fruition in 1960 when he was elected president of the NSCTE. He was by this time already president of the History of Education Section. Under Cremin's guidance the old HES was disbanded and a new and autonomous History of Education Society established. The History of Education Journal was replaced by the History of Education Quarterly (HEQ). It will be recalled that the British Society was established towards the end of the 1960s. There is no comparable body in South Africa as yet.

The first issue of the HEQ made it clear what the policy would be: the history of education should be related more closely to the historical profession; it should develop its roots in social, cultural and intellectual history; it should diminish its parochial and sometimes narrow emphasis.(164)

These developments should be seen in the context of the crisis in American teacher education that began in the late 1950s as part of the general re-examination of American education, and that reached a peak in 1963 with the publication of James Conant's The Education of

American Teachers.(165) Conant criticised courses in the history, sociology and philosophy of education, especially when they were taught by non-specialists. His sharpest attack, however, was directed at courses in the foundations of education. Those who taught such courses were often inadequately trained themselves in any of the foundation disciplines and merely patched together scraps of history, philosophy, political theory and sociology, resulting in eclectic programmes that were usually worthless and, in addition, gave education departments a bad name. This criticism is, of course, very similar to that directed against the 'Principles of Education' in England, particularly by R S Peters (see section on the 1960s and early 1970s in chapter 2). In Cohen's view, the field of education seemed to have been waiting for a pronouncement such as Conant's: 'it was what many had thought for years but had been unwilling to state publicly. Social foundations would now be off the back of history of education'.(166) For educational historians in university schools or departments of education the early 1960s were a heady time. As Cohen says, it was the beginning of a new era. It was a boost to the self-esteem of educational historians to have Bailyn, the distinguished Harvard historian, affirm that education was a legitimate field of historical enquiry, with the consequence that this attracted the professional historians per se, thus giving an opportunity for the educational historian to 'reconnect with the rigorous canons of historical scholarship' and escape the clutches of foundations courses. The requirement that their work should be immediately relevant could be abandoned. Writing in 1976, Cohen could say that the past ten years had witnessed a transformation in the history of education's position. Few fields of social history had grown so rapidly, while the present position and future prospects seemed brighter than ever. Cohen was wise enough, however, to warn that the apparent renaissance might be short-lived and that the reduced tension between the 'professionals' and the 'academicians' might be more of a truce than a lasting peace.(167)

The Radical Revisionists

In 1974 Butts provided a useful survey of the different schools of educational history from Cubberley and the 'pietists' through the liberal revisionists like Cremin to the newer group of more radical revisionists like Katz, Spring, Greer and Violas. He went on to suggest that he, Butts, had actually superseded the lot of them with his conception of modernisation as an organising framework, (168) a theme he had developed in an article in 1967. (169) In the latter he had also mused on the nature of revisionism. He preferred the terms 'reinterpretation' or 'reconstruction', since too often revisionism was the conscious effort to belittle a predecessor's writing in order to enhance one's own (he quoted James Hooker in this regard as saying that revisionism was 'the conscious effort to rewrite a resented past'). (170) Butts himself is, of course, a very worthy and erudite writer, but somewhat wordy and mystical, while his notion that civilisation has been advancing all along and education with it is really rather too facile to offer the kind of explanatory framework that Butts claimed for it.

The radical revisionists - particularly Michael Katz, Clarence Karier, Joel Spring, Paul Violas and David Tyack - came to prominence from the late 1960s. Perhaps inevitably, they attacked not only the 'old' school represented by Cubberley and Monroe, but also their more immediate predecessors, the liberal revisionists like Cremin. Yet Bailyn and Cremin form the bridge between Cubberley and the radicals: their contribution was necessary before the 'Young Turks' could come on to the stage. (171)

The emergence of the new revisionist movement clearly should be seen in the context of contemporary events and developments in American society: reaction to the war in Vietnam; the realisation that patterns of social and racial inequality were deeply embedded and that liberal programmes of reform were likely to fail; the spread of urban blight and the extent of lawlessness in American society; and the widespread corruption in national and local politics. These factors affected the study of history as a whole, of course, and many historians began to look for radical explanations for present

problems and radical proposals for their solution, rejecting liberal approaches as a placebo and arguing for a fundamental restructuring of American society. Historians of education like Katz, for example, were no exception to this general trend:

At this point in history any reform worthy of the name must begin with a redistribution of power and resources. That is the only way in which to change the patterns of control and inaccessible organisational structures that dominate American life. It is the only way in which to make education and other social institutions, as well, serve new purposes.(172)

Ten years after Dailyn's pioneering essay of 1960, Katz spelled out a new revisionist credo. He rejected the view of history as linear evolution in favour of one which saw history as largely 'a series of changes in direction and alternatives chosen'; urged historians of education to encourage teachers 'to probe and question rather than to accept'; described educational innovation as 'essentially a complex reaction to social and economic change'; and proposed such methods of study as quantitative and statistical research.(173)

The question of educational innovation is crucial in Katz's work. Important aspects of his approach are exemplified in his close study of the process of educational development in Massachusetts between 1830 and 1885 (his choice of topic was obviously dictated by the fact that Massachusetts was the nursery of formal education in north America, and by the fact that a traditional history of education had already appeared on the topic)(174):

