

## INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 8926392

**Territorial Normal and Training School, 1895–1931: An  
institutional history of public teacher education in Hawaii**

Logan, Linda Louise, Ed.D.

University of Hawaii, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Logan, Linda Louise. All rights reserved.

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



TERRITORIAL NORMAL AND TRAINING SCHOOL,  
1895-1931: AN INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF  
PUBLIC TEACHER EDUCATION IN HAWAII

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
IN EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

MAY 1989

By

Linda Louise Logan

Dissertation Committee:

Ralph K. Stueber, Chairman  
Ann Keppel  
Solomon Jaeckel  
Victor Kobayashi  
Arthur King  
Robert McGlone

© Copyright by Linda Louise Logan 1989  
All Rights Reserved

---

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Many heartfelt thanks to Dr. Ralph Stueber, whose questioning has expanded and enriched the scope of this study. Thanks also to Dr. Victor Kobayashi who provided the much needed final editing and to the late David Kittleson who was so helpful with my work at the University of Hawaii Archives. Dr. Mary Burton, my friend, whose encouragement and support played a major role in this accomplishment, a big thank you. Finally, and most important, I want to acknowledge my family. Thank you, Bob, Lauren, and Casey for all you've done and not been able to do in order to help me achieve my goals.

**ABSTRACT**

Histories of public education abound in the United States, yet histories of public teacher education, the normal schools, are noticeably lacking. Likewise many have investigated Hawaii's public school system yet a comprehensive study of public teacher education has been neglected. It was the purpose of this study to fill this void in Hawaii's educational history by rediscovering the only institution of public teacher education that existed in Hawaii from 1895-1931, the Government Normal School, later the Territorial Normal and Training School.

This study was designed as an institutional history to record and interpret the relationships between the Territorial Normal and Training School and the governments of the Republic and Territory of Hawaii. The chronological approach has been used to trace the creation of the school, the changes that occurred through three administrations, and finally the amalgamation of the Territorial Normal and Training School with the University of Hawaii. Primary sources, such as, letters, minutes of the Board of Education Meetings, University of Hawaii Regents meeting minutes,

and other documents maintained at the Hawaii State Archives and the University of Hawaii Archives plus pertinent newspaper articles were basic reference materials used.

Several specific conclusions were reached. The Territorial Normal and Training School was used by the oligarchy of Hawaii to initiate the tutelage of the new American citizens of Hawaii, but continued to maintain the early stages of Americanization in order to maintain the economic, social and political status quo of Hawaii's elite. Those who sought to change in Hawaii followed mainland trends and worked within the existing institutions to bring about a more democratic society. The reformers focused their energies on the only teacher institution in Hawaii, the Territorial Normal and Training School. Through changes at the normal school, they hoped to provide Hawaii's public elementary schools with teachers who would promote the knowledge, behaviors, and attitudes deemed necessary to transform the Territory of Hawaii into a more democratic community.

To use history as history, it is recommended that modern-day teacher education reformers reinvestigate the normal school in order to reclaim the many contributions the normal school can make to today's teacher education programs, policies, and practices.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iv
ABSTRACT . . . . .	v
PREFACE . . . . .	viii
CHAPTER I. HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE NORMAL SCHOOL IN HAWAII 1820-1895 . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II. THE BUILDING YEARS - 1895-1900. . .	13
CHAPTER III. EDGAR WOOD SHAPES THE TERRITORIAL NORMAL AND TRAINING SCHOOL 1900-1912 . . . . .	38
CHAPTER IV. TROUBLE AT THE NORMAL SCHOOL 1912-1916 . . . . .	76
CHAPTER V. PROGRESSIVE REFORM, THE 1920 SURVEY AND THE TERRITORIAL NORMAL AND TRAINING SCHOOL - 1916-1921 . . . . .	110
CHAPTER VI. BENJAMIN WIST: CHANGE AT THE NORMAL SCHOOL - 1921-1929 . . . . .	151
CHAPTER VII. FROM NORMAL SCHOOL TO TEACHERS' COLLEGE - 1921-1931 . . . . .	185
CHAPTER VIII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION . .	204
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	226

## PREFACE

The preparation of many American elementary school teachers took place in a sub-collegiate single purpose institution known as the normal school. For approximately one hundred years (1830-1930) the normal school served to provide teachers for the American common school. Since then, the preparation of all teachers has become the responsibility of multi-purpose institutions of higher education (1930-present). Despite its long history, research on the normal school has been sadly neglected by modern scholars in education.

Scholars in education, in their quest for recognition in the academic world, appear to have too eagerly shed their relationship to their normal school origins. Despite the humble professional and academic beginnings, the study of this institution can make contributions to modern-day teacher education programs. Discovery of these contributions has been left to the historian.

Contemporary historians of education have devoted relatively little time to the fashioning of a solid history of teacher education. Although Elwood P. Cubberly in his time hailed the normal school as one of the "great milestones in our early educational history,"<sup>1</sup> such recent historians as Michael Katz, David Tyack, Stanley Schultz, and Diane Ravitch, have barely acknowledged the existence

of such schools and have ignored searching out their contributions to modern teacher education. It is time for educational scholars and historians alike to recognize the normal school as an important institutional beginning of today's teacher education programs. Only through historical scholarship can the normal schools' contribution to teacher education be made known. No profession can afford to be ignorant of its past.

Granted, the study of the past alone cannot resolve current problems, but to ignore historical perspective is simply foolish. To neglect the history of the normal school is to deny contemporary educational scholars and historians, the advantage of this historical perspective.

The College of Education at the University of Hawaii is no exception to what might be called the historical dilemma of the normal school. For example, in 1981, the college celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of Teacher' College of the University of Hawaii; yet 1970 went unnoticed and uncelebrated as the seventy-fifth anniversary of public teacher education in the Islands. Seventy-five years earlier the leadership of the Republic of Hawaii recognized the growing need for teachers especially prepared for their work. The answer to meeting this need was the opening of the Government Normal School in 1895. (The name was soon changed to the Territorial Normal and Training School.) The Territorial Normal

School was not only a public educational institution in the Hawaiian Islands but one dedicated solely to the preparation of elementary teachers.

Although some excellent articles have been devoted to the history of public teacher preparation in Hawaii, none has focused primarily on the normal school. However, three short histories have been written about some aspects of the normal school. In 1929, Ruth Shaw wrote her master's thesis entitled 'The Output of the Territorial Normal and Training School,' which includes a wealth of statistical data on all its graduates. Lorraine Ota's honors thesis, 'The Origins of the Teachers' College of the University of Hawaii 1921-1931' (1969), traces the battle for the control of teacher education in Hawaii. Lastly, John Fry's master's project, 'Edgar Wood and the Territorial Normal and Training School: A Source of Americanization in Hawaii' (1968), makes the case that the normal school under Edgar Wood was aimed at indoctrinating students with American middle-class values. However, no one has attempted a comprehensive history of this institution.

The purpose of this study is to fill this void by providing a comprehensive institutional history of the Territorial Normal and Training School.

The study represents a call to those professional historians who have been highly critical of institutional histories to reconsider the value of institutional history.

Institutional histories have been regarded as of little value due to their reputation for being strictly narrative in nature or essentially self-congratulatory. As historian John E. Talbot declared, "A good share of the institutional history has been the work of antiquaries and devoted alumni, who uncover much valuable information but rarely sought to interpret it."<sup>2</sup> Yet there is danger in neglecting institutional histories because, as Paul H. Mattingly, author of the Classless Profession, says, "The institution is a historical and political organization, whose interaction with its larger context changes over time, revealing patterns in both."<sup>3</sup>

"Revealing patterns in both" is the key to understanding not only the institution under investigation but its impact upon and significance for the society it was established to serve, in particular, its significance to the political order. Institutional history must not be limited to just facts and dates and not be inward looking. Institutional history must be interpretive to view that institution as part of the society. Consequently, educational historians should not return to the narrative and insular self-congratulatory institutional historiography of Cubberly, yet they must be careful to avoid subordinating the educational institution to political, social, and/or economic institutions and their histories.

This study will raise and answer two fundamental questions: What were the relationships between the normal school and 1) the government of the Republic (1893-1900) and 2) the Territory of Hawaii (1900-1959)? I hope to discover how the normal school was created, developed, and changed by the governments of the Republic and the Territory and in turn discover how the normal school played a part in bringing about changes in the meaning and function of government. In this interactive process ideas on the nature of government become issue-ridden, especially the issue of how government is to relate to the sugar industry of the islands, the issue of the nature of citizenship of that government, and the issue of how education related to both.

Hawaii became a republic in 1893 that ended with annexation in 1900 when Hawaii became an American territory. During this brief period as a republic, and under the leadership of Sanford Dole as president, missionary descendants, their relatives by marriage, and a handful of business associates not of missionary connection, comprised the inner haole core,<sup>4</sup> an oligarchy in fact that governed Hawaii as a Republic as well as a territory that ended in 1959 with statehood.<sup>5</sup> In Hawaii Pono, Lawrence Fuchs states that "their (governments'/oligarchy) main concern, aside from maintaining control, was to Americanize the Islands."<sup>6</sup> Americanization of the Islands would go far in convincing the U.S. Congress and

the American people that the peoples of Hawaii were indeed ready for close political ties with the United States, whether it be through territorialship or statehood. However, control of Hawaii would serve to maintain the lifestyle of the elite. Based upon the works of Fuchs, Daws and others, one can say that the American institutions established throughout the Islands in the 19th century were controlled to serve the private interests of the oligarchy (the "public interest" was the concept and social practice of democracy). The dichotomy of Americanizing the island population while maintaining oligarchical control was particularly manifested in the approach to education in the public schools. Attempts to satisfy the two conflicting goals resulted in a continuing paradox in Hawaiian society during the period covered by this study.

For example, the name Republic of Hawaii alluded to a government by many, when in fact it was government by few. The governmental structure was modeled after the United States' three branches, but the voting regulations were so restrictive that the oligarchy could easily maintain control. The term "contract labor" alluded to free choice in employment, while in fact free movement on or between plantations was severely limited. As we shall see the public schools of Hawaii were substandard in every way, while private institutions, which served the elite,

continued to flourish. Yet public education itself was the major tenet in Hawaii's paradox.

Hawaii's oligarchy established a system of government schools, and made school attendance compulsory in 1840. In 1895 the Republic established a government normal school to serve that system. As Fuchs wrote, '(U)niversal education, open to all -- indeed, compulsory for all -- was the goal even under the oligarchy. The leading holes in their zeal for education had placed a Trojan horse within the oligarchical system.'<sup>7</sup>

The goal of education within the oligarchical system was to produce future citizens who possessed controllable knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. The Trojan horse of education contained ultimately uncontrollable forces of new ideas that eventually worked with other progressive forces to produce a more democratic Hawaiian society. As we shall see, a more democratic education encouraged different knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors among those students educated in the public school system. A democratic society is defined here in the progressive sense, as a society where all the people would have an opportunity to control their lives rather than merely adapt to the narrow opportunities the elite provided for them. Such a society would provide wider participation in decisionmaking with opportunities to gain financial security. In short, democracy would be a government of the people, for the people and by the people. The normal

school under Benjamin Wist played a vital role in nurturing these democratic forces throughout the island chain.

This institutional history of the Territorial Normal School is two fold. First, it will explore the nature of the relationship between two forms of government, oligarchy and democracy, and the role the preparation of teachers played during the era of Hawaii's normal school. Second, because the contribution of history lies in its usefulness, the legacy of the normal school will be uncovered (rediscovered) with an eye to today.

Sources used for this study were newspapers, official documents, letters, and some interviews with former normal school cadets (students). Unfortunately, the first two normal school principals did not leave a record of their personal experiences. There is little to be found on the day-to-day experiences of the faculty or students. Therefore, I had to rely on official documents, newspaper accounts, letters, and records found in both the State of Hawaii and the University of Hawaii archives. These documents provide an official view of the normal school but by no means its complete history. Yet, by weaving the histories of Hawaii, the normal school, and the United States, I hope that a well-rounded institutional history has resulted.

NOTES

PREFACE

<sup>1</sup>Ellwood Cubberly, Public Education in the United States (Boston: Houghton Mufflin Co., 1947) pp. vi-vii.

<sup>2</sup>John Talbot, 'The History of Education,' Daedalus (1971) p. 133.

<sup>3</sup>Paul Mattingly, Historical Inquiry in Education ed. John Hardin Best (Washington, D.C.; The American Educational Research Association, 1983) p. 51.

<sup>4</sup>haole - foreigner; mostly white/caucasian.

<sup>5</sup>Lawrence Fuchs, Hawaii Pono (San Diego: Hauteaut, Beoa Javanvich Publishers, 1961) p. 38.

<sup>6</sup>Fuchs, p. 43.

<sup>7</sup>Fuchs, p. 33.

---

## CHAPTER ONE

### HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE NORMAL SCHOOL IN HAWAII 1820-1895

The history of public teacher education in the Hawaiian Islands officially began in the fall of 1895 with the establishment of a public normal school. The normal school idea was not original to the Islands nor was there a lack of teacher preparation before that date. Therefore it is important to briefly investigate how and why Hawaii became concerned with the education of teachers and why that concern culminated with the Territorial Normal and Training School.

In 1820, the first company of New England missionaries arrived in the Hawaiian Islands. Their main mission to the Islands was to Christianize the native Polynesian people.<sup>1</sup> A major part of their plan for Christianization was schooling. Believing, as their Puritan forefathers had, that literacy was essential to salvation,<sup>2</sup> the New England missionaries set out to establish schools in all parts of the kingdom. The novelty of reading and writing intrigued the Hawaiian people, and, with the encouragement of the Hawaiian royalty, scores of adults, commoners and chiefs attended the instruction offered by the missionaries.

With ever-increasing numbers of students the missionaries faced the dilemma of providing more teachers. Additional companies of missionaries were sent from the United States, but never in sufficient numbers. The logical solution was to train natives to serve and create the village schools.

In these earliest stages of Island schooling, future native teachers were selected from among the more advanced students, at least in the eyes of their new mentors. After acquiring the rudiments of reading and writing the Hawaiian language (which had been transcribed to written form by the missionaries), these most promising students were sent out to form their own schools. They in turn taught and then selected students to go out and teach in schools of their own creation.<sup>3</sup> It would follow that as the native students became teachers, the reading and writing skills of the teaching force gradually diminished.

How far could native control be extended? The missionaries, seeing the great contrast between native and missionary teachers, began holding classes at station schools, where they could directly control the training of teachers. However, the missionaries soon found that this was no real solution to the problem of an adequate teaching force in quantity or quality.

They (native teachers) fail to interest because their stock of knowledge is exhausted, and the children, as well as the adults, are quick to perceive their deficiency. . . . The progress of instruction . . . is becoming stationary for want of suitable persons to carry it beyond the mere rudiments.<sup>4</sup>

By 1831 the novelty of going to school had worn thin, and school development, the close companion to church development in the Christianizing movement in Hawaii, was threatened. The missionaries had always felt the weakest link in the educational chain was poor teachers. The American Board of Commissioners to Foreign Missions, an organization that sponsored the mission to Hawaii, reported,

It (native-taught schools) has indeed accomplished all the good and more than was expected from it. Thousands have been taught to read the word of God and some in every place have been taught to write; but the system needs radical reform, which must begin with the teacher.<sup>5</sup>

This need for reform was met with yet another solution to the teacher training problem. This time the missionaries established a secondary school for the training of teachers at Lahaina on the Island of Maui.

Lahainaluna school on Maui was the first formal school in Hawaii to include teacher training in its curriculum. Six years later the Hilo Boarding School was established on the Island of Hawaii, with a proportion of its efforts also going to the training of teachers. However, this training was not provided in the normal school fashion. Teacher training at these two schools did

not include instruction on the art of teaching, nor did they include a practice school. Benjamin Wist, a twentieth-century educator in Hawaii, wrote, "In 1858 an attempt was made to introduce some study of pedagogy; but, despite the original purpose, the institution (Lahainaluna) was not destined to become a teachers' college."<sup>6</sup>

In 1840 the school "system" begun by the missionaries became the responsibility of the newly formed constitutional monarchy of Hawaii. The monarchy placed control of the schools under a centralized Department of Public Instruction, headed by the Minister of Public Instruction. As operational control of the schools gradually became a function of government, the Protestant missionaries set a powerful pattern in place (as shall be seen) by establishing a private institution essentially for the education of their own children. Called Oahu College (later Punahou) teaching was in English and reinforced the religious beliefs of the founders.

In 1848 the Reverend Richard Armstrong was appointed by the Hawaiian monarchy as Minister of Public Instruction, a position he held for twelve years. Armstrong has been credited with bringing to Hawaii an American common school system. During Armstrong's term (1848-1860) certain Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians began agitating for the English language to supplant the Hawaiian language as the medium of instruction in the

government schools.<sup>7</sup> A small number of "select" schools was begun to satisfy these demands. Efforts to extend these select schools were hampered because of the lack of teachers in the Islands capable of instructing in the English language.

The immediate solution was again importation of teachers from the United States, but as early as 1862 a more permanent solution was sought. In his speech to the legislature of 1862, King Kamehameha IV put forth this suggestion,

The importance of substituting English for Hawaiian schools I have already earnestly recommended, and in again bringing the subject to your attention I would touch upon a matter which I think is of equal importance, and that is in raising the standard of elementary education in the Common Schools, as recommended by the President but combined with the teaching of English as a general thing throughout the Kingdom.<sup>8</sup>

The normal school proposal of the King lay dormant until 1870, when H. R. Hitchcock was appointed head of public education in Hawaii. Hitchcock was born, raised, and educated in the Islands. He was the founder of Hilo Union School and had taught for fifteen years in Hawaii before being appointed Minister of Public Instruction. Hitchcock toured the schools of Hawaii in 1870-71 and reported the need for a normal school:

Permit me to call your attention to the imperative necessity now existing for a normal school in our midst. . . . The teachers of our classrooms must be specifically educated for their work . . . the teachers conventions now instituted will lend a strong aid to the

consummation of this desired end. But nothing can take the place of an institution where persons are specially trained up to become educators. . . . If we would attain to stand in the van of civilization and progress we must educate our common school teachers for their work.<sup>9</sup>

Yet Hitchcock stepped down from his post in 1877 unsuccessful in obtaining a normal school for Hawaii.

D. D. Baldwin, a long-time Island resident, succeeded Hitchcock in 1877. Baldwin seems not to have promoted the normal school idea. He focused his efforts on establishing more select schools, schools taught in English throughout the Islands, because the demand to learn English had grown stronger after the Reciprocity Treaty was signed in 1876.

The Treaty gave Hawaii's sugar planters a tariff-free market in the United States in exchange for Pearl Harbor as a military base. The treaty resulted in a tremendous expansion of sugar plantations, the importation of foreign labor to work them, and the growth of supporting businesses. Henry Townsend, an educator in Hawaii, wrote, "Every argument which has hitherto existed in favor of English education for Hawaiians has now doubled, the English language gained rapidly in importance."<sup>10</sup> English as the medium of instruction in the public schools had far reaching implications as Townsend well knew. The English language would open the doors of opportunities and choice for future generations of Hawaiian students in an Americanized Hawaiian society. (Yet, Hawaiian language and culture would begin to erode.)

As Baldwin attempted to increase the number of select schools in Hawaii, teachers also were needed to be educated in the English language. To this end the two schools in the Islands that the common schools most depended upon for their supply of teachers, Lahainaluna and Hilo Boarding Schools, were taught in English rather than Hawaiian. Townsend remarked that this action was 'fatal to the prospects of improving or even keeping up with the quality of the teaching force in the Hawaiian common schools.'<sup>11</sup> This move made the reliance on teachers imported from the United States even greater.

The dependence on teachers trained at Lahainaluna and Hilo Boarding Schools and in the United States continued until 1888 when M. M. Scott, principal of the Front Street School, took it upon himself to begin informal classes.

Yet the major impetus toward a permanent normal school in Hawaii was the work of Henry Townsend who was tagged by B. O. Wist as the first Progressive educator in Hawaii, because Townsend envisioned the normal school as more than a means of improving teaching or the common schools. He saw the normal school as an institution that could change Hawaiian society. R. K. Stueber, an Hawaiian educational historian, described Townsend's ambitions for Hawaii and her schools,

Townsend has stressed, in all of his efforts to improve the quality of public education in the Islands, the fact that school studies were not ends of education but rather the means to ends. In Hawaii he noted, the major end was the establishment of a free

democratic society in which all Hawaii's people would ultimately share. . . that transformation would depend upon the degree to which the schools maintained their role as special institutions in which students of all the various races and tongues could learn the art of living together in peace and harmony. The most important lessons students would have to practice were the lessons of mutual respect and forbearance.<sup>12</sup>

Townsend believed that staffing the common schools with teachers whose normal school education prepared them to make the public schools a forum to educate all elements of the society together would go far in promoting a democratic community. It was to the United States that Townsend looked for a model and structure for a Hawaiian normal school.

The American model for Townsend was a normal school that would educate teachers who would promote "a free democratic society." That education would include problem solving, inquiry, creativity, co-operation in the classroom, and extra-curricular activities such as clubs, organizations and sports teams. The normal school would provide pre-service teachers with a review of the common branches of knowledge to be taught in the elementary schools, instruction in the art of teaching, and a practice school where pre-service teachers were to gain initial supervised experience. In 1890 he began his work toward establishing a normal school.

In 1890 Townsend was appointed principal of Lahainaluna on Maui. He saw this as his opportunity to further his educational ideas and return Lahainaluna to

its original purpose of preparing teachers. To this end he was instrumental in hiring an Oswego Normal School graduate, James L. Dumas, to head a normal department at Lahainaluna.<sup>13</sup>

The Oswego Normal School, under Principal Edward Sheldon, had made a name for itself as a front runner in teacher education. This was mainly due to Oswego's development of a new teaching method, Object Teaching, which according to its creator, was the first American attempt to base primary education, "on sound philosophical principles, carried out in a definite and well-arranged course."<sup>14</sup> The hiring of Oswego graduates was very much in vogue in the latter part of the nineteenth century. At least sixteen United States cities had hired Oswego graduates either to lead or to enhance their educational programs. Seventeen state normal schools were headed by Oswego graduates.<sup>15</sup> Townsend saw the hiring of an Oswego graduate as the first step toward giving Hawaii an American type normal school.

James L. Dumas, a recent Oswego graduate, was hired by Hawaii to serve under Townsend at Lahainaluna as a normal instructor. Dumas arrived in Honolulu in 1892 and reported to the Minister of Public Instruction. Because the minister and the six Commissioners of Education, who constituted the sole hiring agent for Hawaii's public schools, felt Dumas was too young and inexperienced in Island ways to have the important position of teacher

trainer,<sup>16</sup> Dumas did not begin his work as teacher trainer under the progressive Townsend.

Dumas was assigned instead to Maui as principal of the Waihee School. In 1893, during his time at Waihee School, the Hawaiian monarch was overthrown. The men responsible for the overthrow felt that American territoriality would be assured. But when the United States government denied territorial status to Hawaii the Republic of Hawaii was born.

The Republic was fashioned in the image of the United States. The governmental structure was modeled after the U. S. Constitution. Monogamy replaced plural marriages, Christianity was widely practiced, (w)estern dress, music, and recreational habits were the vogue.<sup>17</sup> An American type public school system had already been in place for a generation. To cap the system, a public normal school, one that had been talked about for years, was required.

In 1888, the year informal normal classes were begun in Hawaii, the U. S. mainland already had 263 normal schools, with 2,076 instructors, serving 55,135 students.<sup>18</sup> By 1895 an American dominated Hawaii followed suit.

## NOTES

### CHAPTER ONE

<sup>1</sup>Robert W. Clopton, "The Christianization of Hawaii viewed as a Social Movement," 1939 Xerox, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Edmund Morgan, The Puritan Family (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1944), p. 89.

<sup>3</sup>George T. Lechter, "Lahainaluna 1831-1877," Thesis, University of Hawaii, 1938, p. 19-20.

<sup>4</sup>Lechter, p. 22-23.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Benjamin Wist, A Century of Public Education in Hawaii (Honolulu: Hawaii Educational Review, 1940), p. 135.

<sup>7</sup>Ralph Stueber, "An Informal History of Schooling in Hawaii," To Teach The Children (Honolulu: Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Publication, 1981), p. 23.

<sup>8</sup>King Kamehameha IV, "His Majesties Speech at the Opening of the Legislature 1861," rpt. in Roster of Legislature of Hawaii, ed. Robert C. Lydecher, (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co. 1918), p. 82-85.

<sup>9</sup>Republic of Hawaii, Biennial Report of the Minister of Education to the President 1899, p. 53.

<sup>10</sup>Report 1899, p. 55.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ralph K. Stueber, "Hawaii: A Case Study in Developmental Education, 1778-1960," Diss. University of Wisconsin, 1964, p. 197.

<sup>13</sup>Henry Townsend, "Hawaii: Education in the Nineties," ed. Benjamin Wist, Unpublished Brochure, date unknown p. 402.

<sup>14</sup>U. S. Bureau of Education. The Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States, Circular of Information No. 8 (J. P. Gordy) (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1891), p. 87.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 74-75.

<sup>16</sup>Townsend, p. 42.

<sup>17</sup>Fuchs, p. 36.

<sup>18</sup>U. S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner 1884-1885, (Washington, D. C.: GPO 1885) p. Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1900 (Honolulu:iv.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE BUILDING YEARS 1895-1900

The first five years of the Normal School were years of building a new institution to serve the educational and political and economic needs of the new Republic of Hawaii. Between 1895 and 1900 the structure of the Normal School was established. Yet, more important, these years determined the role the Normal School would play in Hawaiian society.

The Normal School idea came easily to the Islands. There were no legislative battles or public debate over the centralization of teacher training because the leaders of the Republic of Hawaii were essentially of one mind. The government of the Republic of Hawaii was largely dominated by descendants of the New England missionaries. Lawrence Fuchs determined that 70 percent of all key offices in the new government was held by descendants of churchmen and churchwomen.<sup>1</sup> These leaders were convinced that they alone had the ability to rule the Islands. They assumed a relationship with the native Hawaiians that can best be described as paternalistic.

The social structure of the Islands lent itself to control by a few. By 1895 seventy-five percent of the Island population were Oriental immigrants who were imported as labor for the sugar plantations. Twenty

imported as labor for the sugar plantations. Twenty percent of the population were whites including the Portuguese who constituted a miniscule middle class. They served as clerks, foremen, semiskilled and skilled laborers, overseers, and plantation managers. The remaining 5 percent of the population (all haoles) controlled politics, land, business, and labor.<sup>2</sup> The government of the Republic was in fact an oligarchy. One planter reported in 1894 the completeness of control that the oligarchy enjoyed.

We have now as near an approach to autocratic government as anywhere. We have a council of fifteen, perhaps, composed of the businessmen of Honolulu--some of them working men, some of them capitalists, but all are businessmen of Honolulu. They go up to the palace, which is now the official home of the cabinet--they go up there perhaps every day and hold a session of an hour to examine into the business of the country, just as is done in a large factory or farm.<sup>3</sup>

The educational structure of Hawaii, under the new Republic, remained virtually unchanged from the days of the monarchy in regard to schooling. The control of the common schools lay with the oligarchy, under the Department of Public Instruction. The department was headed by the Minister of Public Instruction, who was appointed by the President of the Republic. Eight Commissioners of Education, who constituted the Board of Education were also appointed by the President.

In 1890 ninety percent of the school population attended the common schools. The other ten percent of

the school population attended private schools. The most prominent of these schools was Oahu College, established by the missionaries for their own children in 1840. The major factors responsible for the early development and long tradition of private schools in Hawaii, according to Ralph Stueber, "stemmed from the proselytizing efforts of religious groups and from the great ethnic, economic, and linguistic gaps which the plantation . . . system fostered in Hawaiian society."<sup>4</sup> Yet Oahu College, later renamed Punahou, was not merely a school, but a symbol. Punahou symbolized excellence in education, for sure, but more importantly elite status. Punahou remained exclusively haole until 1896, when a few "token Orientals" were admitted. Yet, acceptance of Oriental students, did not diminish Punahou's role as educator of Hawaii's haole elite. As Fuchs notes, "at Punahou, the children of the kamaaina elite kept their distance from their future employees,"<sup>5</sup> a majority of which were schooled in the public arena. Punahou educated and reinforced the role of the haole leadership on Hawaii. There were two systems of schools under the control of the oligarchy, one for their children and one for the masses.

It was within this atmosphere of oligarchical control that the normal school was introduced to Hawaii in 1895. A normal school imbued with democratic notions that Henry Townsend had envisioned could not survive the transplantation to Hawaii. At the outset of the normal school

movement in the United States, the nineteenth century educational reformers had hoped to enhance democracy by attracting students of all socioeconomic sectors to the common school by providing teachers who were specially trained for their work. American students were to be educated in common yet under the diverse control of state and local governments. The normal school in Hawaii laboring under the oligarchical system, as will be documented, would not serve the purposes of democracy but those of the oligarchy.

James L. Dumas, the Oswego Normal School graduate whom Henry Townsend hired to begin the normal department at Lahainaluna, was employed by the Department of Public Instruction in 1895 to head the government's normal school at an annual salary of \$1,200 and the use of a cottage on the high school grounds.<sup>6</sup> Dumas was to work directly under the control of the Department of Public Instruction. In this capacity Dumas discovered that the American normal school model, in which he had been educated, could not be transplanted unaltered to Hawaii. Dumas would also learn that every step toward establishing a normal school would be closely scrutinized by the Department of Public Instruction.

In the year Dumas served as head of teacher training, he was successful in establishing two of the three major components of the normal school structure: instruction in the art of teaching and a practice school for pre-service

teachers to gain initial experience. The third, review of the common branches of knowledge was not included.

Dumas' curriculum ideas held educational psychology in high regard. In his first and only report to the Minister of Public Instruction, he dedicated twenty weeks to the teaching of educational psychology. He wrote, "The first four weeks are devoted to a brief review of physiology, followed by a special study of the nervous system."<sup>7</sup> He then outlined his program, which included the study of emotions, instincts, appetites, affections, desires, influence of the soul on different parts of the body, attention, perception, imagination, reasoning, and mental reproduction. Dumas also emphasized the history of education, to which he dedicated twenty weeks. This aspect of his curriculum also received a detailed description. Dumas listed the following in his report on this subject;

- (1) Education in ancient times. Confucius, Zoroaster, Moses, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian.
- (2) Education in Middle Ages. St. Augustine, Charlemagne, Thomas-a-Kempis, Agricola.
- (3) The early reformers. Melancthon, Zwingli, John Strum, Montaigne, Bacon, Comenius.
- (4) Education in the nineteenth century.
- (5) Special students of Pestalozzi. . . .<sup>8</sup>

Educational psychology and the history of education were only two subjects which were included in a year's course of study. The entire curriculum also contained the following,

Phonics, word analysis, mental and written arithmetic, number methods, physical and political geography, geography methods, observation and teaching in the Practice School.<sup>9</sup>

These courses received equal or less time in the curriculum.

This would be a challenging course of study for anyone in a year's time, but especially difficult for Dumas' twenty-one students, ten of whom were only sixteen years old with an eighth-grade education. The curriculum was well beyond not only the normal students' abilities, but also the needs of their future employment. The common school student population of Hawaii in 1895-96 consisted of a majority of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians whose English abilities were minimal. Furthermore, the Asian population of the common school was on the rise and contributed to the limited English ability of the student population. Dumas' curriculum did not include a review of those subjects that were to be taught in the common schools of Hawaii and so was not well suited to the needs of Hawaii's common schools.

In his report to the Minister of Public Instruction, under the section of "General Lessons," Dumas described how he instructed his students in the art of teaching: he demonstrated an inductive and deductive teaching method, instructed the students on questioning, observation, and lesson plans. His method of criticism of the student teacher included manner, voice, methods, and

results. For the pupils under the direction of the student teacher, Dumas looked for order, interest, attention, appearance of class, dress, and cleanliness of students. Content matter was judged by usefulness and dependency on preceding lesson.<sup>10</sup> These classes in the art of teaching comprised one of three major components in the normal school structure in Hawaii.

Also included in his report to the Minister of Public Instruction was a plea for a practice school for the normal school. During the first months of the normal school, practice teaching was limited to substitute work in the schools of Honolulu and vicinity.<sup>11</sup>

Dumas addressed the Board of Education on the matter of providing a practice school, where the pre-service teacher could practice the teaching techniques Dumas taught them. He approached the Board of Education on this matter on May 6, 1896, but no conclusion was reached. It was a fortunate occurrence at this time that Dumas' sponsor and friend of the normal school idea, Henry Townsend, was appointed Inspector General of Hawaii's schools. At the very next meeting of the Board in July 1896, Dumas succeeded in securing new construction for the Normal School. The board approved the building of two rooms at the Royal School as a training school for the normal School. Dumas was also recognized as the principal of this school.<sup>12</sup> With the practice school established under the control of the normal school, another major

component of normal school structure was in place in Hawaii.

In the spring of 1896 Dumas also succeeded in convincing the board to issue certificates for the work done at the normal school. These certificates entitled the holder to teach in Hawaii's schools. Dumas was not to have free reign in issuing these certificates. The minutes of the meeting read,

It was moved by Mr. Bowen and seconded and carried that for the present a special certificate be issued to graduates of the normal school in recognition of a completed course therein, and that such a certificate should convey license to teach for a term of \_ years, which term shall depend on the standing of the candidate in passing a special examination to be held conjointly by the principle of the Normal School and the teachers examining committee of the Board.<sup>13</sup>

Thus the Board of Education kept ultimate control of the product of the government normal school.

The Board of Education's planning for the physical provisions for normal instruction was haphazard. Dumas and his students occupied two rooms at Honolulu High School while the practice classrooms were on the grounds of the Royal School. The two schools, while within walking distance, were not adjacent. This splitting of the normal school's functions precipitated various problems.

At the August meeting of the board, Dumas was there to push again for improvements in the normal school situation. Dumas made five requests. Some were for

academic improvements, but most arose out of the difficulty in running two schools, the high school and the normal school, on the same grounds. The board had decided to move the normal classes to the third floor of the high school building, and Dumas requested that one room remain on the first floor. He asked that the normal school classrooms be furnished in the same manner as that of the high school. He also thought that the normal students would be able to use the front gate when traveling to the practice school. Dumas wanted the teacher of natural sciences to give one period a day to the normal students and, finally, thought his students should not be taken out of class except when absolutely necessary.<sup>14</sup> Dumas did not want himself or the normal school subordinated to the high school.

At the next meeting in September, Dumas returned again to request that the practice school be given a separate yard from the Royal School with separate outbuildings. But more important Dumas wanted the practice school upgraded. He stated,

That the practice school, so far as possible, be made to present the same conditions as teachers have to meet when they go out to teach; that for this purpose, the pupils of the school should consist of girls as well as boys; also the practice school should consist of three grades, namely entrance, first reader (I), and second (sic) reader II.<sup>15</sup>

On November 9, 1896, Dumas insisted on a second grade at the practice school to make the practice school align more closely with the public school classroom. His request was

granted, and that same month Dumas obtained thirty-six pupils for the second grade at the practice school. However, the commissioners agreed "that no further efforts should be made to secure pupils but that future growth of the school should be left to care for itself under the operation of natural causes."<sup>16</sup> Dumas remained satisfied for only two months, when he was back again in December requesting that the school be increased to eighty students. He must have made a good case, for the increase was granted. Dumas was also successful in securing a three-year certificate for the normal school graduates.

Despite his success with the Board of Education, Dumas' standing was waning. He precipitated his own downfall in February 1897 when he spoke to a group of Hawaii's businessmen at the Young Men's Research Club. Dumas presented his views on Natural Monopolies. This view was in direct conflict with the ruling oligarchy of Hawaii. It was reported that,

Mr. Dumas takes the ground that where a great advantage must be the property of one man, or body of men, the government should retain it for the benefit of the whole people rather than let some get rich from it.<sup>17</sup>

After making this affront to the oligarchy who employed him, Dumas added to it by registering a formal complaint against J. Lightfoot, a well-established Hawaiian schoolman and vice-principal of the high school. At the meeting of July 15, 1897, the Minister of Education made a verbal report of the complaint. Unfortunately,

neither the complaint nor the solution was put down in the written record, but counter-charges were made by Lightfoot in August 1897, and a committee was formed to investigate headed by the Minister of Public Instruction.

The investigative committee reported at the August meeting. Before the minister's recommendations were read, Bowen, School Commissioner, informed the meeting, "that Mr. Lightfoot had called on him and asked that the Board should deal leniently in any action that might be taken against Mr. Dumas."<sup>18</sup> While the decision could be construed as lenient, it nevertheless led to Dumas' resignation. The Minister of Education recommended the following:

- (1) That Mr. Dumas be retained in his present position as the Principal of the Government Normal School.
- (2) That he be admonished to refrain in the future from any interference in school matters outside the lines of his duty as such Principal, and avoid things likely to cause friction or lead to misunderstandings and disagreements between himself and the other employees of the Department.
- (3) That he be required to vacate the premises now occupied by him as a residence on the High School grounds.<sup>19</sup>

Although Dumas was not outwardly fired, he was being forced to leave. Dumas received a drastic reduction in compensation when his cottage privileges were taken away. On September 2, 1897, Dumas requested, by letter, that his salary be increased by \$25.00 a month, because that was what was needed to finance another residence.<sup>20</sup> The request was denied.<sup>21</sup> The next day Dumas rendered his resignation effective immediately.<sup>22</sup>

Dumas' time was short, only one year; but he was successful in establishing a practice school and a course for instruction in the art of teaching. His reluctance to restrict his ideas to his own realm of authority and his open criticism of the oligarchic government that employed him led to his downfall.

The American Dumas could not adjust the American normal school model to the autocratic environment of Hawaii. Yet having met the challenge of establishing two of the three major components of a normal school, Dumas had well earned the title given him by Benjamin Wist, 'Father of Modern Teacher Education' in Hawaii. The molding of the normal school and its curriculum to the needs of Hawaii and the oligarchy was left to Dumas' successor, Canadian Edgar Wood.

Edgar Wood was another educator who had been employed by the progressive Townsend. Unlike Dumas, Wood was not an American but rather a Canadian of 'United Empire Loyalist stock.'<sup>23</sup> Edgar Wood was a descendant of the Massachusetts loyalist, General Benjamin Wood, who moved to Nova Scotia after the American revolution. Born in Nova Scotia in 1861, Wood attended Amherst Academy in Parrsbor, Nova Scotia, and later the Truro Normal School of the same locality. Wood did not complete his teacher training before he entered the field, but continued his education at Mount Allison University in Nova Scotia while teaching. Later he moved to New York and completed his

collegiate work at Cornell University, graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Science in 1895.<sup>24</sup> The following year Wood was hired by the Republic of Hawaii to teach science at Honolulu High School and then to replace Dumas as head of the normal school.

The two men were significantly different. First, Wood was not an American imbued with ideals of democracy. His cultural and educational background pointed to a tradition of loyalty to the English crown, which would serve him well in a Hawaii under oligarchical control. Second, Wood had actual teaching experience, which Dumas had lacked, and this too would serve him well as teacher trainer in Hawaii.

Wood's teaching experiences and his perception of the Hawaiian race may have led him to revise the normal school curriculum in his first year as principal. In his report to the Inspector General of Schools in 1897, Wood described his curriculum as follows,

The work of the Normal School divided itself into two parts, professional and non-professional. In the two-year course special attention is given the first year to work in scholarship; as without thorough drill in the fundamental branches our pupils will not fully appreciate the professional training given them, nor will they become successful teachers if deficient in scholarship.<sup>25</sup>

The key phrase here is "fundamental branches," which refers to those subjects taught in the common schools. This was a marked change from the psychology and physiology of the Dumas year, but, more important, it

supplied the third and final component of the normal school structure in Hawaii.

Of the fundamental branches, Wood allocated most of the school time to composition and arithmetic. He did include grammar, geography, algebra, geometry, physics, botany, psychology (for one-third of the final year), drawing, and music. In his 1900 report Wood stated,

There is no department of English in the usual acceptance of the term, but each teacher gives instruction in the spoken and written forms necessary to express the thoughts the pupil may have in the different branches of work.<sup>26</sup>

This subject matter would change over the years, but the basic philosophy of offering instruction in the common branches of knowledge would remain the same.

In his first year Wood continued to go through the path of Dumas in requesting that the practice school resemble the common schools of the Republic. To this end Wood wanted a common school with eight grades consisting of pupils from the local neighborhood.

During his second year Wood again revised his course of study. He wrote, "While our primary purpose is to give instruction in the science and the art of teaching, yet we are compelled to give considerable attention to academic subjects."<sup>27</sup> And by the turn of the century Wood was writing,

The mixed classes of pupils and the necessity of attention to the details of the spoken and written word demand much of the teachers, but without this attention little

progress is possible. . . . The difficult task of adjusting the work to the needs of the pupils is to be taken into account in considering the amount of work to be done by each teacher. This task, in a school where four of five great divisions of the human family are represented, is not an easy one.<sup>28</sup>

Wood was continually recognizing the fact that the students at the normal school were ill prepared for professional work and in most cases seriously lacking in the fundamental branches of knowledge.

The changes in curriculum did not stop with the introduction of a review of the common branches of knowledge. Wood included in his program agricultural and manual work following the summer of 1898 visit of Colonel Francis W. Parker, a progressive educator and principal (1883-1899) of Chicago's Cooke County Normal School.<sup>29</sup>

Colonel Parker had campaigned throughout the United States to have the nation's schools transformed into a forum for individuality and democracy. Parker strove to accomplish his goals by promoting an educational philosophy which taught that the child has natural tendencies to be a useful and vital member of a democratic society. He believed the methods used in the schools of his day were distorting and discouraging these tendencies. Parker sought to transform the authoritarian methods of the classrooms to more natural, democratic, ones. Parker translated these ideas into curricular terms when he sought to join the school and the community by means of agricultural and industrial education.<sup>30</sup>

Social historian, Merle Curti, wrote that,

Parker was a pioneer in his efforts to unite the home and the school, to provide a school environment in which the child might see that the work he did had some bearing on the life of the community. Since the really great tasks involved man and nature, they, rather than books, were made to assume prime importance. Parker was the first to establish a large garden in a public elementary school; and one of the first to make field work and visits to factories and to the country a part of instruction.<sup>31</sup>

Parker believed the world of work, not drudgery, would provide the forum for the natural growth of the individual child. Parker also believed, "personal liberty is the one means of making the individual of worth to the mass."<sup>32</sup>

Parker advocated agricultural and industrial education as a natural method of instruction, not as an end in themselves. Parker saw agricultural and industrial education as methodologies to enhance both individuality and therefore democracy.

Parker presented his theories and methods to the normal school summer session in Hawaii in 1898. There appeared to be general agreement on Parker's theories and methods. Three hundred and fifty people signed a membership roll in the Armstrong Industrial Association. The purpose of the association, named after Hawaiian born General Samuel Armstrong, was to pledge promotion of industrial and agricultural education in Hawaii. Edgar Wood, principal of the normal school, was among the signers.<sup>33</sup>

Either Edgar Wood did not understand the educational philosophy behind Parker's methods or he chose not to adhere to them. In December of the same year Parker was in Hawaii Wood delivered a paper to the Research Club on an analysis of races in Hawaii. Wood recommended agricultural education for the Hawaiian students, but not for the reasons Parker did. Wood was reported as saying,

in their (Hawaiians) growth as a nation, they have reached the farming plane and that it would be perfectly natural for them and best for them to turn to tilling the soil, as they were doing when the Islands were discovered and opened to the World for commerce and internal development.<sup>34</sup>

Wood used the same terms as Colonel Parker, such as "natural" and "agricultural", yet Wood was not employing these concepts in education to promote democracy, but was using them to maintain the status-quo.

The editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, W.N. Armstrong, wrote of his reason for supporting agricultural education in Hawaii's common schools. He believed,

the rapid development of horticultural and agricultural education here, must be placed on the political necessities of the case, especially if we are not annexed at once, for our political safety lies greatly in having a contented community.<sup>35</sup>

Yet another article in the late summer of 1898, announcing the new agricultural and industrial curriculum at the normal school, pointedly added, "It is the duty of the Community in the interest it ought to have in training the youth for practical work in the public schools and it is

the duty of the private schools to advance both the intellectual and the practical side of a child's life.<sup>36</sup>

These two articles, again, pointed to agricultural education as a method of maintaining the status-quo rather than of promoting social change.

Although Colonel Parker and the leaders of Hawaii spoke the same words and signed the same rolls, progressive education had little chance in the Hawaii of the 1890's. The Republic's leaders' perception of the Hawaiian people combined with their need for labor on ever-growing plantations, resulted in their interpretation of Parker's methods as a means of control by limiting educational opportunities through vocational education for the public school students rather than regarding his approach as a means of promoting individual liberties.

Hawaii's public school children were to be taught agricultural education and the process was to begin at the normal school with its newly installed vocational education program. Later, in 1912, Edgar Wood would state that his program at the normal school had the approval of educators like Colonel Parker,<sup>37</sup> when in fact, the progressive rhetoric was there but not the actuality.

Wood's perception of the Hawaiian's intellectual capabilities prompted changes in the normal school courses designed to give instruction in the art of teaching. He reported in 1899 that, "Since the beginning

of the work at the Normal School considerable modification has been made in this course.' Wood explained that this work had usually been taught from general principles to the applied; however, Wood found general principles 'to be almost useless when given to the immature pupil teachers.' He felt this point was, 'especially true when applied to the Hawaiian pupil teacher.'<sup>38</sup> He believed that the problem was that the Hawaiian could not learn general principles of teaching and then apply these principles to actual classroom situations. The solution, for Wood, was the introduction of a preplanned teaching method that was virtually 'teacher proof.' To this end he began developing a five-step method for teaching to complement agricultural training.

With expansion of the curriculum, both in the normal and practice school, the time spent at the normal school and the grounds it occupied also required expansion. By 1898 Wood was offering a three-year normal course designed for eighth-grade graduates of the common school. In contrast Dumas had only offered one year. The normal school had been on the grounds of the high school, and the practice school on the Royal School campus when Wood assumed the principalship. In 1899 the school was consolidated at the old Front Street School. This move, although an improvement over the split school, did not meet the needs of the growing institution according to Wood.

The present buildings, while still inadequate to our growing need, offer better accommodations than we formerly had. There is still a need for additional rooms. One of the teachers meets her class on the veranda, while the Manual Training class meets outside under a temporary roof.<sup>39</sup>

The length of the normal school education under Wood would be increased to four years and remain stable. Yet, the need for more and better facilities would continue to plague the normal school throughout the Wood years.