The importance of detailed local history for reconstructing the process of nineteenth century educational development can hardly be exaggerated. State governments had some moral, legal, and financial influence, but for the most part educational change was a local process: it happened when a local community, or influential and powerful people within it, became convinced that change was necessary. Thus the general story of what happened and how it happened must be pieced together from the records of individual towns and cities.(175)

In the light of this strong insistence on detailed local research and historical specificity in order to determine the 'general story', it is interesting to note that several of the major critics

of the revisionists were to complain about their broad generalisations and over-simplifications and to ask for 'less assertion and more documentation, less ideological posturing and more mining of source material'.(176) Such criticisms are, of course, useful only when they are related to specific examples of the revisionists' work.

Katz and the other revisionists of his more radical inclination introduced important new insights into the study of the history of American education. Katz, for example, saw the significance of an understanding of the nature of social stratification in order to explain the development and function of nineteenth century education, stressed the importance of a functional approach to educational rhetoric (i.e., how did the expounding of particular ideas serve the interests of particular groups?), and the need 'to make connections between ideology and action (between what people said and what they did) and between ideology and the situation in which people found themselves (ideas about the world and the actual empirical situation)'.(177) He regarded the matter of consequences as posing the most difficult and yet the most important question for the educational historian:

What were the results of education? What has been its impact upon individuals? Upon the community? Upon intellectual, social, and cultural life? In part these questions can be approached systematically. For instance, it appears possible through the use of manuscript census [the actual records of individuals in a census], assessment rolls, and school records to make some estimation of the impact of education upon social mobility.

In larger part, however, the question of results must rest on a sensitive and even brash attempt to see connections between the nature and style of earlier educational development and the nature and problems of contemporary education, such as the estrangement of the school and the working class or the inability to find an alternative to bureaucracy in education. Inherently full of all the dangers of bad Whig history, this attempt must nevertheless be made without apology and with boldness by historians

of education, for that is the way in which they will speak with significance and relevance to the educational perplexities of our time.(178)

The rather prescriptive tone is notable here, while one has to question the possibility of being both sensitive and brash at the same time. There is no doubt, however, that Katz and his contemporaries were charting important new directions for the study of American educational history, directions, moreover, with implications for the study of educational history in other societies, including South Africa. As will be discussed in Chapter 5, the radical revisionists like Katz have had an influence on the younger, more radical students of South African education.

The radical revisionists dominated the field in the USA in the 1970s, although of course there were still efforts to pursue the 'old' history of education.(179) Although collectively the most significant figures - Katz, Tyack, Clarence Karier, Paul Violas, Colin Greer, Joel Spring - fundamentally influenced the study and the teaching of the history of American education, it would obviously be erroneous to regard them as a homogeneous group holding identical views. They did share a common 'disillusionment with institutionalised education and discouragement with the results of schooling in the present', but at least one of them, Tyack, warned against the dangers of allowing 'presentism' to prompt historians to tell 'a tale of woe as one-sided as the previous story of the public school triumphant'.(180) They often sparked each other off: Violas, for example, mentions his debt to the early liberal revisionists, but more particularly to Spring, Karier, and, most notably, Tyack.(181) It was the latter who stimulated him to explore such questions as social control which, Tyack suggested, had been treated as a rather amorphous concept in recent work in the history of education, which failed to specify the purposes or the beneficiaries of social control (182) (compare the discussion on this point in the previous chapter). The outcome was an important study by Violas on the education of the American working class in which industrial capitalism was identified as a major factor in the development of twentieth century education:

Educators found the requirements for good citizenship to be identical to those for efficient service in the modern economic system. This symbiotic relationship fostered not only vocational training and guidance programs, but the play movements, extra-curricular activities and Americanisation campaigns as well.(183)

This interpretation, particularly as taken by Bowles and Gintis to the extreme conclusion that the educational system is merely functional in relation to the needs of the capitalist economy, became prominent in South African educational revisionist work in the 1980s, although it derives as much from a decade of neo-Marxist study of general South African history as it does from the Americans mentioned here.(184)

Another important theme in the writings of the radical revisionists was the position of America's minorities. This had been largely ignored in the old history of education, and the revisionists sought to redress the balance. In the study already referred to, for example, Violas addressed the question of the relationship between capitalism and the education of black Americans in these terms:

(as a result of) the belated realisation that industrial capitalism could not endure peacefully unless black Americans participated on a basis of reasonable equality... the public school system began to respond with vigorous programs to bring blacks into the mainstream of American life. In many ways, these endeavours resembled the Americanisation programs begun for immigrant children fifty years before.(185)

The distance between Cubberley and Violas, to take two representative figures of the 'old' history of education and the radical revisionist movement, is clearly enormous. The entire agenda had been rewritten. At times, the revisionists' rejection of American society appears to be total. Karier, for example, holds that:

American society is not structured to enhance the dignity of man but, unfortunately, is structured to foster a dehumanising quest for status, power and wealth. We live, I believe, in a fundamentally racist, materialistic society...(186)

Author Randall P R

Name of thesis The role of the History of Education 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.