By the end of Wood's fourth year at the normal school, in 1900, the Territorial Normal and Training School was the only school existing in Hawaii for the training of teachers. This was not the case at the outset of the normal school. The Kamehameha Schools, along with Oahu College, had attempted normal classes starting in 1894. Six years later these classes had been discontinued at both schools. The reason the Kamehameha Schools did away with their normal classes might well have been the same as those for Oahu College. An article in The Friend explained,

The growth and interest of the work downtown under the Department soon make it clear that there was no further field at Kamehameha. Naturally the output of the public school was to be favored in securing of positions and it was thought best that Kamehameha students who desired to teach should connect themselves with the Department at an early age, and so normal work at Kamehameha ceased in 1898.<sup>40</sup>

The Kamehameha Schools must not have hired their own normal graduates, and the same can probably be said of

Oahu College. Their goals had been to have their normal graduates teach in the public school system. Full staffing of the public school classrooms did not occur in Hawaii until 1927; therefore, openings were always available until then. However, according to The Friend, the Department of Public Instruction chose not to hire the private normal school graduates between 1895 and 1900. The Department of Public Instruction, the sole hiring agent for the Republic, was boycotting these graduates.

One can only imagine that the Department of Public Instruction wanted teacher education centralized and under its direct control at the Territorial Normal and Training School in Honolulu. Even later attempts to establish a public normal school in Hilo, on the Big Island, were met with opposition by the Department of Public Instruction. Teacher training became highly centralized as were other institutions within the Republic.

The Republic, however, could point to the normal school as an American institution simply by acknowledging that the basic tenants of a normal school had been established. Territorial status was assured by 1898, and the school system was scrutinized by a United States commission appointed to make recommendations for the laws that would govern the new territory. The committee on education recommended "that the present system remain in force," adding, "No system could be adopted which would tend to Americanize the people more thoroughly than this."<sup>41</sup>

If the schools were the target for Americanization of Hawaii, the normal school was the ammunition. Americanization of teachers was essential. However, Americanization, under the oligarchy, would generate a paradoxical situation. If Americanization meant freedom of choice, it would be a long time coming. If Americanization meant adherence to the will of the oligarchy, then the normal school under Edgar Wood would fill the bill.

President Sanford Dole, soon to be Governor Dole, spoke to all the public school children of Oahu, at the first raising of the American flag at McKinley High School on June 14, 1900. On the first day of American Territoriality Dole, missionary descendant and vanguard of the oligarchy, clearly indicated his definition of the Americanization process in Hawaii. Dole guaranteed the public school children of Hawaii, "We are going to make American citizens out of you."<sup>42</sup>

## NOTES

### CHAPTER TWO

<sup>1</sup>Lawrence Fuchs, Hawaii Pono (San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich, Publishers, 1961), p. 33.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 37.

<sup>3</sup>Z. S. Spaulding Testimony in Hawaii Islands, Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1984), p. 248, cited by Ralph K. Stueber, "Hawaii: A Case Study in Developmental Education 1778-1960," Diss. University of Wisconsin, 1964, p. 157.

<sup>4</sup>Ralph K. Stueber, "Hawaii: A Case Study in Developmental Education 1778-1960," Diss. University of Wisconsin, 1964, p. 157.

<sup>5</sup>Fuchs, p. 61.

<sup>6</sup>Hawaii (Territory), "Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Education, 1895-1931" (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), 18 July 1895, p. 183.

<sup>7</sup>Hawaii (Republic), Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education to the Legislature of the Republic of Hawaii, 1894-1895 (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1896), p. 42.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>12</sup>Hawaii, "Minutes of the Meeting," 8 July 1896, p. 252.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., 25 May 1896, p. 241.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 26 August 1896, p. 272.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., 30 September 1896, p. 296.

- <sup>16</sup>Ibid., 27 November 1896, p. 14.
- <sup>17</sup>Hawaii's Young People, No. 1 (March 1897), p. 8.
- <sup>18</sup>Hawaii, "Minutes of the Meeting," 12 August 1897, p. 120.
- <sup>19</sup>Ibid., 14 August 1897, p. 124.
- <sup>20</sup>Ibid., 2 September 1897, p. 133.
- <sup>21</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>22</sup>James L. Dumas, Letter to Minister and Commissioners of Education of the Republic of Hawaii (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), 3 September 1897.
- <sup>23</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 9 January 1913, p. 4.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>25</sup>Hawaii (Republic), Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education to the Legislature of the Republic of Hawaii, 1897-1898 (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1899, p. 33.
- <sup>26</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1900, (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1901), p. 85.
- <sup>27</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Minister of Public Instruction for the Biennial Period Ending December 31, 1899, (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1900), p. 81.
- <sup>28</sup>Willard S. Elsbree, The American Teacher, (New York: American Book Company, 1939.), p. 402.
- <sup>29</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Superintendent, 1900, p. 83.
- <sup>30</sup>Merle Curti, Social Ideas of American Education (New Jersey: Littlefield Adams & Co., 1959), p. 383.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>32</sup>Curti, p. 385.
- <sup>33</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 27 July 1898, p. 7.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid., 7 December 1898, p. 1, col. 2.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., 19 May 1898, p. 4.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., 9 August 1898, p. 5.

<sup>37</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 26 January 1912, p. 1, sec. 3, col. 1-7.

<sup>38</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Minister, 1899, p. 89.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 81.

<sup>40</sup>The Friend, December 1928, pp. 299-300.

<sup>41</sup>Wist, Benjamin O. A Century of Public Education in Hawaii, (Honolulu: Hawaii Educational Review, 1940), p. 142.

<sup>42</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 14 June 1900, p. 6, col. 1.

## CHAPTER THREE

### EDGAR WOOD SHAPES THE TERRITORIAL NORMAL AND TRAINING SCHOOL 1900-1912

Edgar Wood supplied the leadership for the normal school for the first two decades of Hawaii's territorial status. Under the new government the normal school would undergo little change.

The territorial government, as established by the Organic Act of the United States Congress, fitted well into the oligarchical structure of Hawaii. Although the Organic Act established U. S. control of Hawaii, the oligarchy through its omnipresent power and political skill would continue to rule Hawaii. In establishing the new territorial government, the Federal Government relied heavily on the leadership that had already been established in Hawaii. This core of the leadership continued to be the New England missionaries and their descendants. As Fuchs wrote, "The second generation of missionaries, including the Alexanders, Baldwins, Cookes, Hitchcocks, Rices, and Wilcoxes, constituted an inner elite within the oligarchy."<sup>1</sup>

However, missionary zeal was giving way to economic interests. The New England missionaries who remained in the Islands after the American Board of Christian Foreign Missions withdrew its financial support in 1863 sought

their livelihood in the development of an infant sugar plantation industry. Second, third and fourth generation missionary descendants continued this trend. By 1900, when the sugar industry was being transformed from individual interest to corporate interest, the grandchildren of the missionaries were firmly in charge of Hawaii's business as well as the government. Fuchs notes, 'At nearly all times during the four decades of elite rule, the Governor, and a substantial number of the legislators were men who had held administrative or policy positions in the major sugar agencies or the subsidiaries.'<sup>2</sup>

The new government brought minimal change to the structure of government in the Islands. The Governor, under the Organic Act, had extraordinary powers, much like the President and kings before him. The Governor was appointed by the President of the United States for a four-year unimpeachable term and had the authority to make all government appointments, which included those in the hierarchy of the Department of Public Instruction. He also held the power of veto over the legislative branch of government. The Governor, by Federal law, was required to be a resident of Hawaii.<sup>3</sup>

The advent of territoriality with the United States did bring some changes to Hawaii. Some of these changes enhanced oligarchical control; for example, a U. S. tariff was placed on foreign sugar that protected the Hawaiian

markets and the oligarchy's wealth.<sup>4</sup> However, other changes brought threats to their control, particularly new voting regulations. Universal suffrage was granted all native Hawaiians and all persons born in the Islands after June 14, 1900.<sup>5</sup> Although the scores of Oriental laborers were not given the vote, their children would in time hold the franchise and present a threat to oligarchical control of the Islands. Those in power knew all too well that by sheer numbers the future Oriental vote could wield a great deal of power. The rising generation of new voters would have to support the status quo if the oligarchy was to maintain its power and lifestyle.

Control of these immigrants could have been made most complete by refusing to include the children of the foreign laborers in the public schools. Illiterate docile workers were preferred by the managers and overseers of the plantations. Walter G. Smith, editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, broached this point when he wrote,

The Chinese and Japanese were imported for servants and laborers, and their children put into these schools. Query: Will they succeed their fathers and mothers as laborers or will they pit themselves against the white man presently in a keen contest of wit and endurance on the higher levels of competition? Will their education assist or retard Anglo-Saxon spirit in Hawaii?<sup>6</sup>

Although Smith and others may have advocated excluding these new citizens from the schools of Hawaii, the missionary zeal for education was too deeply ingrained in the leadership of Hawaii to let them take this stand.

Added to this, an American Territory without a public school system would not have been tolerated by the American public. The oligarchy's moral and political obligation was readily expressed by one educator.

It is useless to talk of any scheme to get out of our plain duty of educating at public expense every child in the Islands, be his parentage what it may. To shirk the duty and to allow American born children to grow up uneducated in American lines would produce results disastrous to the future of Hawaii.<sup>7</sup>

If the oligarchy was to maintain its power over Hawaii's business and government, while providing free public education to the rising generation of new voters, it would have to control the schools: Control of the institution through which the children of imported laborers would learn how to function in a society alien to their parents was mandatory. Hawaii's tradition of centralized control of education would play a more vital role than ever before.

The use of schooling for the preparation of citizens was not a new concept for Hawaii. In 1895, during the Republic, Wallace Farrington, editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, wrote,

The community cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that there is a large number of children (Japanese and Chinese) coming up who will have the right to the claim of citizenship. . . . It is necessary these boys and girls would be as well educated as circumstances will allow.<sup>8</sup>

Farrington's prediction was correct, but it was American citizenship that would be the right of these children.

Farrington was writing in 1895 when the school population for Portuguese was 774, Chinese 665, and Japanese 147. In 1899 the Portuguese student population had risen to 3,882, Chinese to 1,314, and Japanese to 1,141. Comparisons for the same years show Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian population relatively stable.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, by 1899, the concerns for educating the native had drastically shifted to a larger and more diverse non-English-speaking school population.

There was faith among those who ruled Hawaii that the public schools through their teachers could work their magic and prepare the different ethnic groups for their roles in territorialship. The editor of the Advertiser, W. N. Armstrong, wrote in the year of annexation, "It is this (American-type school system) that has dispelled the fear of American statesmen that the native population would be a menace to good government."<sup>10</sup> President Sanford Dole, speaking at the opening of 1899 Summer School, charged the teachers with the following responsibility,

The work of the teacher is not principally to inculcate knowledge, but to impart those principles which will tend to strengthen and unify our heterogeneous population, and to eliminate those differences which necessarily arise from so many diverse elements.<sup>11</sup>

By subordinating knowledge acquisition to socialization, i.e. Americanization, President Dole challenged the teaching force of Hawaii to help create a public that would serve the private sector. Although this goal was not unlike that of American public schools, the difference was

that the private sector of Hawaii was narrowly conceived by the oligarchy. This challenge was to be spearheaded by the only source of Island-trained teachers, the Territorial Normal and Training School.

Its graduates continued to be preferred by the Department of Public Instruction, even over mainland trained teachers. Locally trained teachers not only would be aware of local conditions but also could be molded into the type of Americanization force that the department required. A. Atkinson, respected schoolman of Hawaii, told the 1901 graduating class at the normal school that,

Any community which depends for its instruction from abroad is not properly a self supporting community. Brilliant and exceptional minds we may call in but the ordinary work of instruction should be done by our own people as soon as possible. . . . But before our own people can undertake this work, they must be trained, and this training is offered to you here by the Commissioners of Education.<sup>12</sup>

The Commissioners of Education believed that the locally trained teacher should be imbued with American ideals and standards. Yet in 1900, there was disagreement as to how best Americanize the diverse peoples of Hawaii. There was a consensus among governmental and educational leaders in Hawaii that English would play a powerful role in the Americanization process, but they also agreed that instruction in language alone would not complete the job. Henry Townsend pointed out that:

Although English education for Hawaii has everything in its favor, and is an absolute necessity, it offers but a small part of the solution to our problem. Polynesians and Asiatics cannot be made to think and feel as Anglo-Saxons by the simple process of teaching them the English language.<sup>13</sup>

If English education was part of Americanization, what would constitute the whole? There were different answers to this question, because there were different interpretations of the meaning American and the role of schooling in Americanization. The spectrum ranged from autocratic dictation to the schools, which would favor autocracy and its idea of the status quo, to a progressive/democratic interpretation that was aimed at social change towards a more democratic community. These differing views were expressed in curricular terms.

Some educators, like Edgar Wood, believed that the youth of Hawaii should receive vocational education to serve vocational ends. To this end a program was established at the normal school in the fall of 1898 following Colonel Parker's visit to the Islands. They hoped the program would bring the children of the foreign laborers back to the plantations, eliminating the need to import more foreign labor. These educators believed that giving 'greater and greater emphasis to vocational education. . . could overcome the false idea that education was the avenue to a more genteel way of life.'<sup>14</sup>

Vocational education was also justified as being the best education for Oriental and Hawaiian youth. One article

in the Advertiser claimed that industrial, manual, and academic work were interdependent; however, "the ratio of one to another should depend upon the temperament of the whole school population which in Hawaii is of an industrial rather than of an academic cast."<sup>15</sup> Speaking to the Kamehameha Schools, W. M. Armstrong said, "You young Hawaiians are in the world with brains and hands. You must make your living. You cannot be professional men, but working men, as a rule."<sup>16</sup>

Mainland trends were also used to substantiate the efficacy of vocational education. In his annual message to the U. S. Congress in 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt maintained, "Our school system is gravely defective in so far as it puts a premium upon mere literacy training."<sup>17</sup> He continued by advocating more emphasis on vocational and agricultural education. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 codified the Federal Government's advocacy of vocational education.

However, Tanner and Tanner, curriculum specialists, point to the different interpretations of outcomes of vocational education as follows,

On one hand were those who promoted vocational education to meet industrial demands for trained manpower. . . . In contrast were the progressive educators who envisioned vocational education as a means of providing for the "liberation of a greater diversity of personal capacities which characterize a democracy."<sup>18</sup>

John Dewey, leader in the progressive education movement on the mainland, had warned that vocational education that

served the industrial needs of the nation would become "an instrument of perpetuating unchanged the existing industrial order of society instead of operating as a means of its transformation."<sup>19</sup> Since Hawaii's oligarchy desired "perpetuating unchanged the existing industrial order," Dewey's progressive idea stood little chance in the autocratic system.

The progressives in Hawaii, led by Henry Townsend, had envisioned the Americanization process in progressive terms. They believed that the different ethnic groups of Hawaii could learn how to participate in a democratic community through the public schools. Vocational education would be the medium through which the new citizens would learn such attributes as decisionmaking, cooperation, equality of opportunity, and the responsibilities of a member of a democratic community. However, too few understood the new ideas Townsend represented, and those who did regarded Townsend as a radical ready and able to upset the status quo.<sup>20</sup>

Americanization for some educators and parents in Hawaii did not include vocational education but stressed getting back to basics. Defined in educational terms, a back to basics curriculum meant that the schools would be responsible for giving the students the three Rs only. In this atmosphere the educational creme would rise to the top, and the less capable would sink to the bottom. Faith

in the individual and the power to get ahead by oneself were (and are) distinctly American doctrines.<sup>21</sup>

The followers of Townsend and those advocating a back-to-basics movement soon realized that the oligarchy was too strong to allow change. Townsend was not rehired to head Hawaii's school after annexation. He left the Islands at the turn of the century, and with him went progressive leadership. Those advocating a back-to-basics approach were never strong enough in the early 1900's to influence the Department of Public Instruction. Both movements faded, but did not disappear.

The oligarchy in its striving to maintain its power and lifestyle saw the public schools as its agent. Edgar Wood, principal of the normal school, was to see to it that the teaching force of Hawaii would learn to perpetuate the authority of the oligarchy. Wood fashioned a curriculum that was designed to ensure close cooperation between the teachers of Hawaii and oligarchical interests.

Wood's curriculum was three-fold. First, Wood relied most heavily on the vocational education program which he hoped would supply the future teachers of foreign parentage with the trappings of the Western world through the world of work. The vocational education program was also aimed at enhancing the Island's labor pool. Second, Wood's self-styled teaching method served as a unique form of control. Third, Wood included a strong emphasis on Herbartian psychology. Herbartian psychology was used by

Wood to create a veneer of Anglo-Saxonism on the future teachers of Hawaiian and Oriental heritage through its emphasis on English literature.

Herbartian psychology was loosely derived from the German philosopher Johann Herbart, 1776-1841. However, the attractiveness of Herbartianism for American educators came from his follower, Tuiskon Ziller. Harold Dunkel, a Herbartian scholar, wrote this of Ziller:

What most attracted Ziller to Herbart's thought was apparently the idea that character should be built (and to a degree rebuilt) by structuring the circle of thought properly. Certainly this would be one way of regenerating the lower classes. And as far as Ziller's educational interests were concerned, Herbart's ideas seemed to him also applicable as an appropriate way to educate the masses of German citizens.<sup>22</sup>

This construction and/or reconstruction of character was presented by Ziller in Darwinian terms. According to some evolutionary theorists, the embryo of most species recapitulates the various stages of evolutionary development. Applied to education, Herbartians believed that the child's educational development should recapitulate the intellectual and more evolutionary stages of the child's culture, epoch by epoch. Herbartians used this cultural epoch theory as a guide to the construction of the curriculum. For Herbart the integration of the curriculum was all important. Herbart was the first among educators to suggest that subjects should not be dealt with as isolated entities. . . .wherever feasible, their matter should be brought together. . . .<sup>23</sup>

The major thrust of the Herbartians' curriculum, however, was history and literature. The very young children would be told legends and myths that were rooted in their own culture. Through the heroes and villains of the stories the children would be shown acceptable behavior and values that they in turn could emulate. As the children developed, more complex social issues would be approached through the culture's history and literature.<sup>24</sup>

Herbart designed a prescribed educational methodology known as the Formal Steps. His followers expanded these to five. The five Formal Steps were: preparation, presentation, association, generalization, and application.<sup>25</sup> These steps were developed to support Herbart's theory of application. Apperception theory claimed that "all new ideas are interpreted through those already resident in the consciousness."<sup>26</sup> But like so many educational theories the meaning was lost on those who applied the Formal Steps in the classroom. For many teachers the Formal Steps stood alone.<sup>27</sup>

Herbartianism came to America by way of American scholars studying in Germany. Charles DeGamo, Charles McMurry, and Frank McMurry were well-known American Herbartians who popularized Herbartian psychology in the United States.<sup>28</sup> Between 1885 and 1896 many books and articles were published by or about Herbartianism. A national organization was formed, a national journal created, and many colleges, universities, and normal

schools advocated Herbartianism.<sup>29</sup> "For a period of at most fifteen years, American Herbartianism was a lively enterprise probably reaching its peak in 1896."<sup>30</sup>

The decline of Herbartianism in the United States was due, in part, to its application in Germany. Although there was agreement in the United States among educators such as Colonel Parker that the curriculum should be integrated, its application in German schools seemed too limiting for a democratic environment. In Germany the free schools were not aimed at developing a free-thinking citizenry, "therefore, the Herbartian theory had to stop short of encouraging individual freedom through personal effort."<sup>31</sup> By the end of the nineteenth century American educators were turning away from European pedagogy and developing their own.

Edgar Wood saw Hawaii as a very fertile ground for Herbartianism, even though its popularity was declining on the mainland. Wood's selection of Herbartian psychology was based on his view of the problems Hawaii faced in the 1890s.

In Hawaii our population is heterogeneous, consisting of people of European, Hawaiian and Asiatic extraction. These must be trained in the exercise of our (Anglo-Saxon) arts and crafts, our customs, and manners, and instilled with our ideals and standards; in a word they must become American citizens with the ideals and standards of democracy handed down by our Anglo-Saxon forefathers.<sup>32</sup>

The appeal of Herbartianism, for Wood, lay in the concept that character could "to some degree be reconstructed."

Having the children of diverse background substitute for their culture an Anglo-Saxon one by recapitulation of that culture in the schools would do much to enhance the Americanization process.

Herbartian psychology permeated the normal school under Wood's administration. The curriculum in the normal department readily reflects this. (The normal school essentially had two departments, the normal and the training. In the training department pre-service teachers were instructed in the technique of teaching students; the normal department was designed to review the subjects the pre-service teacher would teach. Although they were separate in nature, Wood never differentiated them.) The normal department was divided into two areas: academic and vocational. The subjects taught in the academic department adhered to the Herbartian's recommendation for concentrating on a culture's history and literature to recreate cultural epochs. The literature curriculum at the normal school included such Anglo-Saxon selections as Longfellow's Hiawatha, Hawthorne's Twice Told Tales, Shakespeare's Macbeth, and Dickens' The Christmas Carol.<sup>33</sup> The history curriculum was considered by Wood to be the most difficult to teach. This four-year curriculum consisted of mythological and historical stories of chief nations of civilization in the first year, the study of social life in the chief nations in the second year, religious life in the chief nations in the third year, and

a review of the political life of the great periods in the fourth year.<sup>34</sup> And of course, the "chief nations" were Western nations.

In his reports to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wood gave glowing reports of the academic work done at the normal school. Some of these reports, however, were misleading. Reporting that a subject was offered at the normal school did not mean it was being learned. A former student reported, "Yeah. We had to read Odyssey and those hard literature stuff. We didn't know what it meant. . . . We all didn't know."<sup>35</sup> Added to this was the fact that some subjects that were reportedly taught at the school were either not taught at all or were given very little attention.<sup>36</sup>

In his 1914 report to the superintendent, Wood included actual time given to each subject. In Wood's four-year program English literature was given three periods a week for the first three years and five the final year. Mathematics received even less attention. Although arithmetic, algebra, and geometry were listed in the course work of the academic department, algebra was not taught at all, geometry taught only two periods a week in the third year, and arithmetic three hours a week, but only for two of the four years. Likewise the sciences were listed, but very little time given them.<sup>37</sup> In fact, the number of science courses declined between 1902 and 1914. Wood defended his position on these two subjects in

Herbartian terms when he argued, "Mathematics and science are not neglected but they are not stressed for the simple reason that mathematics and sciences do not make for national life, while the others do."<sup>38</sup>

"The others" Wood referred to were not necessarily English literature and history, because in comparison with the vocational department the academic department received far less attention. The fact was that vocational education was required for three hours a week for the first three years and ten hours a week in the final year. If one can judge the emphasis of a school by the amount of time dedicated to individual subject matter, the Territorial Normal School was clearly vocational. In his 1920 report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wood explained why vocational education was being stressed at the school.

We have stressed vocational work, because out of a knowledge of our arts and crafts comes the exercise of our manners and customs. Our manners and customs are different from those of the alien because our activities are fundamentally different. It is through our arts and crafts and callings that the alien must travel to the possession of our manners and customs and an appreciation of our ideals and standards. From his fireside to ours is a long road.<sup>39</sup>

The vocational department's curriculum focused on giving the normal students the trappings of Americanization, which they in turn would pass on to the rising generations of public school students. This department was divided

into three sections: household arts, mechanical, and agriculture.

The household arts section taught the young girls such things as preparation of food, how to trim a hat, how to make artificial flowers, practice in removing stains, making detergent, ironing, and sewing undergarments.<sup>40</sup> Wood summed up this program when he wrote,

When the girls have finished the course they can cook a meal, make a dress, trim a hat, and clean and repair their clothes. This is fair equipment for the teacher who expects to enter the schools of Hawaii and teach the children of different nationalities how to live as Americans live.<sup>41</sup>

The girls of the normal school must have been very successful in their homemaking skills, because they established quite a reputation in the Islands. The following spoof conversation between two local men was printed in the Sunday Advertiser,

But after this, Hinnessey, ye c'n pick a gir'rl aut av th' Normil or th' teachin' staffs wid yer oyes shut an' know ye have a house keeper.<sup>42</sup>

Superintendent Kinney remarked at the 1916 graduation ceremonies of the normal school that 33 percent of the girls' household section were married within a year of graduation. He thought,

While I hope that this may serve to make domestic science work still more popular I am afraid it may be necessary for Mr. Wood to put on brakes just a little bit, for, after all, we are trying to conduct a Normal School and not a marriage bureau.<sup>43</sup>

The mechanical art section never developed such a reputation, but the students too were involved in learning Anglo-Saxon skills that they in turn would teach in the public schools. The program was divided into two areas: construction and repair. Wood proudly wrote of this program, "When the boys graduate, they can make a plan for a building or a repair job, buy the materials, construct the building, paint it, make chairs for the teacher and the teacher's desk. They are fair workmen."<sup>44</sup>

The agricultural section was in charge of the school garden and the care and propagation of chickens and rabbits. Wood briefly described this section as follows: "This work is on a commercial basis and therefore profitable as a means of training the pupils for their future work."<sup>45</sup>

All the sections of the vocational department were aimed at training these young people to emulate Anglo-Saxon home life and workplace.

The Americanization of the normal student shifted from a Herbartian recapitulation of Anglo-Saxon evolution through literature and history to enculturating the student with American vocational pursuits. Edgar Wood stated this very bluntly when he wrote in 1918,

The aim of the school is to give the prospective teachers such training as will enable them to go out into the schools of Hawaii and train the children of the different nationalities to live as Americans live. When the boys and girls of our public schools know how to raise the kind of food Americans eat, to

construct the kind of homes Americans live in, to make and wear the kind of clothes Americans wear, and to understand and aim at American ideals, our work of making citizens has been accomplished.<sup>46</sup>

The normal department of the Territorial Normal and Training School did not constitute the entire school. The training of teachers was the ultimate purpose of the training department. Although these two departments were never dealt with separately under Wood, they did have distinct purposes. The purpose of the training department was to give the cadet teacher (pre-service teacher) instruction and practice in teaching, while that of the normal department was to instruct in the fundamental branches of knowledge.

Edgar Wood fashioned a unique teaching method for use at the normal school based on his perception of what constituted the ideal teacher for Hawaii's public schools. Wood defined the ideal teacher as one who was strong in social and mechanical intelligence and weak in abstract intelligence. Wood viewed the role of teacher much the same way Sanford Dole did. They believed the teacher's primary job was to introduce the children of alien parentage to their new social structure and only secondarily provided academic instruction. Wood believed the Hawaiian population to be the strongest in these qualities. He wrote,

From very early times, the Hawaiian teacher has occupied a prominent place in the school system. . . gifted in social intelligence of a high order, the teacher's special endowment,

any possible short comings along the line of academic preparation had been lost sight of in the general progress of school life in the Territory.<sup>47</sup>

Wood also believed,

The Hawaiian teacher is recognized as among the very best in our schools, and as a social factor in the community, he is undoubtedly the best. In the process of Americanization, these teachers are the best carriers of our ideals and standards, of our manners and customs, to the alien races that are among us.<sup>48</sup>

Wood designed his teaching methods to accommodate the cadets he believed to be weak in abstract intelligence and methods that would enhance the Americanization process in the public schools.

Although Wood had been convinced of the usefulness of tenets of Herbartian psychology in the Americanization process in Hawaii, he did not follow through with the use of the Herbartian five-step method to train his cadets. The Herbartian five-step method relied too heavily on the child's previous experiences. Wood did not want to use the child's previous experiences, because it was those, the alien experiences, that Wood was so ardently trying to remove.

The method designed by Wood was influenced by the Herbartian five-step method simply because Wood also reduced instruction to a neat five-step package. In creating his own steps Wood designed a method that would furnish Hawaii with a highly trained Americanizing force. The outcome of this training was to be automatic and well-conditioned attitudes, precision in execution and fidelity

to the model, freedom from deviation, innovation, and inquisitiveness, and a highly qualified product from the skill standpoint.<sup>49</sup> This model lent itself well to dictating and standardizing training.

Wood's five-step method was as follows,

- 1st: Thought getting through objects, sketch story, etc.
- 2nd: Expression of thought, through making, modeling, drawing, painting, or dramatizing.
- 3rd: Oral expression of thought.
- 4th: Making use of oral expression of thought for reading, copying, and dictation.
- 5th: Written expression of thought.<sup>50</sup>

In the first step the child would be shown an object and asked to notice as much as possible about it, such as color, texture, size, etc. The second step was a check by the teacher that the child had gotten the proper thought. Language could not be used to relay this, because most of Hawaii's public school population were not English speakers. Therefore Wood used "the universal modes of expression," which were mainly art and drama. The child would be asked to draw, model in clay, or act out the idea he gained from observing the object. Once convinced that the child had obtained the proper thought, the teacher told the child the proper word and wrote down a few short sentences that the child could use for a reading lesson. The child would then copy the sentences; read the sentences; and write them from dictation. This was considered making use of the oral expression, step four. For the fifth and final step Wood wrote, "The child is

required to give expressions in written form to the thoughts he has gained through the preceding steps."<sup>51</sup> The fifth step would be done without assistance from the teacher. Wood realized that the child's first attempts would be almost identical to what the teacher had written, but he believed, "gradually. . . the child gains ability to express his own thought in his own way, each year showing more originality in forms of expression."<sup>52</sup> In theory this method appeared to promote independent thinking; however, in practice this was seldom the case.

The second and third steps in Wood's method, expression of thought, were influenced by Colonel Parker's theories. Parker's theories, however, had never been intended to be used as part of a structured method.<sup>53</sup> Therefore, what had been intended to be original expression on the part of the child at these two steps became a source of dictation of thought. The child would soon learn that it was not original thought that was being sought by the teacher but the thought the teacher demanded. Consequently, the thought-getting stage could be interpreted as a means of teacher control rather than as independent thinking. Wood's teachers were so highly trained at the normal school that the responses to the thought-getting stage were programmed by Wood there.

The cadet teachers were required to prepare, in detailed written form, lesson plans that would depict everything they were going to do and say in the classroom.

These extensive and detailed lesson plans of the cadet teacher were checked and rechecked by the faculty. And each lesson plan did not escape Wood's personal approval or disapproval. Wood wrote of his strict control over lesson plans,

Each pupil prepares and submits to the critic teacher a carefully prepared plan of the lessons he is to teach. . . the plan is passed and the cadet brings it to the office for my approval. This demands of the pupil a careful preparation, of the critic teachers and from myself a close supervision. The result justifies the effort.<sup>54</sup>

John Fry's master's thesis on Edgar Wood included an incident told to him by normal graduate Henrietta Freitas on how closely the students felt they were monitored by Wood.

After following Wood's outline for several weeks, the student teacher realized the students. . . were not responding with any initiative or new ideas. . . . She hesitantly asked her supervisor. . . if she could deviate from the outline. She was surprised when Miss Culter (supervising teacher) agreed to stand at the door, "to make sure Mr. Wood did not come in unexpectedly." The student teacher then proceeded to use group discussions, panels, and private study with outside materials she had brought in. The students were enthusiastic and Miss Culter more so. The latter told her, "I only wish we could do this together and omit outline." But even stern Miss Culter did not change or ignore the plans of Principal Wood.<sup>55</sup>

As illustrated in the preceding, Wood not only monitored the cadets' written plans, but made quite sure that they did not deviate from them in the classrooms where they did their practice teaching. The cadet teacher divided his/her time between the normal department and the

training department. One-third of each day in the last three years of the normal school was spent in practice classrooms. The cadet teacher throughout the three years would experience all eight grades. The grade teacher would supervise the cadet's work in the classroom. Wood wrote,

The cadet, guided by the teacher, takes charge of the room in which they teach, prepares the lesson plans, cares for school property, and supervises the pupils on the grounds. In this way, the cadets are prepared to take charge of any school to which they may be appointed.<sup>56</sup>

Wood felt that the cadet teacher needed close supervision while in the classroom, because the cadets were too immature academically and professionally to be left strictly on their own.<sup>57</sup>

By 1912, due to overcrowding, two cadet teachers would frequently be in one room at the same time. Wood defended this practice by stating, "Teachers accustomed to the slight increase in noise . . . find the condition conducive to efficiency, both from the standpoint of the pupils and the cadets."<sup>58</sup>

The method Wood used, along with his strict control of the cadets in the classroom, was due to his belief that his students were not academically oriented. To this end Wood fought very hard to keep the academic requirements low in order to keep the normal school accessible to the Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian student.

The entrance requirements at the normal school remained low throughout Wood's administration, admitting students directly from the eighth grade for a two-to-four-year course. Although Principal Wood repeatedly reported that he was upgrading the entrance and graduation requirements at the normal school, little evidence can be found to support him. Wood could only point to the fact that one graduate of the normal school had received a year's credit at Columbia Teachers College, and the Board of Education of California had recognized the work of the school. However, these forms of recognition had all come in the first decade of the twentieth century. Wood seemed satisfied to rest on these laurels.

Nearly all the changes at the normal school resulting in upgrading the entrance or graduation requirements were forced on Wood by the Board of Education. Even then Wood objected to some of these movements and ignored others.

In 1900 the normal school offered a four-year course to elementary school graduates and a one-year program for pupils who had graduated from high school. The four-year course proved to be a financial burden on some students; therefore, in 1904 Superintendent Atkinson changed the normal school policy to read, "At the end of the second year an elementary certificate is granted to those who may find it impossible to complete the four-year course."<sup>59</sup> The granting of a two-year certificate lasted until 1909, when the Board of Education decided to suspend this

practice in hope of upgrading the standards of Island teachers, because the option for the two-year program for certification was taken by some 209 students, while the four-year diploma program graduated only sixty-four.<sup>60</sup>

When the Board of Education suspended the two-year certificate, it allowed for a teaching permit to be issued at the end of the third year. This permit would enable the needy student to teach for one year and then return to the normal school to finish the four-year program.<sup>61</sup> The decision of the board brought protest from Wood, students, and parents. They requested that if the two-year certificate was to be suspended it should be done over a three-year period. The matter was turned over to the Attorney General for a decision. The Attorney General and the Superintendent of Public Instruction agreed to let the practice continue for three years and after that certificates were to be granted "only where demands were made."<sup>62</sup>

In 1912 the board elected to do away with the third-year permit for needy students, again trying to upgrade the teachers. Wood wrote a letter to Superintendent Pope, protesting the move on the grounds that many students had entered the normal school expecting to take advantage of the third-year permit. Wood reminded Pope of the Attorney General's decision in the 1909 case and hoped the same would apply to the 1912 action. And it did.<sup>63</sup> Wood supported the idea of giving certificates to those who had

not finished the entire program. In his letter to Pope, Wood expressed this view:

The general trend of the mainland is to grant a larger and larger number of certificates and to use every means to induce persons who intend entering the teaching profession to take a course in a Normal School. Our records show . . . that the charge of doing unsatisfactory work does not lie entirely with those holding temporary certificates nor with any nationality, but is distributed with an impartiality that seems to indicate what other factors . . . contribute to whatever inefficiency exists.<sup>64</sup>

Certificates continued to be issued until 1919. However, by 1914 certificates signified course of study completion and not time spent at the normal school.<sup>65</sup>

The one-year post-high school class never yielded many graduates. Only 147 high school graduates also graduated from the normal school during Edgar Wood's administration,<sup>66</sup> out of 855 total graduates.<sup>67</sup> Of the 147 high school graduates, 33 received certificates rather than diplomas. A two-year post-secondary program was not introduced into the normal school until 1920. Even as late as 1920 Wood felt strongly that high school graduation as an entrance requirement at the normal school was well in the future.

Wood was forced by law in 1914 to accept only those students who had graduated from elementary school. Although this had been the requirement in the past, Wood evidently did not always adhere to it. In a letter to Wood, Superintendent Henry W. Kinney reminded him of the grammar school completion requirement for entrance to the

normal school. He added that "if it had been lost, the applicant can be referred to this office."<sup>68</sup> One can only imagine that Wood accepted students on their word that they had graduated from elementary school or had simply ignored the order in some cases. It is interesting to note that the reminder from Kinney came over two years after the board made their order.

Consequently, Wood had been able to keep the entrance and graduation requirements the same in 1919 as they had been in 1896, i.e., entrance of students with an eighth-grade education for a two-to-four-year course. In 1920-21 two years of high school were required for entrance into the normal school.

While Wood was hesitant about upgrading the student population, he was not hesitant about upgrading the buildings and grounds. In almost every Report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wood requested some new additions to the normal school.

In 1901 members of the Territorial Legislature visited the normal school, located at the Front Street School. They found what Edgar Wood and others had claimed for some time; the building was unfit.<sup>69</sup> The increasing pupil population, in both the normal school and the practice school, along with an expanding curriculum, warranted more room. A new structure was approved and funds were made available for construction.

The new building was opened in the fall of 1905 on the slopes of Punchbowl. It was the first home of the normal school that had not been a hand-me-down. However, the comeliness of the new structure was in question. Wood claimed, "The location of the building, the interior arrangements, the ventilation and light are exceptionally good."<sup>70</sup> Yet the Department of Public Instruction and especially the members of the board expressed dissatisfaction with the new building. At a March 1905 meeting of the commissioners, they said, "The Normal School is built in a most peculiar position relative to the rest of the lot and the adjoining premises."<sup>71</sup> At the February 1906 meeting of the board, after the normal school was built, the commissioners discussed the construction of the high school. They asked to see the plans, which were not available. They insisted on seeing the plans before the construction began because they had never seen the plans of the normal school before it was built and two members, particularly, were sorely disappointed with the outcome.

"Nobody ever did see the plans for that. If we had seen them maybe the building would have been different," said Mrs. Jordon. "Why?" asked Director Von Holt. "Well you go past the building everyday and you will see why," and Mrs. Jordon shuddered a duet with Mrs. Wilcox. "It is something frightful." And, really, that Normal School building is a fright. Its facade looks like the back of an old fashioned deck of cards, one of the striperly kind and has the same quality of giving the one who looks upon it a kind of dizziness, calculated to end in nausea.<sup>72</sup>

Ruth Shaw, a long-time employee of the normal school, reported that students and faculty "sighed when they looked at the desolation of the site . . . an abandoned stone quarry,"<sup>73</sup> but Wood continued to hail his normal school building as "cool and comfortable,"<sup>74</sup> complimenting the architect on a superb job. However, the building was not built with the normal school's growing needs in mind. By 1910 Wood was requesting more space for the ever-growing student population.

The lack of sufficient accommodations for the training school had made the work of the school harder than it should be. . . . In the Normal School proper there is not a single teacher who has a room to call her own. As soon as a teacher finishes . . . she must collect her papers and books and move into the hall or library while another teacher occupies the room. When you add to this classes too large for the seating capacity of the room, and too many periods per week, it is surprising that the teachers of the school succeed doing satisfactory work.<sup>75</sup>

Finally in 1914 new buildings were constructed with the help of the vocational education classes of the normal school. These buildings were of an open-air-type bungalow and well suited to the Hawaiian climate.<sup>76</sup> Again in 1918 a new twelve-room building was finished to help relieve overcrowding in the practice school.

The Territorial Legislature rarely apportioned enough funds to house the normal school properly. In his reports to the Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1899, 1900, 1902, 1910, 1916, 1918, and 1920, Wood reported the need for additional room. In 1914 after the new bungalows were

constructed Wood proclaimed, "For the first time in the history of the school, each teacher has a room where she can meet her classes and not be subject to the interruptions due to other teachers occupying the same room."<sup>78</sup> However, only two years later, in 1916, Wood was deploring the crowded conditions at the training school. Although all the superintendents whom Wood served under shared his feelings that the "home product" was the best teacher, they continually failed to supply money to maintain a first-class normal school.

The faculty that served the school was not well schooled. Wood never reported the status of the education of the teachers at the normal school, but Benjamin Wist's report of 1923 gave this information. The faculty that Wist inherited from Wood contained no one with a master's degree and only sixteen or twenty-nine percent with bachelor's degrees, leaving forty-one with no degrees at all.<sup>79</sup> The faculty was overwhelmingly female, as were the students, and the pay was low. Wood enjoyed hiring his own graduates to work at the normal school. He wrote in 1902,

We have now reached the point where we supply teachers for the more responsible positions . . . from among our own pupils and this without loss to the efficiency of the schools. There are now several of our own graduates occupying important positions in the Normal and Training School and at no previous time in history of the school has the attendance been larger or the standards of work of a higher character.<sup>80</sup>

The turnover rate of the faculty at the normal school was exceedingly high. According to the Survey of Education in Hawaii, the high turnover rate indicate(d) a very serious lack of permanence within the institutional staff, creating a condition which is disconcerting to say the very least.<sup>81</sup>

Wood's authority at the normal school was enhanced by these conditions. He was the only member of the staff who held an advanced degree. Wood saw women as less of a threat to him than men. His own graduates, besides being indoctrinated in his methods, would respect his authority, and a high turnover rate would not allow any one individual to establish much influence. One might therefore assume that Wood was the ultimate authority at the normal school.

Edgar Wood's control over the normal school could not have been maintained strictly from within. Wood also had to have support from the Superintendent of Public Instruction, for whom he worked directly. Wood wrote to Dr. Frank Bunker, Director of the Federal Survey, in 1920,

All of the ministers of education and the superintendents of public instruction have been strong supporters of the Normal School and myself. Two entered the office distinctly critical of the administration of the school. When these men left office, they were firm friends of both the policy and the administration. I believe that the informed thought of Hawaii recognizes that the Normal School has done good work under very adverse conditions and in the face, at times, of strong opposition and that it has always been in the front line where things were being done.<sup>82</sup>

The official view of the Department of Public Instruction was that,

the Normal School has for its sole purpose the training of teachers . . . that the last fourteen years through all the changes in the department of public instruction it has had the support and approbation of the department at all times and its work is an expression of the department. . . . The Normal School trains teachers how to carry out the course of study and the department stands behind the Normal School and its curriculum.<sup>83</sup>

Wood was producing the ideal teacher for Hawaii in the eyes of the oligarchy. The atmosphere of the government's normal school virtually oozed authoritarianism. Wood's administrative practices, curriculum, and unique teaching methods were devised to maintain control of Hawaii's Americanization force. As Wood continued to produce a highly controllable teaching force, his power grew within the haole elite and the Department of Public Instruction that represented them.

Wood served under two Ministers of Education and five Superintendents of Public Instruction. These positions were all appointed by the President of the Republic of Hawaii or later by the Territorial Governor. Therefore, the stamp of approval by the head of the Department of Public Instruction was, ipso facto, the seal of approval from the governments of Hawaii.

Wood's power remained unquestioned and untested until 1912. In that year Wood faced the first real threat to the status quo that he and the oligarchy had so ardently protected. But Wood was well insulated against adversity.

NOTES

CHAPTER THREE

<sup>1</sup>Lawrence Fuchs, Hawaii Pono (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1961), p. 154.

<sup>2</sup>Fuchs, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 155.

<sup>6</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 18 May 1901, p. 4, col. 2.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 29 November 1910, p. 4, col. 1.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 8 March 1895, p. 4.

<sup>9</sup>U. S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education 1896-97 (Washington, D. C.: GPO, 1897), p. 1515; U. S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education 1899-1900 (Washington, D. C.: Gpo, 1900), p. 1657.

<sup>10</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 12 August 1898, p. 4, col. 1.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 15 August 1898, p. 2, col. 1.

<sup>12</sup>Atatau T. Atkinson, "Opening Address Delivered Before the Teachers and Pupils of the Summer Normal School" (Honolulu: Hawaii Star Press, 1901), p. 6.

<sup>13</sup>Henry Townsend, "Education in Hawaii" (1898), cited by Ralph K. Stueber, "Hawaii: A Case Study in Developmental Education 1778-1960," Diss. University of Wisconsin, 1964, p. 197.

<sup>14</sup>Ralph K. Stueber, "Hawaii: A Case Study in Developmental Education 1778-1960," Diss. University of Wisconsin, 1964, p. 202.

<sup>15</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 2 May 1900, p. 9, col. 1.

- 16Ibid., 23 December 1899, p. 6.
- 17Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, Curriculum Development (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1980, p. 571.
- 18Ibid., pp. 569-570.
- 19Ibid., p. 573.
- 20Stueber, p. 155.
- 21Tanner and Tanner, pp. 259-260.
- 22Harold Dunkel, Herbart and Herbartianism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 108.
- 23Tanner and Tanner, p. 255.
- 24Adolphe E. Meyer, An Educational History of the Western World 3rd ed (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972), p. 368.
- 25Ibid., p. 368.
- 26Ibid., p. 367.
- 27Harold Dunkel, Herbart & Herbartianism: An Educational Ghost Story (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 242.
- 28Meyer, p. 370.
- 29Dunkel, p. 102.
- 30Ibid., p. 123.
- 31Tanner and Tanner, p. 249.
- 32Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1906 (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Company, Ltd., 1907), pp. 11-12.
- 33Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1902 (Honolulu: The Bulletin Print Company, 1903, p. 26.
- 34Ibid.

<sup>35</sup>Ronald Iwamoto, "Territorial Normal and Training School: The Perceptions of One Graduate, Mrs. Ruth M. (Yokochi) Iwamoto," Unpublished Oral History, Xerox, 1981, p. 9.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1914 (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd., 1915 pp. 24-25.

<sup>38</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1920 (Honolulu: New Freedom Press, 1921), p. 72.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid.

<sup>40</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1916 (Honolulu: The New Freedom Press, 1917), pp. 39-40.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 25 February 1906, p. 4, col. 3-4.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 16 June 1916, p. 2, col. 5.

<sup>44</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Superintendent 1916, p. 40.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>46</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1918 (Honolulu: The New Freedom Press, 1919, p. 43.

<sup>47</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 15 August 1921, p. 1, col. 7.

<sup>48</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Superintendent 1920, p. 73.

<sup>49</sup>Lawrence Thomas, "Identifying Significant Educational Variables," Type-T Training, Xerox, n.d.

<sup>50</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Minister of Public Instruction for the Biennial Period Ending December 31, 1899 (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1900), p. 93.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 92.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Education (New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1959), p. 389.

<sup>54</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Superintendent 1902, p. 33.

<sup>55</sup>John Fry, "Edgar Wood and the Territorial Normal and Training School: A Source of Americanization 1900-1921," Master's thesis, University of Hawaii, 1969, pp. 34-35.

<sup>56</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1912 (Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd., 1913), p. 85.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 86.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid.

<sup>59</sup>Ruth Shaw, "The Output of the Territorial Normal and Training School," Master's thesis, University of Hawaii, 1929, p. 8.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 46.

<sup>61</sup>Edgar Wood, Letter to Superintendent Pope, 15 February 1912 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), p. 5.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid.

<sup>65</sup>Shaw, p. 9.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., p. 46.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>68</sup>Superintendent Pope, Letter to Edgar Wood, 24 October 1916 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives).

<sup>69</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 16 February 1901, p. 11, col. 3.

<sup>70</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Superintendent 1906, p. 10.

<sup>71</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 18 March 1905, p. 5, col. 2.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., 10 February 1906, p. 5, col. 2.

<sup>73</sup>Shaw, p. 7.

<sup>74</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 29 May 1906, p. 10, col. 3.

<sup>75</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1910 (Honolulu: Hawaiian Star Print, 1911), p. 37.

<sup>76</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 17 July 1914, p. 2, col. 4.

<sup>77</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Superintendent 1918, p. 36.

<sup>78</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Superintendent 1914, p. 24.

<sup>79</sup>Hawaii (Territory) Hawaii's Public Schools Being the Biennial Report of the Department of Public Instruction (Honolulu: Advertiser Print Company, Ltd., 1923), p. 52.

<sup>80</sup>Hawaii, Report of the Superintendent 1902, pp. 25-26.

<sup>81</sup>U. S. Bureau of Education, Survey of Education in Hawaii, Bulletin #16 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1920, p. 80.

<sup>82</sup>Edgar Wood, Letter to Dr. Frank Bunker, 19 January 1920 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), p. 5.

<sup>83</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 23 January 1912, p. 4, col. 6-7.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### TROUBLE AT THE NORMAL SCHOOL 1912-1916

By 1912 the Territorial Normal and Training School had been under the sole direction of Edgar Wood for fourteen years. Almost from its inception, he had spun a web of control over the institution that mirrored the control the business/government interest enjoyed over the Territory. Wood was very satisfied with his school and the teachers it graduated, so much so that change had been almost nonexistent through 1912. Although the school curriculum had shifted to a more vocational emphasis, the overall philosophy and methods had remained the same since 1898, when Wood assumed the principalship.

The Territorial Normal and Training School had become static, and no one in a position to initiate change was willing to do so. Yet there were people in Hawaii who challenged Wood's ultimate control of the normal school and questioned the methods he used. There was a budding middle class in Hawaii who wanted change at the normal school. They wanted the normal school to more accurately reflect the Hawaii of 1912 with its rising middle class and to more closely emulate the wave of educational efficiency that was sweeping the mainland. The wave of efficiency was characterized, in part, by scrutinizing school systems, through social surveys, to determine two

factors: what return taxpayers were getting for their investments and how these returns could be increased.<sup>1</sup> Based on this strictly economic/business model, it was believed that consolidation of students, subject areas, schools, and administration would increase efficiency in schooling. Hawaii attempted to follow mainland trends toward educational efficiency, yet their first money-saving move brought a strange twist of fate. While the wave of efficiency brought consolidation to mainland school systems, Hawaii, perhaps unknowingly, took its first steps toward decentralization.

To maintain control of a centralized system that stretched over an eight-island area, the Department of Public Instruction had employed normal inspectors to go out to the Islands from Honolulu and supervise the in-service teachers. In a money-saving move in 1909, the normal inspectors were replaced with supervising principals. These were principals of large centrally located schools who took on the added responsibility of supervising all the schools in their district. In 1912, the number of supervising principals was increased from four to eighteen, which included Edgar Wood as the principal of the normal school.<sup>2</sup> The role of the supervising principal was also expanded in 1912 to include power to (1) change and adopt textbooks, (2) change the course of study and its adaptations, (3) make changes desired in the methods of instruction and training in the

. . . Normal School of cadets destined to come under their supervision,' and (4) discuss all matters relating to the proper conduct of the schools of the territory.<sup>3</sup> The supervising principals were also directed by Superintendent Pope to accept suggestions for school improvement from teachers and other principals.<sup>4</sup> The supervising principals met annually in Honolulu just before the summer meeting of the Commissioners of Education and made their recommendations available to the commissioners.<sup>5</sup>

The expansion of the number of supervising principals and also of their influence on schools and teachers, coupled with Superintendent Pope's orders to accept suggestions from teachers and other principals can be interpreted as a first step toward democratization of the Department of Public Instruction although it was a money-saving move. Although these supervising principals were not publicly elected officials, as professional educators, they clearly were not included in the oligarchical structure of Hawaii. Furthermore, the move toward supervising principals marked the first time educational authority was expanded to the outer islands, rather than emanating from Honolulu. The men who filled these positions represented the emerging middle class in the Islands, therefore, it was not a coincidence that, when the base of power in the Department of Public Instruction was expanded in 1912, there was agitation for change at the normal school.

In January 1912, two articles were written for the Advertiser. They appeared together under the title, "Opposite Views expressed on Hawaii's School System - Normal School Principal Explains Principles of Present System - Normal School Graduate Condemns System in Force." The writer of the first article was, of course, Edgar Wood; the second author remained anonymous.

In his letter, Wood defended the public school's course of study against charges of "fads and frills," which were largely aimed at Wood's five-step method. The charges were much the same as what had been heard in the first decade of the twentieth century. Wood defended the work of the normal school by citing several mainland educators whom he claimed put their stamp of approval on Wood's methods, such as Dr. Brown, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Colonel Parker of the Cooke County Normal School, and John Dewey. Wood also defended the work of the normal school as being in line with the particular need of Hawaii, which for Wood was Americanization of its different ethnic groups.<sup>6</sup> A contrary view was expressed by a "Normal Graduate" in her article. She wrote,

I am familiar with the work of Dr. Brown and others mentioned in some of the best normal schools in the United States, and I am in a position to state emphatically that these methods as taught on the mainland are totally unlike the system as carried out here. . . . In fact, I have never seen or heard such a method as is in use in the normal school of Honolulu. It is so peculiar and I believe it should be investigated by a competent committee.<sup>7</sup>

'Normal Graduate' described a system that she equated with the 'grind from a machine.'

As the plan of geography, so it is with every other subject. Thought getting by the teacher, expressions of thought by the teacher, oral expressions by the pupil, paragraph or development by the teacher, etc. Everything is on the same plan, five, ten, or fifteen minutes given to the different sections, with little variation from week to week, from month to month, a regular grind from a machine.<sup>8</sup>

'Normal Graduate' also challenged another of Wood's major defenses of his normal school and the school system of Hawaii when she wrote that the situation in Hawaii differed little from the cities on the east coast of the mainland.

We have teachers in these Islands who have taught Poles, Bohemians, Russians, and Armenians in the Eastern States, and in schools where English is no more the mother tongue than it is here. . . . They tell me that the methods used in those places work very well and are in every way more satisfactory and produce better results than the machine methods used here.<sup>9</sup>

The controversy over the methods used at the normal school was brought up at the first meeting of the expanded board of supervising principals in May 1912. It was suggested at this meeting that the normal school might be investigated, but a majority of the principals decided not to proceed. Principal Davis, of the Royal School, paid 'high compliments to Professor Wood and the management of the Normal School, and said he didn't think supervising principals could improve the professor's school.'<sup>10</sup> Copeland of Maui disagreed as to the possibility of

improvement, but finally acquiesced. Hilo principal C. E. King wanted to investigate the school anyway. He felt "that while the report was certain to praise the school it was a duty of the supervising principals to investigate and report."<sup>11</sup>

Although no investigation of the normal school resulted from the meeting of the supervising principals, there was a major altercation between Principal Wood and Supervising Principal Copeland that is worthy of note. There was, as the newspaper reporter heard, some "Taft-Roosevelt kind of talking to each other."<sup>12</sup> The argument stemmed from a disagreement over the methods used at the normal school; however, Superintendent Pope cut the argument short by calling for order.<sup>13</sup> This disagreement between Wood and Copeland foreshadowed a larger rift between these two men that would later play an important role in the future of the normal school.

Later in May, the Commissioners of Education met to perform a task they did every spring, which was to prepare the list of teachers for the next school year. However, this meeting had some irregularities which stemmed from Wood's letter recommending that a normal school teacher, Etta Davis, not be reappointed to the normal school staff.<sup>14</sup> Superintendent Pope must have believed there would be some discussion of Davis' dismissal, because according to Commissioner Aiken, the regular procedures for appointing teachers were not used. The appointees for

the normal school were read instead of being printed out, as had been the practice in the past.<sup>15</sup>

Aiken had been alerted to the fact that Davis was not to be reappointed, and when he did not hear her name called he inquired into the matter. He was told by the superintendent that she had resigned. Commissioner Aiken recalled,

Being rather surprised at this I pressed the point, when the secretary informed the superintendent that Miss Davis had asked for reappointment instead. With some warmth I then moved that Miss Davis be reappointed to her position, and with no objection whatever the superintendent placed her upon the list. My motion does not appear upon the minutes, nor do I know that it was seconded, but I do know that Miss Davis was reappointed.<sup>16</sup>

Later the official story was that the letter from Wood had been mislaid and Davis' reappointment had been a mistake.<sup>17</sup>

Nevertheless she was reappointed to the normal school. Her reappointment did not satisfy Etta Davis, because added to the uncertainty of her position, she was given a third-grade class instead of an upper division class, which she had requested, and her pay was reduced.

The question of Davis' pay was a confusing issue. She had originally been hired as a grade school teacher for the practice school. However, she had been paid the salary of a teacher in the normal school proper. She had been expecting a \$200 raise for the second year, which would have brought her salary of \$1,200 a year. Her

reappointment to grade work meant that she would receive \$850 a year, the salary for a teacher in the practice school. In September, Superintendent Pope stated,

On finding that Miss Davis' appointment had been greatly delayed and that her re-rating of salary would be less in the change of salary, I corrected it by letter, stating that her salary would be the same as that of the previous year and explained that I had personally investigated the matter and that if she continued in the same work the unsatisfactory reports would not entitle her to \$1,200.00 per year.<sup>18</sup>

Upon hearing this, Davis hired attorney Lightfoot to defend her position. Davis requested a hearing before the Board of Education. Lightfoot was well known in the community and had gone on record as not being a friend of the normal school.

When Davis hired the lawyer, the Board of Education immediately began their investigation of her and her teaching abilities. Three members of the board visited Davis' third-grade classroom at the practice school at the normal school. Inspector Gibson reported on what they had observed,

The noise in the room could be heard in the hallways and in fact in the yard. There was utter confusion in the room when I entered, pupils all talking out loud, running around the room, throwing crayons at each other, jumping out of the windows, etc. Miss Davis was walking around with a ruler in her hand, issuing orders for quietness that were not heard. She tried force to get a boy into his seat; he turned on her, struck her, and snatched the ruler out of her hand. This continued for some minutes without change.<sup>19</sup>

Two other similar reports were filed by Commissioner May Wilcox and Edgar Wood.

Wood wrote another letter in which he continued to build a case against Etta Davis. He accused her of the following: (1) She was mis-hired by the Friske agency in Boston. He had asked for a grade teacher and she was not prepared for this but prepared for high school. (2) She was engaged for work in the grades in music and, although prepared, refused. (3) She kept attendance on loose sheets instead of the assigned register. (4) She refused to pass in the written work of the pupils. (5) She failed to prepare work for the cadet teachers. And (6) she urged other grade teachers not to do the work required and canvassed the normal school teachers, urging them to join in opposing the requirements of the principal.<sup>20</sup> Wood considered the last charge, of disloyalty to the administration, the most serious.

When Superintendent Pope reviewed all charges against Davis and her classroom abilities, he wrote to the Board of Education:

But feeling that it is strictly my duty to act and not permit such destructive work to continue, I suspend Miss Davis until some further action could be taken by the Department, the suspension to take effect on receipt of notification. It was delivered about noon on the 25th.<sup>21</sup>

The case was brought before the commissioners on December 4, 1912. During the proceedings many charges were hurled from one side to the other. Davis, represented by attorney Lightfoot, requested that she be given work for which she was suited. Lightfoot suggested

. . . that as she had made a specialty of psychology that such a class should be formed at the Normal School.<sup>22</sup> He added that the Territorial Normal and Training School was the only normal school he had ever heard of that did not offer a course in psychology.<sup>23</sup>

As to the methods at the normal school, Davis was most critical. Her testimony was recorded as follows,

She said she had withheld her judgement as to the school and its methods as long as possible, but that Principal Wood must have known that her ultimate judgement could not be favorable and that she would consider it wrong to conceal, "the deplorable state of affairs in the school." She styled this condition, as a "sickening travesty of real education," and said that the slight results accomplished are obtained at terrible expense of time and health on the part of both teachers and cadets.<sup>24</sup>

The defense also called Miss Dawson, a former teacher at the normal school, to illustrate how bad Wood's methods were. Dawson declared, "No teacher ever speaks of them [Wood's methods] without expressing disapproval."<sup>25</sup>

Dawson then went on to describe one occasion when she had refused to carry through with an assignment she was required to do. She had not considered "a request to have her pupils describe the birds which were here when Capt. Cook arrived as proper. She thought it proper to describe from specimens collected but not from fossil remains."<sup>26</sup>

As to Wood himself, Davis was most critical. She charged Wood with having harassed her, hindered her work, humiliated her in front of her students, and in her

opinion, having done everything in his power to make it unpleasant for her, resulting in her suspension.<sup>27</sup>

Wood defended his methods at the normal school, as he always did. He referred to the many mainland educators who supposedly endorsed the work he was doing. He flatly denied any misconduct in regard to Miss Davis.

The decision of the Commissioners of Education upheld Superintendent Pope's decision, and Etta Davis was not reappointed to the normal school. The decision read that Davis was dismissed for the benefit of the department.<sup>28</sup> Davis was not only dismissed from the normal school, but also barred from teaching in any public school of the territory.<sup>29</sup> Commissioner Aiken spoke up and said that he did not believe such action was warranted because "the fact that a teacher had failed to get along with one principal did not mean that she could not get along with another."<sup>30</sup> The board did not rescind its decision, but stated that they would give Davis a letter stating that her dismissal "had nothing to do with her academic qualification."<sup>31</sup>

This was a peculiar turn of events, because the board had based its case on Davis' lack of ability in the classroom. At the end they were essentially admitting that the case had been based on a disagreement between Wood and Davis. Clearly Wood could not tolerate Davis in the normal school, because she overtly disagreed with his methods and threatened his control of the normal school.

The Board of Education with Pope at its head, was also willing to abide by Wood's decision and avoid a situation that could lead to change at the normal school.

The next day at the meeting of the Board of Education it was suggested that the public had misinterpreted the meaning of the hearing and was construing it as an attack on Wood and the normal school, due to the accounts in the newspaper. Aiken was angry with Wood for passing around a circular explaining the merits of the normal school and its principal. Aiken felt these circulars were perpetuating the belief that the normal school and its principal had been on trial. He wanted action taken against Wood on this account.<sup>32</sup> Commissioner Farrington disagreed and explained,

If there was a 'nigger in the woodpile' it is a reflection on the Board, Attorney Lightfoot, and the young ladies in question. We heard Miss Davis and Miss Dawson were satisfied that they were treated fairly. No citizens were justified in passing an opinion unless they had been present at the hearing and the Board should not make a recognition of it. There is no reason why we should criticize our own action and say what should not have been done. Until there are indications of lack of confidence in the Normal School, we should support and uphold the school.<sup>33</sup>

Farrington continued by saying that 'any corrections or further explanations in the public press would carry the controversy on interminably.'<sup>34</sup>

The controversy was to continue, but not at the department level. Davis, backed by her attorney, filed a petition with the Territorial Legislature requesting

Wood's dismissal. This probably came as no surprise to Wood, who felt it necessary to circulate his own defense after the hearing. Wood strongly believed that behind all the turmoil lay a plot to remove him from the principalship of the normal school. He wrote of his suspicions to Superintendent Pope in October 1912,

The present difficulty arose, not as it is said, from conditions existing within the school, but through influences on the outside. For the past two years, certain persons have been deliberately plotting to bring about trouble within the School, and thus furnish an excuse for attacking the Principal.<sup>35</sup>

In his letter Wood recalled several incidents to give credence to his accusations. Curiously these facts or semi-facts were never part of the recorded hearing or newspaper accounts.

The first incident that Wood relayed happened in 1910. The Reverend Mr. Ebersole had asked Wood if he was having trouble with his teachers. Ebersole had heard this from someone in Maui. Wood was puzzled because he never felt there was any trouble with his faculty.<sup>36</sup>

The second incident Wood recounted was when he had canvassed all supervising principals as to their support of normal graduates under their supervision. All responded in the affirmative except the principals on Maui.<sup>37</sup>

In December 1911 Wood invited several of the supervising principals to visit the normal school. He gave this account of their stay.

Mr. Wells (Maui). Mr. Copeland (Maui), Mr. King (Hawaii and the supervising principal that requested a formal investigation of the Normal School), and Mr. Brodie came early in the morning, and remaining until after lunch. Mr. Brodie left shortly after lunch, saying to me that others were looking for trouble and that he preferred to come some other day.<sup>38</sup>

On another occasion Wells of Maui had visited several members of the normal school faculty, some of those having been employees of the school for ten and twelve years, asking their backing for the movement to remove Wood. The teachers told Wood that Wells had told them, 'You will have less work, and do it your own way. Anyway, we have the needed support, and must win.'<sup>39</sup>

The last incident that Wood relayed about the plot was that Copeland of Maui had been in Honolulu stirring up support for the Davis case, stating that he and others were supporting her.<sup>40</sup>

Wood concluded his letter by stating, 'I think you will find on investigation, that this affair (Davis) finds its center in Wailuku, Maui, and has a very limited number of supporters. Those sympathizing, do so largely because they are not informed.'<sup>41</sup> Maui was the center of the movement to replace Wood at the normal school. Supervising principals Copeland and Wells saw Wood as an obstacle to change in the public school system.

Copeland and Wells had presented the other supervising principals with a new course of study for the public schools at the May meeting of the principals.<sup>42</sup>

Their curriculum, "Copeland-Wells Course of Study," advocated reduction of the public school curriculum to the three R's and extensive use of textbooks.<sup>43</sup> Their curriculum had been rejected by the supervising principals with Wood leading the opposition.<sup>44</sup> The move to streamline and economize the public school curriculum did not end at the departmental level.

The first phase of the Davis case was successful for Copeland, Wells, and those who backed them. Even though Davis was dismissed, the case received a great deal of press. It brought to the public eye what many believed to be malpractices on the part of the normal school. The case also gathered enough appeal to have Davis and her attorney believe that a petition in the legislature would find a sympathetic ear. Davis filed the petition in March 1913, declaring, "it is Edgar Wood of the Normal School and not she who is incompetent, and that if anyone deserves firing it is her former principal and not herself."<sup>45</sup>

In her petition to the Territorial Legislature, Davis did not limit her charges to Wood alone. Davis included Superintendent Pope, and to a lesser degree the Commissioners of Education. The major charges read,

. . . that because of his alleged dissatisfaction with petitioner in teaching such grade work, said principal procured the superintendent of education, Willis Pope, to suspend your petitioner from duty on or about the twenty-fifth day of September 1912. That thereafter

and constantly until about the first day of December 1912, petitioner endeavored without success to procure a meeting of the commissioners of public instruction in order to submit to said commissioners a complaint against and appeal from the action of said principal and said superintendent as above set forth and your petitioner charges that said principal and said superintendent during said period, acted in collusion to prevent such meeting of the commissioners and to continue and perpetuate the injustice therefore done to your petitioner in the premises.

That the meeting of said commissioners, and as of the date December 2, 1912, said commissioners, by a vote of said body, illegally, as the petitioner is advised and believes, dismissed said petitioner from her said position.<sup>46</sup>

Davis continued to request a full investigation of the proceedings leading to her dismissal and an investigation of the normal school and its principal. Davis believed the investigation would show that,

Edgar Wood is and has been for years past, incompetent to serve as the principal of said Normal School, and that he had been and is arbitrary, oppressive, rude, domineering, insincere, and untruthful in his relations with the subordinate teachers to a degree highly prejudicial to the welfare of said school.<sup>47</sup>

The Territorial Legislature assigned a joint committee to investigate the charges brought by Davis' petition. Leading the committee was Senator Paxton, with Senator Penhallow and Representatives Cooke, Huddy, and Spaulding also serving.<sup>48</sup> The committee did not limit themselves to an investigation of the normal school. They set their sights higher. The three main points to be looked at were (1) salary list of the teachers and the other employees of the department, (2) cost of textbooks,

and (3) the course of study in the primary, grammar, high school, and normal school.<sup>48</sup> The Advertiser reported, "The joint committee shall also state if, in its opinion, the course of study in effect . . . is reasonably extensive or expensive, and wherein, if at all it can be simplified and cheapened consistently with reasonable efficiency."<sup>50</sup> With economy being the watchword for this committee, they would look into reducing the course of study, especially within the primary grades, where most of the student population was enrolled. The course of study was to include "nothing beyond an intelligent understanding of the English language, writing and speaking and the simple rules of arithmetic,"<sup>51</sup> which was in reality the Copeland-Wells Course of Study. The committee was given free access to any resources they deemed necessary to conduct a full investigation.

The probe into the Department of Education was welcomed by the politicians in an election year. In the previous months they had just finished scrutinizing the Department of Public Works with an emphasis on efficiency and economy.

However, the normal school did deserve special attention, since it was due to its turmoil that the investigation was begun. The joint committee visited the normal school on April 3, 1913. The visit was a surprise one, and the committee members found the students at an assembly. Wood must have been taken aback by the visit,

because he made the mistake of introducing the committee's chauffeur to his admiring students as a legislator and called on the embarrassed man with the goggles to speak to the assembly.<sup>52</sup> This did little to assure Wood's standing with the joint committee.

The last two weeks of April 1913 were ones of great activity in the normal school and the Territorial Legislature. The committee reported their findings and recommendations on April 24, 1913.<sup>53</sup> The joint committee charged the normal school with exceedingly poor entrance requirements. They stated, "The pupils simply walk into the school irrespective of their previous training and ability to take advantage of the course offered."<sup>54</sup> The committee recommended that no one be accepted into the normal school without proof of at least an eighth-grade education or without having passed an entrance examination. The second point the joint committee criticized was the dual cadet system. This was defined as the practice of having two or more student teachers teaching in one classroom. They believed this system would be abolished, because "the system results in ruining the nerves, to say nothing of the voices of the cadets and pupils."<sup>55</sup> The Committee also could not find the dual cadet system used in any other normal schools and suggested that one cadet teach while the other observed. In regard to Wood, the joint committee simply stated,

The principal of this school, Mr. Wood, has given the Territory many years of service. Your committee recommends that he be given a year's vacation.<sup>56</sup>

The major recommendation of the joint committee and the one that raised the loudest outcry from the teachers, students, and press, had two objectives: economy and Wood's permanent removal from the employ of the Department of Public Instruction. The committee recommended that the normal school be abolished and teacher training become a function of the College of Hawaii.<sup>57</sup>

The major reason given for this recommendation was "to increase efficiency of the College of Hawaii."<sup>58</sup> The proposal included adding a preparatory department to the college where graduates of the eighth grade could be enrolled in a four-year preparatory course, followed by two years in either pedagogy, sugar technology, agriculture, or mechanics.<sup>59</sup> Clearly the College of Hawaii would be beneficiary of this recommendation, with more students, more appropriations, and more power.

Wood did not remain silent. He was quick to answer each and every charge, with one exception, the joining of the normal school with the University. His reply was printed in the Advertiser on April 25, 1913. In relation to the Davis case, he reintroduced his documented side of the story. In regard to the charge of low or nonexistent entrance requirements he wrote,

The examining committee at the Normal School met and examined all candidates for admission to the Normal School, except such as present satisfactory evidence of proper preparation for the work. Graduates of Punahou and the High School are examples of such exceptions.<sup>60</sup>

Wood defended the dual cadet system by stating that it was one of the oldest tried and true methods used to train teachers. He cited the entire country of England as using this method, he referred to the Lancasterian method in use in Pennsylvania, and he assured the Department of Public Instruction that this system was being used at San Francisco Normal School, Cooke County Normal School in Chicago, and Bridgewater Normal School in Massachusetts.<sup>61</sup>

The one issue that Wood did not answer in the newspaper was the proposed amalgamation with the College of Hawaii. He either was leaving that up to his teachers, which was not in character, or he was in some way hoping that if amalgamation did occur and he remained neutral on the point, there would be a position at the college for Edgar Wood. That eventuality was in the future, but the accusations against his administration were immediate and would have to be dispelled.

The disassembling of the normal school, an institution that had been a part of the educational system of Hawaii for eighteen years, was not to be taken lightly. Protest came from every corner, and none so significant as that of the public school teachers themselves.

On April 27, 1913, the teachers called a meeting to protest the recommendations of the committee. The

teachers believed the recommendations inappropriate because they had not been invited to speak during the investigation.

So far as we can learn, the committee consulted with none of the kamaaina teachers in the city. Honolulu had many teachers, graduates of the Normal School, and some who have taken post graduate courses on the mainland, who are well able to tell what is the work of the Normal and to compare it with work of the normals in the educational centers of the Mainland. But we were not asked. The report is unjust, untrue and unwarranted by the facts.<sup>62</sup>

The entire faculty of the normal school went to see Governor Walter Frear. They requested that the Governor give a great deal of thought to amalgamation of the normal school with the College of Hawaii. The result of the meeting was a resolution that read as follows,

We, the teachers of the public schools of Honolulu, do hereby protest against the report of the committee of the legislature on school conditions, as published, which criticizes Superintendent of Schools, Willis T. Pope and Principal Edgar Wood of the Normal School; and we also consider it most unwise to amalgamate the Normal School and the College of Hawaii, as the objects of the two schools are different. We petition, therefore, that there be a public hearing of this protest as soon as possible.<sup>63</sup>

Other concerns were expressed by the public and other schoolmen of Hawaii. There was a legal question of the College of Hawaii being in a position to take on the sub-collegiate work. This would be the case if the College of Hawaii included a preparatory course for pedagogical work. The Enabling Act under which the college operated strictly forbade any such work. President Gilmore of the college

believed this could be rectified by an act of the Territorial Legislature.<sup>64</sup>

Duplication was a concern of some citizens. They believed the high school was already preparing students for the college and that work would only be duplicated by the recommendation.<sup>65</sup>

C. H. Dickey, in a letter to the editor, brought out another concern of the public. He wrote,

The College of Hawaii is not fully under the control of the Territory. It is largely supported and controlled by the federal government. If the change is made and the college does not manage matters for the best in the eye of the territorial government it would have no power to interfere.<sup>66</sup>

Even without considering the many issues that were concerned with amalgamation, the work of the normal school and its principal were still the focus. Many believed that the recommendation for amalgamation was directed at Edgar Wood personally. Editor Matherson stated this issue directly.

It is openly charged that the whole desire on the part of the 'investigators' into the educational system is to, in some way, secure the discharge of Professor Wood. It is believed that they are willing to make the whole department of education, and the College of Hawaii in addition, look foolish provided only enough changes can be made to legislate the Normal School principal out of his position.<sup>67</sup>

Matherson concluded that 'Wood is the victim of a combination of little men and in no way deserving of sacrifice.'<sup>68</sup> A normal school teacher wrote, 'I consider the work that Mr. Wood has accomplished here in the

Normal School marvelous.' This teacher had recently arrived from Boston, the 'hub of the Universe.' She compared the work in Honolulu with that of Boston and believed the Territorial Normal and Training School to be superior.<sup>69</sup> M. M. Scott, long-time educator in Hawaii, added his opinion of the normal school and the investigators, 'The Normal School has prepared more girls of different nationalities to be useful to the community than any other school in the Islands. . . . I believe that it (report) was made without careful consideration and with some degree of sarcasm.'<sup>70</sup>

The joint committee that prepared the report was surprised by the outpouring of objections to their recommendations. They had apparently been led to believe that there was a great deal of support for the dismissal of Wood and termination of the normal school. They had gone too far. Clearly the schoolmen and many leaders of Hawaii were not convinced that the normal school had outlived its usefulness. There was still a need to be filled by the preparation of teachers at the post-elementary school educational level.

The legislators could not withstand the onslaught of opposition to their plan, especially in an election year. They took the easy way out and deferred any action on the amalgamation on the normal school with the College of Hawaii and the principalship of the normal school for two years. The problem was left to a Holdover Committee and

the Governor.<sup>71</sup> In the Governor's report on the investigation, he found no fault to be placed on the normal school or the commissioners for dismissing Davis. The Governor also found no fault with Wood or his administration at the normal school.<sup>72</sup> This was basically a victory for Wood and the normal school, and it was so hailed.

The outcome of the investigation was not entirely rosy for the Department of Public Instruction. The investigation yielded the immediate resignation of Superintendent Pope. Governor Frear in his 'Statement of Results of School Investigation by Governor' felt there had been too much disagreement between factions on the Board of Education and followed a policy of getting a 'fresh start'.<sup>73</sup> Consequently most of the commissioners were not reappointed. One of the commissioners who was not reappointed wrote, 'The Governor finds us all innocent, but fires us all out as a caution not to do it again. Caution not to us . . . but to our successors.'<sup>74</sup> Wood had agreed to the one-year vacation as recommended by the investigative committee and left for New York to study at Teachers' College, at Columbia University, and Etta Davis was not reappointed at the normal school. With the principals of the case dispersed, the turmoil that had begun in 1912 had come to a temporary end. Wood was temporarily replaced at the normal school by Ida Ziegler, a long-time normal school faculty member.

On Wood's return from Columbia in 1914 the department had changed. Pope had been replaced by an interim superintendent, Thomas W. Gibson, who served for only one year. Henry Kinney was appointed Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1914. Kinney came to the office as a newspaper editor. Benjamin Wist said of Kinney,

His mistakes were primarily due to a lack of professional training and experience - typical of what one might expect in business leadership superimposed on an educational system. His accomplishments were within the range of his business experience and ability.<sup>75</sup>

Kinney was a welcome addition to the Department of Public Instruction from a legislator's point of view. As Wist pointed out, "Involved in the selection of Kinney was also a prevailing low price of sugar, which in a manner typical of Hawaii led to a hue and cry for economy."<sup>76</sup> With that in mind Kinney set about to restructure the department. Hawaii was very much in line with the rest of the United States in this emphasis on efficiency.

In the years between 1911 and 1925 educational administrators responded in a variety of ways to demands for more efficient operation of the schools. Before the mania ran its course various "efficiency" procedures were applied to classroom learning and to teachers, to programs of studies, to the organization of the schools, to administrative functions, and to entire school systems.<sup>77</sup>

Kinney's response was to structure the already structured school system even more. To produce better students Kinney set up a series of examinations and standardized grading procedures. His belief that the curriculum should be limited to the simplicity of the three R's surely

brought applause from Copeland and Wells. Kinney wrote to all teachers in the territory his first directive shortly after his appointment,

All pupils in the future, will be promoted according to the results of the term examinations, but teachers will be held responsible for such results in examinations, as the Department will judge the teachers on the basis that all pupils were properly graded at the beginning of the school year.<sup>78</sup>

Kinney wrote to the new Democratic Governor of Hawaii, Lucius Pinkam, on his opinion of the quality of teachers in Hawaii,

If Hawaii possessed a corps of teachers of the ability and independence of thought which would be trusted to use, in all cases, their own judgement and to use the course of study only as a general guide--this is done by some very efficient teachers--then the danger might not be great. However, we have to take conditions as we find them, and many teachers must be held to an outline lest they stray altogether.<sup>79</sup>

Clearly Kinney believed the teachers of Hawaii needed strict guidance in order for them to produce a good product, as did Wood. However, the kind of teachers the normal school produced would not fit well into Kinney's scheme. Teachers who were trained by Wood emphasized vocational education in both ends and means, although highly structured, were not the kind of teachers who would promote the three R's. This was the situation that faced Edgar Wood when he returned from Columbia in May 1914.

Wood had approached the Board of Regents of the College of Hawaii when he returned from Columbia and before he appeared in front of the Board of Education.

During this meeting Wood submitted a plan for the affiliation of the normal school and the college.<sup>80</sup> Wood must have believed that the Board of Regents would be agreeable to the idea of association with the normal school because they had supported the idea of association during 1913 legislative investigation. Wood's proposal was not acted upon, leaving Wood to face the Board of Education without the support of the College of Hawaii.

Wood was summoned to the May meeting of the Board of Education to determine if he would be retained by the board. There was some opposition to Wood's reappointment. Attorney C. W. Ashford appeared before the board to rehash the Davis affair as his reason for not supporting Wood.<sup>81</sup> Kinney's opposition to Wood most likely stemmed from Wood's strict adherence to his five-step method. It was not the structure Kinney objected to, because he believed the teachers of Hawaii required structure. His objection was to subordinating the subject matter to the teaching method used by Wood. Kinney believed that the three R's would be a more efficient means of schooling the diverse ethnic groups of Hawaii. To accomplish this Wood would have to be replaced.

The Commissioners disagreed with Kinney and voted to reappoint Wood as head of the normal school for one year.<sup>82</sup> Kinney did have conditions for Wood's reappointment which were entirely related to the complaints the joint committee had about the normal

school, Kinney's new standards, and Wood's attempt to associate the normal school with the College of Hawaii. When he faced his conditions of reemployment this became perfectly clear. The conditions read,

First. That no one will be admitted to the Normal School, except after having passed the regular eighth grade examinations.

Second. That the Normal School course of study be limited definitely to four years.

Third. That the recommendations contained in the course of study as prepared by the Course of Study Committee and adopted by the Department be followed to the letter and spirit.

Fourth. That the advancement of pupils from one class to another within the Normal School and the graduation therefrom be contingent absolutely upon examinations prepared and carried out under the directions of the Board of Examiners.

Fifth. That the dual cadet system be abolished.<sup>83</sup>

Kinney also insisted on examinations for the cadets before graduation. This was in line with his policy in all the schools of the territory. The passing mark was raised at different times from 70 in all subjects to 75 and finally to 80 for those seeking a diploma rather than a certificate.<sup>84</sup> Wood left the meeting of the board stating 'that he wishes to assure the members of the Board that he wishes to carry out the instruction of the Department.'<sup>85</sup>

As Wood left the chambers of the Commissioner of Education, he knew that the hierarchical system of the oligarchy had saved his position as head of teacher training in Hawaii, a suitable reward for one who had so long supported the system. The power he wielded with the Department of Public Instruction was waning. In fact, the

ultimate power the department had so long enjoyed was also in the balance.

The Davis case had far-reaching effects in the Territory of Hawaii. The altercation between Wood and Davis sparked the flame of reform in Hawaii. Yet the matter could have remained an obscure incident in a provincial school had not other social conditions been right to fan the flames.

In 1909, the Department of Public Instruction had unknowingly set the process into motion that would eventually weaken their total control over the public schools. The money-saving move that eliminated the position of the normal inspectors, who were based in Honolulu, in favor of local supervision by district principals was the first step in the process. Then in 1912 the number of supervising principals was increased along with their powers. What had been seen as an economic move soon proved to be the first step in democratization of the department.

The men who held the office of supervising principal used their new-found positions of power to agitate for change in Hawaii's schools. Their first target was logically the institution that stood as the key to the public school system, the Territorial Normal and Training School. Etta Davis' challenge to Wood's authority at the normal school offered a timely opportunity to achieve their goals.

Supervising principals Copeland and Wells used Etta Davis and her complaints to try to remove Wood from the normal school and install a new common school curriculum. They advocated a curriculum of the three R's as a means of efficiency in education, a trend that was popular on the mainland at the time. Yet the departmental investigation, the legislative investigation, and even the appeal to the Governor did not generate enough power to change the normal school's administration. However, the Davis case did result in Fope's removal as Superintendent of the Public Instruction. He was replaced by Henry Kinney, who was successful in getting the new curriculum installed in the public schools and bringing about superficial changes at the normal school.

Superintendent Kinney himself stood as a symbol of the democratic rumblings that were being heard in the Hawaii of 1915. Kinney's appointment had been the result of a middle-management movement to change the policies of the department, and it had worked. Yet, these policy changes had a chance because the watchword of their campaign was efficiency, which the oligarchy welcomed. The major objective, that of removing Wood, went unrealized because Wood wielded too much power with the department and the teachers he had trained. On the heels of this first attempt to challenge Wood came yet another.

NOTES

CHAPTER FOUR

<sup>1</sup>Raymon Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press: 1962), p. 113.

<sup>2</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1912 (Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd., 1913), p. 26.

<sup>3</sup>Superintendent Pope, Letter to W. Copeland, 31 January 1912 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives).

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 26 January 1912, p. 1, sec. 3, col. 1-7.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., 24 May 1912, p. 1, col. 5.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Edgar Wood, Letter to Superintendent Pope, 10 May 1912 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives).

<sup>15</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 18 July 1913, p. 9, col. 1.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Superintendent Pope, Letter to the Board of Education, September 1912 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives).

<sup>19</sup>T. H. Gibson, Letter to Willis T. Pope, 18 September 1912 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives).

<sup>20</sup>Edgar Wood, Letter to Willis T. Pope, 16 September 1912 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives).

<sup>21</sup>Willis T. Pope, Letter to the Board of Education, September 1912 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives).

<sup>22</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 3 December 1912, p. 5. col. 1-2.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 4 December 1912, p. 10, col. 1.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 3 December 1912, p. 5, col. 2.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., 4 December 1912, p. 10, col. 2.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

<sup>32</sup>Hawaii (Territory). "Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Education, 1895-1931" (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), 6 December 1912, pp. 205-206.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid.

<sup>35</sup>Edgar Wood, Letter to Willis T. Pope, 20 October 1912 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), p. 1.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

- 41Ibid.
- 42Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 26 April 1913, p. 2.
- 43Ibid.
- 44Ibid.
- 45Ibid., 24 March 1913, p. 4, col. 3.
- 46Ibid.
- 47Ibid.
- 48Ibid., 24 April 1913, p. 1, col. 4.
- 49Ibid., 21 March 1913, p. 9, col. 6.
- 50Ibid.
- 51Ibid.
- 52Ibid., 4 April 1913, p. 5, col. 2.
- 53Ibid., 25 April 1913, p. 9, col. 2-3.
- 54Ibid.
- 55Ibid.
- 56Ibid.
- 57Ibid.
- 58Ibid.
- 59Ibid.
- 60Ibid., 26 April 1913, p. 2, col. 4.
- 61Ibid.
- 62Ibid., 26 April 1913, p. 1, col. 1-2.
- 63Ibid., 27 April 1913, p. 7.
- 64Ibid., 25 April 1913, p. 11.
- 65Ibid., 24 April 1913, p. 4, col. 1.
- 66Ibid., 26 April 1913, p. 4.
- 67Pacific Commercial Advertiser, ed. Matherson,  
24 April 1913, p. 4, col. 1.

68Ibid.

69Ibid.

70Ibid.

71Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 29 April 1913,  
p. 1, col. 2-3.

72Walter Frear, "Statement of Results of School  
Investigation by Governor," Hawaiian Pacific Collection,  
1913 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), p. 5.

73Ibid.

74Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 18 July 1913, p. 1,  
col. 1.

75Benjamin Wist, A Century of Public Education in  
Hawaii (Honolulu: Hawaii Education Review, 1941), p. 152.

76Ibid., p. 154.

77Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of  
Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962),  
p. 95.

78Henry W. Kinney, Letter "To the Teachers of the  
Department of Public Instruction," September 1914  
(Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), p. 1.

79Henry W. Kinney, Letter to Governor Lucius Pinkham,  
27 March 1914 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), p. 6.

80Hawaii (Territory), "Minutes of the Meeting of the  
Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii, 1907-1931"  
(Honolulu: University of Hawaii Office of Regents), April  
1914, p. 2.

81Hawaii, "Minutes of the Board of Education," 27 May  
1914, p. 280.

82Ibid.

83Ibid.

84Ruth Shaw, "The Output of the Territorial Normal  
and Training School," Thesis, University of Hawaii, 1929,  
p. 9.

85Hawaii, "Minutes of Board of Education," 27 May  
1914, p. 281.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### PROGRESSIVE REFORM, THE 1920 SURVEY, AND THE TERRITORIAL NORMAL AND TRAINING SCHOOL 1918-1921

Some seeds of progressive education had been planted in Hawaii by Henry Townsend in the 1890's. But as late as 1918 progressive leadership in the Department of Public Instruction was minimal. Superintendent Kinney's administration had accommodated to the wave of efficiency in education, the public school curriculum had been reduced to the barest of fundamentals, and formalism was widespread. No sooner had the curriculum of the three R's been established in the public school when rumblings of progressive reform were heard again.

Progressive reform in Hawaii, as in the United States, was a 'humanitarian effort to apply the promise of American life - the ideal government by, of, and for the people.'<sup>1</sup> The function of the school in the progressive sense was to prepare the future citizen to partake in all realms of social, economic and political life through the uses of science, organization for problem solving and economic incentives.

The progressive movement began in Hawaii, as in the United States, as a response, not to economic depression, but to economic well being (at least for a great many).

Richard Hofstadter defines the progressive movement as follows:

an attempt to develop the moral will, the intellectual insight, and the political and administrative agencies to remedy the accumulated evils and negligences of a period of economic growth.<sup>2</sup>

Strong economic growth and centralization of that growth can readily be seen in Hawaii between 1900 and 1920. The incorporation of Hawaii's sugar industry, by 1900, enabled the Big Five to control 75 percent of the sugar crop by 1910, which in turn produced the opportunity to control banking, insurance, utilities, wholesale and retail merchandising, railroad transportation and all shipping. The control of the Big Five was not distributed throughout the population of Hawaii but was held by an interlocking family structure of descendants of the New England missionaries.<sup>3</sup>

Incorporation of the sugar plantations resulted in a wider gap between the labor that supplied the wealth and those that controlled it.

The earlier intimacy between management and labor has, necessarily, disappeared. Lines of economic and social stratification are more rigorously drawn, and the gulf between the great masses of non-caucasian laborers and the small community of managers and lunas become more difficult to bridge.<sup>4</sup>

Life on the plantations, particularly between the years 1900 and 1920, was an oasis for the managerial class only. "(T)he managers felt a sense of grandeur, of superiority, and were immune to criticism."<sup>5</sup> Treatment of the laborers

below them was exceedingly harsh. One laborer's child reported, ". . . the lunas were mean to the people, hitting them with a whip like slaves in Washington's time."<sup>6</sup>

The resident proprietor of an earlier time had "retained the atmosphere of kindly paternalism to a higher degree."<sup>7</sup> However, the circumstances had changed. Imported Asians had replaced the native Hawaiians in the fields and managers had replaced the resident owner.

The corporate owners of the sugar plantations reinforced such treatment of Oriental laborers when it meant increased production. In 1910, one haole leader believed, "the Asiatics in Hawaii had no more impact on the institutions and customs of the Islands than did the cattle on the ranges."<sup>8</sup> Five years later a federal government representative observed that "haole leaders thought of the Japanese, Chinese, and Korean primarily as instruments of production."<sup>9</sup>

The sugar industrialist relied exclusively on imported labor as "instruments of production." Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Filipinos were imported by the thousands to work the cane fields in Hawaii. With what must have seemed to the oligarchy a never-ending supply of cheap labor, the planters consequently cared little for the education or the well-being of their workers. The following letter from an anonymous "Employer" illustrated their attitude,

Do I care how my horse lives, how my ox lives, how my dog lives? Indeed I do! My horse is a thoroughbred and my dog is of high pedigree; they cost me considerable money and I keep a groom to take care of them. But as for my employees (sic) if they fall sick or die it is none of my concern; I can get plenty of others without any delay. . . . Of course, I understand that all this may not be just right: in fact, I have the deepest sympathy for the lower classes, and I let no occasion pass by without expressing it, and contributing considerable every year to charities, but I can not allow sentimentality to interfere with my business because if I would I should find myself very soon driven to the wall by my abler competitors.<sup>10</sup>

'Employer' also wrote that education of the lower classes was worse than useless because it 'unfitted' them to work the plantations. 'Employer' believed that teachers and their work yielded no returns and that any amount of pay was too much for such a useless pursuit.

Yet, the Hawaii that supported 'Employer's' views was changing. With annexation came the closing of China as a source of cheap labor. Even though the Japanese took up the slack, by 1907, the influx of Japanese laborers was curtailed by the 'Gentleman's Agreement.' Other sources of cheap labor were found in Korea and the Philippines, but more and more Hawaii's oligarchy began to realize their need to cultivate a domestic labor force. Hawaii was entering a new age where a disposable work force was no longer a luxury. If a permanent work force were to be cultivated in Hawaii, a new approach to labor and the training or the education of that labor had to be broached.

The population of the Islands was also changing. In 1895, President Dole had said, "Asiatic immigration is mainly of a transitory character, experience showing that it cannot be relied on for permanent population."<sup>11</sup> Yet by 1920, the Japanese-American population alone constituted 42.7 percent of the stable population of Hawaii. Other ethnic groups, such as Chinese, Filipinos, and Puerto Ricans, were also choosing to make Hawaii their permanent home.

The contract laborers were leaving the plantations but not Hawaii, as soon as their contracts would allow them. The Chinese, the first immigrant group, left the plantations for the city. In Honolulu, as early as 1889, the Chinese monopolized the restaurant and butchering businesses.<sup>12</sup> They also increased their land holdings by fivefold between the years 1900 and 1930.<sup>13</sup> The Portuguese doubled their holdings during the same time.<sup>14</sup> The Japanese operated 49 percent of the retail stores in the Islands. They also constituted the majority of skilled and semi-skilled labor.<sup>15</sup> The teachers from the mainland, as well as the Territorial Normal School graduates, were also aspiring to middle-class wages and opportunities.

This rising middle-class was beginning to realize political gains as well. The Oriental laborers had been denied voting rights in 1900, at annexation, but their children, born in Hawaii, were not. Many were coming of

age. In 1920, only 4.3 percent of the Chinese population in Hawaii were registered to vote. In 1927, the number had doubled.<sup>16</sup> The Japanese-Americans had comprised only 3 percent of the registered voters in 1920. Their numbers grew to 8 percent of the vote in 1926 and 25 percent of the vote by 1936.<sup>17</sup>

The increasing numbers of foreign laborers who were creating a middle class in Hawaii needed more than training in the public schools--they needed education. In the eyes of the progressive reformers the three R's curriculum would not transform these varied ethnic groups into American citizens or a local work force. The emerging Hawaii would need an educational policy that would involve the varied ethnic groups in the democratic process. Exclusion of these groups would mean a serious threat to the Americanization of Hawaii. Education was the answer for many reformers, but not the formalized schooling that was being offered in Hawaii's public schools. The republican education of the eighteenth century would have to give way to a more democratic one. According to historian, R. F. Butts, schooling for all meant one thing, education for all meant another.

Whereas the republican ideal had been to provide some education for all and much education for a few, the democratic goal was to provide as much education as possible for all. . . . education must be made available to all, to the poor as well as to the rich. . . . to immigrants as well as to native-born. . . .<sup>18</sup>

For the reformer's of Hawaii's school, education would come to mean teaching the children of all groups how to partake in all realms of social, economic, and political life of the Islands. The children of the rising generations would have to be prepared for their new role in the already existing school structure. To accomplish these goals the school curriculum would have to be broadened to include not only the three R's, but also instruction to vocation, health, citizenship and family life. The classrooms would have to become the forum for individuality rather than mass instruction, co-operation rather than competition, and problem solving rather than memorization.

The attitude of the reformers was best expressed by Mrs. McNaught, Commissioner of Elementary Education in Hawaii, in her article for the Hawaiian Educational Review.

Americanization means patriotism, not jingoism; service, not conquest; sympathy, not pride; equality, not dominance; democracy, not anarchy; humanity, not intolerance; not hatred to any, but love to all.<sup>19</sup>

These attitudes were shared by a growing number of educators and reform-minded women of the middle and upper classes. The medium through which these ideas spread throughout the Islands was ladies' clubs and, inadvertently, the Department of Public Instruction.

The department aided the spread of progressive ideas through its hiring practices. Mainland-educated teachers

were hired for almost all high school positions and as many elementary positions as were needed after the normal school graduates were placed. The department reserved teaching positions on Oahu and particularly in Honolulu as rewards either for longevity or political favors.<sup>20</sup> Therefore the majority of mainland-educated teachers were placed immediately on the outer islands. These new educators, most likely imbued with the philosophy of John Dewey from mainland normal schools, colleges, and universities, set out to do their work of educating the various ethnic groups in the spirit of cooperation and democracy. Outstanding progressive educational leaders like Benjamin Wist and Miles Carey are two such examples. Both of these men served the cause of progressive education on the Island of Maui before taking their places as school principals on Oahu.

The reform movement also attracted many women of Hawaii's elite. Mrs. Henry Baldwin, wife of the most powerful man on Maui and missionary descendant herself, was a shining example of the new educational reform role of women in the Islands. She was instrumental in convincing her husband to extend schooling to the high school level on Maui. Mrs. Baldwin also established the "Baldwin House" at Lahaina, Maui, which offered such free educational services as kindergartens, night schools, a circulating library, and language schools.<sup>21</sup> The Baldwin House might well be called the sequel to progressive

educator and social worker, Jane Addams' Hull House in Chicago's inner city.

On Oahu, women's clubs worked for free kindergartens, playgrounds, health education, and other educational aids to enhance the lives of the new Americans whose parents were of foreign birth. The most active of these was the Honolulu College Club.

The College Club was formed in 1905. Mrs. Walter Frear, president of the club, missionary descendant, and wife of the soon to be Governor Frear, explained that the Club was to be opened to any woman who had attended an English or American college/University. Restricting membership to college graduates gave great insight into the intellectual and social make up of its members. First, mainland college education came only to members of the elite families of Hawaii. Second, one could conclude that these women were abreast of the progressive literature of the time on the mainland and Europe.

The literature of the time was directed at exposing social ills and rallying support of the more fortunate into action to cure them. Jane Addams' Philosophy and Social Progress, (1893), is one such example. Addams wrote about the well-brought-up and sheltered young Americans of her generation.

Reared in the ideal of social injustice and on Protestant moral imperatives, (and) had grown uncomfortable about their own sincerity, troubled about their usefulness, and restless about being "shut off" from common labor by which they live. . . .<sup>22</sup>

Rheta Childe Dorr's article entitled 'On the Role of American Women,' asserted that,

The modern thinking, planning, selfgoverning, educated woman came into a world which is losing faith in the commercial ideal, and is endeavoring to substitute in its place a social ideal. She came into a generation which is reaching passionate hands towards democracy.<sup>23</sup>

Lewis E. MacBrayne's, 'The Promised Land' described his heroine as 'a woman of superior education and wide social experience, and, like many other American women of similar qualifications, had that tireless energy that could not be satisfied with remaining a passive spectator to the progressive life around her.'<sup>24</sup> Magazines of the time, such as McClure's, bombarded the American female population with article after article of social injustice and 'grave sins of which our nation is guilty.'<sup>25</sup>

The idea that the wealthy, educated, and social-minded were in some way responsible for the injustices of a nation would have had to appeal to the granddaughters and great-granddaughters of the New England missionaries to Hawaii. The paternalism and sense of duty to the Islands was the mainstay of their heritage. Yet, the practice of their responsibilities had been sharply curtailed by the growing distance between the laboring masses of Hawaii and the elite. This void could be filled by combining their sense of duty with their historical influence within the realm of education.

During the first two decades, following annexation, the powerful men of the haole community had more important things than education to concern them, and often the 'do-gooders,' sometimes women missionary descendants, were appointed school commissioners. For the most part, education was left to the commissioners and professional educators. Encouraging the oligarchy's neglect of the schools was the fact teachers did not cost much.<sup>26</sup>

The main purpose of the club was originally to raise money to fight tuberculosis. In 1909 their campaign against tuberculosis brought them in contact with the normal school. Lectures were given at the normal on tuberculosis because the members realized that 'these young people going out to all parts of these Islands will form new centers from which this crusade will spread.'<sup>27</sup> The College Club expanded their activities to educational pursuits. They formed lecture groups and gave college scholarships to young Island girls, and the club established an experimental school at Kaulani for vocational education.<sup>28</sup>

It was their interest in island education, their own education, their close association with the normal school, and their missionary reform zeal that prompted them into action to reform Hawaiian Territorial education, especially teacher training.

The College Club saw the normal school and Edgar Wood, in particular, as perpetuating the deadening formal methods that engulfed the public schools. If reform of the schools were to be successful, the normal school would

have to be changed. However, Edgar Wood had successfully blocked change at the normal school for more than eighteen years and the leadership in the Department of Public Instruction had constantly upheld Wood's principalship. All grass roots attempts at change had been thwarted. It was clear that an authority that superseded Wood, the Department of Public Instruction, and even the Governor would be needed to bring change to the normal school. To this end the women of the College Club wrote a letter to Democratic Governor Pinkham, the Superintendent of Public Instruction Kinney, and the Commissioners of Public Instruction in 1916 requesting a Federal survey of Hawaii's schools. The major thrust of their letter was as follows,

The College Club makes no plea for cultured amateurs in primary, grammar or high school; but for young Islanders, who have added professional training to their high school diploma and college degree, this Club now speaks. At present they are rated by the Department as inferior to the graduates of the local Normal school; they lose their status as Islanders and are subjected to conditions reserved for "Malahinis"; neither in salary or in other conditions of employment, are they on an equality with locally trained graduates; their high school, college and higher professional work are not assets, but stand against them.<sup>29</sup>

They were essentially charging the Department of Public Instruction with inbreeding, the practice of overhiring within the school system. Their charge of inbreeding can mainly be seen as an avenue for requesting a Federal survey. Inbreeding itself could not have been a

major problem, even though Wood and the department had gone on record as favoring the "home product", because first, there were always teacher shortages and employment was available, and second, by 1916, the normal school had only graduated 509 teachers<sup>30</sup> and the average length of service was only 3.47 years.<sup>31</sup>

There was such a teacher shortage in Hawaii in 1916-17 that Superintendent Kinney tried desperate ways to attract mainland teachers to fill the vacancies. In August 1917, the Advertiser reported that Kinney had hired a young man named Phil Danky as official greeter at the piers for prospective teachers. Kinney believed Danky had the qualities needed to attract new teachers.

First impressions are always lasting. With a man of Danky's fine physique meeting the young women on the threshold of Hawaii, I feel fully satisfied they will immediately make up their minds to take their chances in the Islands.<sup>32</sup>

Again in 1918, Danky was hired, but this time he was sent to California to recruit normal school students to fill vacancies in Hawaii's classrooms. Despite these facts, on paper the charge of inbreeding might be a sound reason for requesting a survey of the schools.

The women of the College Club thought the charge of inbreeding was a viable avenue to request a Federal survey because these were exactly the charges the Federal government had brought against city normal schools and city systems in its publication entitled "City Training School for Teachers." This U. S. Bureau of Education

Bulletin was published in 1914. Contained in this bulletin were many examples of educators on the mainland criticizing the well-established practice of inbreeding teachers. The following letter from the Superintendent of Newark's schools is amazingly similar to the letter written by the College Club.

I have always regarded the rule adopted by the board many years ago, that preference in appointment, whatever the relative excellence of candidates, must be given to local graduates, as not in the interest of the school system. Under this rule a candidate, say, from Montclair State Normal School, although a resident of the city of Newark, cannot be appointed until the eligible list of local normal-school graduates had been completely exhausted. By what line of reasoning--social, moral, or economic--such preference can be justified. . . . Education in the United States has made its greatest strides when free interchange of teachers had been encouraged by a liberal and enlightened policy on the part of the boards of education. Inbreeding, to use a term derived from biology, has been and is today the bane and blight of a great many school systems in this country.<sup>33</sup>

The report goes on to cite many other superintendents and schoolmen who agreed with the Newark opinion. This report's findings were published in the Advertiser on March 19, 1915. The article was entitled "Outside Teachers are School Need." The report said, "A city may easily have too much 'home talent' in its teaching force."<sup>34</sup> It is more than likely that the women of the College Club were aware of this Federal report.

In the minds of the women of the College Club, they had uncovered a practice at the normal school that Wood could not defend as being in the mainstream of educational

practices on the mainland. It was a viable complaint that would justify a survey of the schools.

The request on the part of the College Club for surveying the school system was also in keeping with the times. In conjunction with the wave of efficiency that was hitting the school systems of the nation, the survey would do much to hasten improvements in schools. Raymond Callahan writes, "In the years between 1911 and 1925 hundreds of surveys of schools were made--so many, in fact, that it seems there was hardly a state or local school system in America which was not surveyed."<sup>35</sup> Many of the surveys throughout the country were initiated by citizen groups who were dissatisfied with their local system, much like the College Club.

The College Club was continuing the crusade which began in Hawaii in 1912 to change the policies of the Department of Public Instruction in regard to teacher training. However, the College Club took a different approach to the problem. It was an approach they believed would be more successful than other avenues of change that had been attempted in the past.

The idea of a school survey was met with little enthusiasm by Democratic Governor Pinkam and Superintendent Kinney. The Governor believed the motivation for the College Club was less to improve the schools than to undermine his administration. He violently opposed the legislative appropriation for the survey and did his best

to stop it. In building his case he asked Superintendent Kinney to prepare a list of the College Club women and to find out where their children were attending school.

Kinney reported to the Governor, by letter, on December 21, 1916, that none of the children of the signers of the College Club letter attended public schools. All who had children had them enrolled at Punahou. The Governor believed that the ladies behind the letter were agents for,

an influential person, whose ambition to become Commissioner of Public Instruction remained unfulfilled, and some principals who found that certain rules of the department did not suit their individual fancies, as well as a number of persons for whose idle hand nothing better is usually found to do than that of "starting something".<sup>36</sup>

Kinney agreed with the Governor.

The attitude of those back of this letter was decidedly antagonistic, the methods of campaign polemic, and they openly expressed their intention to force the survey down the department's throat, whether the administration and the department wanted it or not.<sup>37</sup>

Although the money was appropriated for it in 1917, the survey did not begin until 1919. By 1918 inquiries were being made as to why the survey was being delayed. Kauai teachers queried, "We would respectfully inquire whether there is still any chance of this promise being redeemed, or was it only a political sop to pacify an insistent public for the time being?"<sup>38</sup> The survey was being delayed due to Pinkham's total objection and political reactive maneuvering. However, by 1918

Superintendent Kinney began to believe that a survey would, in fact, be beneficial to the administration. Kinney wrote a letter to the Governor in January 1918 marked "PERSONAL". In this letter Kinney put his case forward on the merits of a survey. He believed that the College Club action was based "upon the erroneous belief that a school survey partakes of a Grand Jury investigation, and in ignorance of the fact that surveys are of a constructive rather than a destructive nature."<sup>39</sup> On this point, Kinney believed that the survey could well be useful to the department.

I am satisfied, as are other officers in charge of this department, that the conditions prevailing in the department are such that a survey report will be a thing to look forward to and not to fear, and that it may, among other results, have the effect that those who criticized the department, largely on the account of their ignorance of conditions, may be assured by an authority which they will recognize, that the affairs of the department are a credit to the Territory rather than otherwise.<sup>40</sup>

Kinney did make one stipulation to his predictions. The survey might serve the administration well,

provided the survey is conducted by practical schoolmen with actual and practical Normal School training and with actual professional teaching experience in schools on the Mainland. I am, at the same time, thoroughly convinced that if the survey is placed in the hands of theoretical enthusiasts of the type with which we have, unfortunately, been made familiar by one or two specimens from the College of Hawaii staff, the survey may result in no good.<sup>41</sup>

This reversal in opinion of surveys seems also to be in step with the times. The sentiment for the superintendent

of schools to initiate or at least not oppose a survey was put well by Calvin N. Kendall, Commissioner of Education in New Jersey, and speaker at a meeting of school superintendents.

It was possible . . . that the results of the surveys could be more helpful to schoolmen and he cited the Baltimore survey as an example of a case in which the facts indicated that more money needed to be spent on the schools. . . . The superintendent. . . could take the initiative in arranging for a survey. By doing this he could beat his critics to the punch, for, obviously it is a much wiser course for him (superintendent) to take the initiative than to have it taken by hostile influences in the community.<sup>42</sup>

For Kinney, the decision for supporting the survey came too late. War conditions delayed the survey until both Kinney and Pinkham had been replaced. President Wilson replaced Pinkham with Charles McCarthy in 1918. Governor McCarthy bowed to rising opposition from the teachers and reformers to the strictly business practices of the Kinney administration and appointed Vaughn MacCaughey, College of Hawaii faculty member, as Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1919.

MacCaughey had come to the Islands originally to teach natural sciences at the Territorial Normal and Training School under Edgar Wood. MacCaughey had also graduated from Cornell University with a degree in science. He taught at the normal school for two years and then he was hired by the College of Hawaii in 1910 to teach botany and horticulture. MacCaughey left the

Islands for one year in 1915 to do graduate work at the University of Chicago. At Chicago MacCaughey came in close contact with the Progressive Education movement. Upon his return he continued in the employ of the College of Hawaii as Professor of Botany. In 1919 he was appointed Superintendent of Public Instruction.<sup>43</sup>

MacCaughey's appointment was extremely important to progressive reform in Hawaii. The centralized structure of the educational system in Hawaii lent itself to wielding change at a rapid rate. Once MacCaughey ascended to this leadership position the progressive reform movement that was building on Oahu and especially on the outer islands had a greater chance of success.

Superintendent MacCaughey's first task was to improve the position of the teachers in Hawaii. The efficiency movement, led by Kinney, had reduced the profession of teaching to an assembly line method. Superintendent Vaughn MacCaughey set out to do what he could to enhance the position of the teacher in Hawaii. He did away with most of the strict rules and examinations that had been the plague of the Kinney administration. He promoted a new course of study and worked to have teachers' pay increased.<sup>44</sup> MacCaughey did much to bring about the Federal survey of which he was totally in favor. MacCaughey believed that a survey would hasten the changes so desperately needed. The normal school was also one of his first concerns.

MacCaughey had firsthand knowledge of the normal school after being a member of the faculty for two years. He was a staunch opponent of the methods Wood employed at the school. Speaking to a group of teachers in April 1919, MacCaughey expressed his concerns.

The opinion seems to be fairly general throughout the Territory that the Normal School is in need of some radical changes, particularly along the lines of relieving the teachers and cadets from the ceaseless outlines of petty drudgery. . . . The coming of the Federal Survey Staff next fall will afford an unusually satisfactory opportunity to reorganize the Normal School.<sup>45</sup>

By June that year the Advertiser was whipping up support for the reorganization of the normal school. The Advertiser requested its readers to answer this question: "What's Wrong with Our Public School System?" Many letters came pouring in with many pointing to the same problem: poorly trained teachers and too many non-English speakers. One letter to the editor complained, "'How can we American-ize the children of Hawaii', said a school teacher indignantly to me, 'when we have so many teachers who cannot speak or write English correctly or intelligently?'"<sup>46</sup> This writer continued his report,

"That is a sample of what the normal school is turning out," remarked my teacher friend, "If you can draw and sing you are a sure graduate. Nobody gets flunked there because the teachers are blamed by the principal for flunked students and of course they don't flunk many".<sup>47</sup>

A taxpayer wrote, "Students at the Normal are not American in speech or ideas. Since the teachers' pay is raised the taxpayer expects more."<sup>48</sup> Another critic of the schools believed, "the serious fault of our public school system is a heavy percentage of Oriental teachers."<sup>49</sup> Another writer claimed, "It would occupy the entire sheets of The Advertiser to point out half the defects of the Normal School and of the administration."<sup>50</sup>

In April 1919, the strongest and most damaging article appeared in the Advertiser. The source was again from the island of Maui. A Maui teacher responding to the question "What's wrong with Hawaii's public Schools?" wrote,

In my humble opinion the weakest link in our educational chain is the Normal School. I think that other school principals will agree that the average graduate of the Territorial Normal School had to unlearn much of the rubbish she has been taught before she can make much of a success as a teacher. So much of the cadet's time is spent in writing lengthy plans on the style of, "I shall next ring the bell. Then I shall say to the children, etc., etc.," and memorizing selected sentences, and so little time spent in broadening education that will fit her for the work that justifies the name teacher-Americanizer of our children.<sup>51</sup>

In July Superintendent MacCaughey wrote his own article and entitled it "What's Right with Hawaii's Public Schools." In his article MacCaughey cited the decrease in class size, the increase in the school year and teachers' salaries, and the new buildings being erected, but said nothing of the quality of the teaching corps.<sup>52</sup> To top

off the summer of criticism against the normal school, only five prospective teachers passed the teachers' examination at the Summer School session of 1919, out of the 150 who took the test.<sup>53</sup>

In November the editor of the Advertiser portrayed the situation bluntly.

Superintendent MacCaughey talks about democracy in the public schools, but there can be no democracy, no progress and no originality as long as the schools are dominated by a little hui of fossils who look upon our public school system as their meal ticket and who vigorously oppose any change for fear it may expose their own incompetence and ignorance of modern methods.

It is because of the dominance of this hui that we have, for instance, teachers in the Normal School who can't speak English correctly, who say "childrens" for children, "dat" for that, and make similar errors and teach the embryo teachers to make them. It is because of the oligarchy that the public school system has been falling behind and the superintendent is meeting with such obscure opposition in his efforts to improve it.<sup>54</sup>

Edgar Wood did not remain silent to the attacks on the normal school. In an article to the Advertiser and letters to Superintendent MacCaughey, Wood defended himself and his methods as the best means to Americanize the students at the normal school. In fact, he thought he was doing a remarkable job with the material he had to work with.<sup>55</sup> In the mind of Wood the problem in the public schools lay, as always, outside the walls of the normal school, in the society, family life, and even the church. The language problem, for Wood, "is only part of the great problem of the schools, the problem of

Americanizing the boys and girls found in our schools. . . . We must train them to live as Americans.<sup>56</sup> However, Wood did respond to the charge of inadequate English skills at the normal by initiating a 'war against Pidgin English' at the normal in the fall of 1919.<sup>57</sup> It was the very fall of the survey team's arrival.

The survey team consisted of Dr. Frank E. Bunker, specialist in city school administration of the Bureau of Education, Dean William W. Kemp of the School of Education, University of California, Dr. Parke R. Kolbe, President of Akron Municipal University, and Dr. George Twiss of Ohio State University, and an expert on private schools.<sup>58</sup> It is important to note that no one on the survey team represented the normal school.

The survey consisted of interviews, observations, and questionnaires with teachers, principals, supervising principals, students, and the superintendent. The survey team traveled to some outer islands as well as studying schools on Oahu.

The surveyors' final recommendations related to foreign language schools, secondary schooling, vocational education, higher education, organizational aspects of Hawaii's schools, private schools, and, of course, the Territorial Normal and Training School.

The majority of the criticisms made by the surveyors about teacher training were directed toward Wood and his methods at the normal school. First, the commission felt

the standards for admission were too low. Second, lack of articulation between the normal teachers and the training department affected the instruction at the school. Third, the cadet teachers were introduced too early into practice teaching. Fourth, the commissioners confirmed what others had been saying for years, that there was an overabundance of routine work that did not contribute to the proper training of teachers.<sup>59</sup>

The survey commission recommended a reorganization of the normal school to make the recommended changes. The commissioners felt this could only happen if Wood were removed. The commissioners saw the machinery of administration as a major obstacle to change.

(1) That the machinery of administration is defeating the very aims which the normal school has set for itself; (2) that this machinery has prevented both the school and the faculty from reaching a satisfactory efficiency in the training of local teachers; and (3) that radical changes in the organization and administration of the institution should be effected.<sup>60</sup>

To the commission and many critics of the normal school, Edgar Wood had outlived his usefulness as head of teacher training in Hawaii. But Edgar Wood did not agree. Wood, as he had done in the past, gathered his resources and prepared to defend himself once more. Wood wrote to the Governor defending himself and his methods,

These recommendations strike at the very roots not only of the organization and the administration of the Normal School, but at the very heart of the school system throughout the islands. . . . The three vital recommendations of the report that strike at the island trained

teachers and consequently at the very heart of our educational system are:

I. That the preparation of a teacher be four years of high school and two years of normal work.

II. That the colloquial English work, or the special classes in oral English be abolished.

III. That phonics be used as an introductory approach to reading.<sup>61</sup>

It was the first recommendation Wood opposed the most. Wood saw requiring a high school diploma for entrance into the normal school as disastrous for the Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian. As Wood had believed from the beginning, the Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians were natural teachers because of their superior social abilities. Yet according to Wood, the Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian student lacked abstract intelligence needed to succeed in the high school.

. . . Relatively few Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians graduate from the High Schools and only one a year on the average come to the Normal. The reasons for this are partly economic and partly inherent. The Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian is often financially unable to go to high school but the inherent reasons are most important. The high schools are organized for the pupil of strong abstract intelligence, a useful factor in making a good teacher but not a vital one. The Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian, strong in social intelligence, are eliminated from the school in which abstract intelligence is chiefly emphasized.<sup>62</sup>

Speaking to the Civics Club, Wood reemphasized his stance on the Hawaiian teacher.

When agitation for change in the Normal Policy first began about six years ago, I was forced to change the policy of the school (requiring an eighth-grade diploma for entrance) due to the influence of a small group of people who were looking to control the

schools. I protested, but in vain. The ruling was enforced and we lost 15 percent of our Hawaiian students in three years.<sup>63</sup>

Although Wood had proclaimed the superiority of the Hawaiian race as teachers, some people, including long-time educator M. M. Scott, charged that he favored the Hawaiians because they had not attended high school. In an editorial by Edward Irwin, M. M. Scott was reported as saying Wood had always discriminated against high school graduates.<sup>64</sup>

The second recommendation, that of abolishing the oral English classes, was also opposed by Wood on the ground that many island teachers would be lost to the schools. He wrote, "Abolish this and many desirable island teachers would fail oral English or be relegated to poorer and poorer positions. They are entitled to help and the school should give it."<sup>65</sup> There were good teachers to be cultivated in the Islands, particularly Hawaiians, but according to Wood they needed extra help on a sub-collegiate level.

The introduction of phonics in Hawaii's public schools was almost a laughable matter to Wood. He so strongly believed in his methods in teaching reading based on his own five-step method for the mixed population of Hawaii that he could not even consider an alternative, even in the face of much criticism.

He used the commissioners' recommendation of a phonic system to prove how out of touch the commissioners were in

the realities of Hawaiian life and education. Wood condemned them as follows,

Thus the folly of the advocates of phonics as an introductory approach to reading is apparent. They say "Let the child work out the printed word from his knowledge of the spoken word." But there is no spoken work in 97 or 98% of the beginners in our public schools. The children must learn to talk English before they can be taught to read English. The thought must precede the symbol.<sup>66</sup>

Wood did not stop here. As to the continued criticism of the lengthy lesson plans required of the cadet teacher, Wood believed that the surveyors simply did not understand the type of young person that attended the Territorial Normal and Training School. According to Wood, the average Normal cadet was not American in thought or practice, and, lacking the educational and cultural background of a mainland normal school student, the Hawaiian normal student had to be carefully supervised in lesson plans and execution. Wood defended the process of lesson plan construction by citing the lack of ability of the students and professional concerns.

To protect the cadet teacher and the pupils . . . the teachers in the grades and head of the departments in the Normal School, in consultation with myself, have worked out the model plan. . . . This plan is the consensus (sic) of opinion of the best teachers of the school collected over a number of years.<sup>67</sup>

The recommendations on the Federal Survey had clearly threatened Wood's methods and total control of teacher training. Wood struggled to maintain a strictly sub-collegiate school where his methods reigned supreme, even

in the face of growing support for change, because he knew that once the normal school was subject to outside forces, he would lose his absolute authority. Although he justified the status quo of the normal school as beneficial to the Hawaiian race and Hawaii, he ultimately feared loss of control to the very people he had so long deemed inferior to himself and the Anglo-Saxon heritage.

True to his attitude and actions during and following the legislative investigation of 1913, Wood did not assume any blame for conditions in the schools and refused to make any changes at the normal unless forced to do so by the Department of Public Instruction. Wood continued to use Columbia's acceptance of normal graduates, as well as to cite educational authorities that had supposedly put their stamp of approval on the normal school, as his major defenses. However, these arguments were getting old and wearing thin.

With his position threatened at the normal school, Wood was forced to turn to local support from those who held views similar to his and to the Hawaiians whose interest he supposedly was fighting to advance. Letters were written for him by Bishop Henry Restarick, Charles Baldwin, and Nina Frazer, Principal of Kaiulani School. Personal appearances before the board in favor of Wood included former Governor Carter, Theodore Richards of the Kamehameha Schools, and Reverend Erdman of the Hawaiian Board of Missions, and Mrs. Emerson and Mrs. Clark.

Commissioners Wilcox, Woods, and Blackman all spoke well of Wood.<sup>68</sup>

Wood hoped to dispel any rumors that there was dissent among the faculty members of the normal school. To this end the entire faculty of the normal signed a letter to the editor of the Advertiser entitled "Criticisms Criticized." The letter read in part, "We recognize Mr. Wood's plan as broad, his vision as progressive, and his work as constructive, though hampered by much unjust criticism, misunderstanding, and lack of financial support."<sup>69</sup> A cloud of doubt hung over the letter when the editor added,

But it is only fair to say that some of those who signed it have been among the bitterest critics of the administration of the Normal School. It is impossible that they did not care to take the risk of incurring executive disfavor by declining to sign the letter when it was presented for their signature.<sup>70</sup>

Dr. Kemp, one of the surveyors, wrote to superintendent MacCaughy on the subject of the letter signed by the teachers. Kemp remarked,

I am surprised by the number of women who have signed the white-wash statement of Mr. Wood, since so many of them were very open in their criticism of him, and very positive in their belief that his administration was a handicap to the institution.<sup>71</sup>

Added to this the Advertiser reported that,

during the executive session (of the Board) a letter was sent to The Advertiser by teachers of the school asking if those having opposing views would be permitted to have time off from school to appear before the board of commissioners. However, no action was taken.<sup>72</sup>

Clearly the full and honest view of the faculty of the normal school was not presented to the board or anyone else for that matter. Wood's comment to the Governor that "the morale of both teachers and pupils have always been good. I believe that 99% of both are unquestionably loyal and always have been,"<sup>73</sup> was questionable.

The Commissioners of Education were forced, in the summer of 1920, to decide if Wood would be remaining at the normal school. An informal hearing was scheduled for June 1920, and the commissioners listened to arguments for and against Wood. They decided to retain Wood for one more year as principal of the normal school, because (1) it was not possible to secure a new principal before the new school year started, (2) Wood would have reached the twenty-five-year mark that would entitle him to a pension, and (3) another year would enable him to leave in a more dignified manner rather than be subjected to peremptory dismissal following the findings of the survey.<sup>74</sup>

Not everyone was happy to let Wood remain. The press and the public were calling for action. Editor Irwin of the Advertiser relayed this sentiment when he reported that the tide of letters and comments from teachers and laymen had answered the question, "What's Wrong With Our Schools." These opinions were confirmed by the Federal Survey. The editor believed that no progress could be made with Edgar Wood remaining as principal. Therefore, he called for Wood's removal, but added,

the recommendation of the federal school survey will meet with vigorous opposition (from) that mysterious influence that has so long kept Edgar Wood at the head of the Normal School and enabled him to weather the storm that has raged over the obvious defects of the institution.<sup>75</sup>

He charged the Commissioners of Education not to defer action on the survey's recommendations, because, according to Irwin, "If it is not taken the report might as well be thrown into the waste basket and the schools be allowed to continue as if no survey had ever been made."<sup>76</sup>

However, Wood's one-year reappointment was made, but not without concessions. Superintendent MacCaughey forced Wood to accept new requirements for admission to and graduation from the Territorial Normal and Training School. Three of the major conditions for entrance to the school were that the prospective student had to have two years of high school work and "reasonably accurate and fluent command of spoken English," and must be either an American citizen or have applied for citizenship. For graduation, the new regulations included that correct use of spoken English and the ability to teach had to be exhibited, whatever their academic standing. These regulations were passed unanimously by the Department of Public Instruction on May 18, 1920, and went into effect in September 1920.<sup>77</sup>

Superintendent MacCaughey, believing the matter had been settled, began his search for a new principal of the Territorial Normal and Training School. By the fall of

1920 MacCaughey had three candidates for the office: Dr. Charles W. Waddle, Los Angeles State Normal School; James Brownlee, State Normal School, Silver City, New Mexico; and Dr. Linwood Taft, University of Oklahoma. MacCaughey strongly recommended Waddle of California.<sup>78</sup>

Evidently no action was taken on the matter or at least the actions were not recorded. The entire normal school question lay dormant until June 1921 when Wood's employment with the Department of Public Instruction was to come to a close. But Wood was not ready to give up. Perhaps the inactivity of the board gave him hope that history would repeat itself as it had in June 1914, when he had returned from Columbia and his job had been saved by his supporters on the board.

Wood must have also used his interim year to further his own cause. At the meeting of the board on May 17, 1921, the principalship of the normal school came up for a vote. The superintendent read his letter to Wood dated April 29, 1921, wherein he asked Wood if he desired a further hearing by the board. Wood replied that he did. Although legally Wood was not entitled to another hearing, he was granted an informal hearing, scheduled for the next day. Wood returned ready to fight. He stated, "he had not received any notice that his appointment was to be for one year only."<sup>79</sup> This loophole in the legal removal of Wood was the same ploy presented by Etta Davis in her case against Wood. In his hearing Wood again gathered those

who would speak in his behalf. The newspaper reported the following:

Speaking in the defense of Mr. Wood were Judge Sanford B. Dole, the Rev. Akaiko Akana, Noa Aluli and John Watt. The group of federal surveyors on whose report the case against Mr. Wood is based. (sic) It is claimed, were entirely unfamiliar with conditions in Hawaii, were young teachers and their work occupied only about three days, a period entirely inadequate to make an investigation sufficiently thorough to dismiss an educator who had been doing excellent work in the Territory a quarter of a century.<sup>80</sup>

Wood relied heavily on strong Hawaiian support. Also attending this meeting were Duncan, representing the Hawaiian Civic Club, and Edgar Henriques, representing various Hawaiian organizations.<sup>81</sup> Wood had also spoken at the Hawaiian Civic Club on June 8, 1921, on the merits of Hawaiian teachers and penned an article headlined, "Hawaiian Race Asset Internationally is Belief of Educator Edgar Wood, Sees in Nature of Island Pacifying Influence, Enabling All Peoples to Live Harmoniously."<sup>82</sup>

In a letter to Governor McCarthy, Superintendent MacCaughey informed him of Wood's attempt to rally Hawaiian support.

Mr. Wood is now making a strong appeal to the Legislature particularly to the Hawaiian element. He is alleging that the proposed reorganization will eliminate the pupils of Hawaiian ancestry.<sup>83</sup>

MacCaughey relayed to the Governor the reaction of survey commissioner W. W. Kemp to Wood's grandstanding, "To what extent has Principal Wood been able to throw the smoke

screen about himself? Would he be able to hold the fort? . . .<sup>84</sup> However, Wood also knew that legally the board could not remove him, but could transfer him to another job in the department. Wood stated, "Any action at this time looking toward my transfer or retirement from the Normal School should be taken only for the gravest of reasons supported by unquestioned evidence."<sup>85</sup>

Regardless of the pleas for reinstatement, Wood was removed as principal of the normal school and transferred to McKinley High School to resume his place as science teacher. The board announced that Wood's reassignment was not due to the survey's report, but "it was simply in line with a reorganization policy worked out by the board."<sup>86</sup>

The board continued on to new business and the task of replacing Wood. None of the names that Superintendent MacCaughey had presented to the Governor the previous autumn were mentioned at the meeting of the board. The minutes read,

The matter of the principalship of the Territorial Normal and Training School was taken up and the name of Mr. B. O. Wist suggested for the position. On the motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mrs. Candless, it was voted that Mr. Linsey be authorized by the Department to enter into communication with Mr. Wist for the purpose of finding whether, if the Department so wishes he would be willing to accept the principalship of the Normal School.<sup>87</sup>

Immediately following that action, the board voted to assign a committee of five persons--two from the board, two from the Board of Regents, and one appointed by the

Governor--to investigate 'a program of close cooperation and articulation between the University of Hawaii and the Territorial Normal School.' The Board of Education believed 'work of the Territorial Normal and Training School could be more advantageously conducted in connection with the work of and cooperating with the University of Hawaii.'-88

Surprisingly the Wood matter was not yet at an end. At its June meeting a petition was presented to the board signed by 300 students at the normal requesting Edgar Wood's reinstatement as principal. Also, more than twelve people attending the meeting, including Judge Sanford B. Dole, sought to reinstate Edgar Wood at the normal. The superintendent reminded the audience 'it was the unanimous opinion of the Board that Mr. Wood's usefulness at the Normal School had come to an end and that a change of administration there was imperative.'-89

B. O. Wist's appointment was brought before the board. Commissioner Linsey stated, 'Although Mr. Wist would be at a loss financially, he would gain along the professional line, and would be willing to accept it (principalship).'-90 Wist's record was then studied. The afternoon session brought a vote on Wist's position. Commissioners Mrs. Candless and Mrs. Wilcox went on record as not approving of the appointment. However, the motion was carried. There was further action on the association of the normal and the university. Mrs.

Candless and Superintendent MacCaughey were appointed to the joint committee to investigate the possibility of cooperation between the two institutions.<sup>91</sup>

Meanwhile, at Wood's final graduation ceremonies at the normal school on June 25, 1921, this article appeared in the Advertiser,

Edgar Wood has given 25 years of his life to the cause of education in Hawaii, and though he has been demoted to a very inferior position, and his professional record placed under a cloud, we feel that there is not a man in this community who holds a firmer hold on the hearts of those with whom he has been associated, than he.<sup>92</sup>

The obstacle to change had been removed, and now it would be left to the reformers of Hawaii's schools to mold the schools to fit their dreams of reform.

## NOTES

### CHAPTER FIVE

<sup>1</sup>Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), p. viii.

<sup>2</sup>Richard Hofstadter, The Progressive Movement (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1963), p. 2-3.

<sup>3</sup>Gavan Daws, Shoal of Time (New York: McMillan Co., 1968), p. 312-312.

<sup>4</sup>Andrew Lind, An Island Community (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), p. 239-240.

<sup>5</sup>Lawrence Fuchs, Hawaii Pono (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishing Co., 1961), p. 65.

<sup>6</sup>Lind, cited from "Collection of Autobiographical Statements by Junior High School Students in Hawaii," 1930, p. 225.

<sup>7</sup>Lind, p. 239.

<sup>8</sup>Fuchs, p. 45.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 25 March 1909, p. 5.

<sup>11</sup>Ralph S. Kuykendall and A. Grove Day, Hawaii: A History (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1961), p. 210.

<sup>12</sup>Fuchs, p. 91.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 123.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 97.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 135.

- 18 Robert Freeman Butts, "Search For Freedom." NEA Journal, March 1960, p. 43.
- 19 Mrs. McNaught, "Annual Report Commissioner of Elementary Education," Hawaiian Educational Review, 7 (1919), p. 12.
- 20 Cecil Ponte, Interview, Honolulu, September 1984.
- 21 Fuchs, p. 269-270.
- 22 Richard Hofstader, Age of Reform (New York: Vintage Books, 1955), p. 209-210.
- 23 Reta Childe Dorr, What Eight Million Women Want (Boston: 1910), pp. 2-6, 11-13, rpt. The Progressive Movement ed. Richard Hofstader (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1963), p. 86.
- 24 Hofstader, Age of Reform, p. 210.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Fuchs, p. 266-267.
- 27 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 7 July 1909, p. 11, col. 4.
- 28 Ibid., 25 August 1916, p. 2, col. 2.
- 29 College Club Letter to Governor Pinkham, 1916 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), p. 1.
- 30 Ruth Shaw, "The Output of the Territorial Normal and Training School," Master's Thesis, University of Hawaii, 1929.
- 31 U. S. Bureau of Education, Survey of Education in Hawaii, Bulletin #16 (Washington, D. C.: GPO, 1920), p. 60.
- 32 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 8 August 1917, p. 6, col. 3.
- 33 U. S. Bureau of Education, City Training School for Teachers, Bulletin #47 (Washington, D. C.: GPO, 1915), p. xx.
- 34 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 19 March 1915, p. 2, col. 2.
- 35 Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 112.

<sup>36</sup>Henry Kinney, Letter to Lucius Pinkham, 21 January, 1918 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), p. 1.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 9 January 1918, p. 2, col. 3.

<sup>39</sup>Kinney, p. 2.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 2-3.

<sup>42</sup>Callahan, p. 113.

<sup>43</sup>Men of Hawaii (Territory of Hawaii: Honolulu Star Bulletin, 1921), pp. 265-267.

<sup>44</sup>Benjamin Wist, A Century of Public Education in Hawaii (Honolulu: Hawaii Educational Review, 1941), pp. 158-160.

<sup>45</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 23 April 1919, p. 4, col. 2.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., 29 June 1919, p. 4.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., 10 July 1919, p. 4, col. 2.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., 3 July 1919, p. 4, col. 3.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., 16 April 1919, p. 3, col. 1.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., 23 July 1919, p. 2, col. 3-4.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 14 August 1919, p. 4, col. 3.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., 29 November 1919, p. 4, col. 1-2.

<sup>55</sup>Edgar Wood, Letter to Dr, Frank F. Bunker, 19 January 1920 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), p. 1.

<sup>56</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 16 July 1919, p. 2, col. 1-2.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., 18 September 1919, p. 2, col. 7.

<sup>58</sup>Wist, p. 158.

59 USBE Survey, pp. 84-85.

60 Ibid.

61 Edgar Wood, Letter to Governor McCarthy, 27 October 1920 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), Governor McCarthy's Papers, p. 1.

62 Ibid.

63 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 19 June 1921, p. 1, sec. 2.

64 Ibid., 10 June 1920, p. 4, col. 1.

65 Wood, Letter to McCarthy, p. 2.

66 Ibid., p. 5.

67 Wood, Letter to Bunker.

68 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 15 June 1920, p. 1, sec. 2, col. 7.

69 Ibid., 11 June 1920, p. 5, col. 1.

70 Ibid.

71 Vaughn MacCaughey, Letter to Governor McCarthy, 19 November 1920 (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), Governor McCarthy's Papers, p. 6.

72 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 16 June 1921, p. 1, sec. 2, col. 7.

73 Wood, Letter to McCarthy, p. 8.

74 MacCaughey, pp. 1-2.

75 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 10 June 1920, p. 4, col. 1-2.

76 Ibid.

77 Department of Public Instruction, "Requirements for Admission and Graduation from the Territorial Normal and Training School to Take Effect September 1, 1920" (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), 19 May 1921, p. 79.

78 MacCaughey, p. 4.

79 Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 19 May 1921, p. 1, col. 7.

<sup>81</sup>Hawaii, "Minutes of Board of Education," 14 June 1921, p. 82.

<sup>82</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 15 August 1921, p. 1, sec. 2, col. 7.

<sup>83</sup>MacCaughey, p. 4.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid.

<sup>85</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 19 May 1921, p. 1, sec. 2, col. 7.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., 20 May 1921, p. 1, col. 7.

<sup>87</sup>Hawaii, "Minutes of Board of Education," 19 May 1921, p. 87.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., 14 June 1921, p. 82.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., 15 June 1921, p. 84.

<sup>92</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 27 June 1921, p. 4, col. 2.

## CHAPTER SIX

### BENJAMIN WIST: CHANGE AT THE NORMAL SCHOOL 1921-1929

Public education in Hawaii was on the verge of major changes in 1921. Those who were leading Hawaii's educational forces were poised and ready to transform the schools. The progressive reform movement that had its beginnings in the 1890's and had been revived in the second decade of the twentieth century was finally beginning to be felt within the hierarchy of the Department of Public Instruction. Superintendent Vaughn MacCaughey was armed with the recommendations of the just-completed Federal Survey. Wallace Farrington, a true friend of education and public schooling, was appointed Governor of the Territory on 1921. Both men were advocates of a strong public school system, whose job it would be to prepare the multi-cultural youth of Hawaii to become active participants in Hawaii's future. Yet barriers still remained.

The decade of the 1920's was one of economic energy. Hawaii's sugar industries experienced tremendous growth. Pineapple exportation was expanding. In 1910 Hawaii exported half a million cases of canned fruit, by 1930 twelve and a half million cases were being shipped from

the Islands. Tourism was quickly becoming a prime source of revenue and jobs. Military expenditures in Hawaii were growing, also adding to the job market.<sup>1</sup> In summary, the economic picture of Hawaii was one of growth and high expectation for the future, even though the decade had begun with a devastating strike of the sugar workers in 1920.

In mid-February 1920 most of Oahu's 5,871 Japanese workers and 2,626 Filipino workers were on strike.<sup>2</sup> The strikers demanded an eight-hour work day, overtime pay for Sundays and legal holidays, maternity leave for women, and an increase in wages from \$.72 a day to \$1.25 per day. In short, the organization of workers was demanding more control over their economic and personal lives. The Hawaiian Sugar Plantation Association made "no concessions whatsoever" to the strikers and eventually broke the strike in June that same year. Yet, in a surprise move, the planters, themselves, initiated minimum wage increases by as much as fifty percent and spent more than one million dollars to improve living conditions on the plantations.<sup>3</sup> The point was made, those that controlled the wealth were not going to relinquish any part of that control. It would be the "chosen few" who would control all aspects of the laborers lives, not the laborer himself.

During the 1920's and 30's, this group (minority of the haole elite) pushed uplift programs for the Orientals. Realistically facing the permanency of a large Oriental population in the Islands, they aimed to

haolify, or Americanize, it. Even this minority within the elite was not always agreed on what Americanization meant. But there was general consensus that at the very least it did mean going to Christian churches, playing American sports, and eating apple pie; there was nearly complete accord that it did not mean labor unions, political action, and criticism of the social order.<sup>4</sup>

Yet, for the educational reformers of Hawaii, education meant the schooling of Hawaii's youth in order to participate in all aspects of Hawaii's political and social life. However, the progressive reformers were not revolutionaries and did not want to make gains through confrontation with the oligarchy like the strikers had done. Their method of reform was the quiet nurturing of democratic attitudes within the already existing public school system.

Thus the stage was set when Benjamin Wist was appointed head of the Territorial Normal and Training School. Edgar Wood had been a major obstacle to change at the normal school, but now Wist would be the major catalyst to transform the formalistic authoritarian methods of teacher training into a progressive democratic education for Hawaii's teachers. If the Progressive Education movement demanded the education of the total child, then the same philosophy would have to be applied in the education of the teacher.

Wist was a 1910 graduate of Spokane University in Washington State. In 1911 he was attending a summer session at the University of California when he met a

group of young teachers headed for employment in Hawaii. Even though Wist did not have a job in the Islands, he joined his new friends on their trek.<sup>5</sup> On arrival he was hired, and, as was departmental policy was assigned to an outer island. His first position was principal of Kaikiki School at Hilo on the "Big Island". After five years he was transferred to Pahala School, also, on the Island of Hawaii. He was moved again to Lahaina, Maui, to serve as principal of the Kamehameha III School, where he served until he was called to the Territorial Normal and Training School in 1921.<sup>6</sup>

Objection could have been raised to Wist's appointment to head teacher education, especially from the ladies of the College Club, on the charge of inbreeding (the practice of hiring within the system). Wist could have been considered a "home product" because he had been with Hawaii's schools for over ten years. The mainland educators who had been nominated by Superintendent MacCaughey the spring before would have been favored, yet no objections to Wist's appointment were voiced by the club or the press. The choice of Wist must have been welcomed by the supervising principals Copeland and Wells, who for years had desired change at the normal school. Now, not only had Wood been replaced, but a Maui schoolman sat in his place.

Strangely, the record of the Board of Education gave no hints as to why Benjamin Wist was selected to head the

normal school. At the May meeting of the board he was nominated, and at the next meeting in June he was hired. There was no mention of anyone else being considered for the job, and there was no objection to Wist except from two commissioners who did not want Wood replaced.

Wist was not unknown to the superintendent or the public. He had gained a reputation in the educational circles of Hawaii. He had been particularly active in teachers' organizations on Maui and had been instrumental in leading the Boy Scout movement within the schools.<sup>7</sup> But, more important, his philosophy of education was clearly aligned with Superintendent MacCaughey's and Governor Farrington's. These three men saw education in a very different light than those who preceded them. Yet, in the true progressive spirit they were bent on working within the system to achieve their goals. They realized that progress in the schools could not be made in direct opposition to needs and wants of the economic power that paid the bills. For example, Governor Farrington believed that education and business did not have to be incompatible, but each should be changed to enhance the other. Farrington saw the expansion of educational opportunity for all ethnic groups as the means by which not only would Americanization take place but also Hawaii's basic industries would benefit. Farrington's belief that the "basic industries would benefit" brought charges that he was trying to force Oriental youths back to the plantation. Farrington replied,

that no one was trying to drive the Orientals back to the plantation, but in Hawaii there should be opportunities available so they would want to remain in agriculture.<sup>8</sup>

Farrington was clearly in favor of the laborers having a choice of occupations and that the public schools would prepare the children of Hawaii to make that choice.

MacCaughey wrote to the public school teachers of Hawaii in 1921, "The boys and girls of Hawaii should be trained in terms of the beautiful natural background and the great basic industries of Hawaii." Yet he believed more importantly, "Every person, directly or indirectly, is a tax-payer and is thus a stockholder in the public school system. . . . In any community there is no more helpful and optimistic sign than the free and interested discussion of educational problems. . . ."<sup>9</sup> MacCaughey indicated here that he believed that all Hawaii's people have the right to opinions and choices in the schooling of their children, therefore, choices in their life work.

Benjamin Wist also believed in expanding choices for the people of Hawaii. He saw the cooperation between the plantation and the school and a means to enhance both. Cooperation itself indicated choices. Wist wrote,

When one realizes that the great majority of our Island public school children are plantation children, many of them workers themselves, that the cost of their education is largely borne by these same plantations, it makes one wonder why there is so little connections between these two interests.<sup>10</sup>

Yet Wist saw the public school's role differently than his predecessor. Wist believed the solution lay, in part, in

educating the public school children to take responsibility for their leisure time on the plantation.

One way in which the school can be of assistance to the child through the plantation is in doing pioneer work which will prepare the plantation and the workers for welfare work. . . . Theoretically, the demand for different activities, which should come from the laborer himself. But as yet, he had not reached the stage where he can make a reasonable demand. This is where the school comes in. We should make it a part of our business to develop in the boy and girl the ability to organize and carry on the work of athletics and social clubs. They should be able to assume the initiative in organizing camp baseball, basketball or volleyball teams. They should be able to make intelligent use of anything that is done for them along welfare lines.<sup>11</sup>

Wist wrote of initiatives, intelligent use of time, the skills to organize and lead and the ability of the child to make demands of the plantation system.

MacCaughey saw everyone regardless of economic stature as being a "share holder" in the public schools. Farrington wanted the plantation to woo the laborers not enslave them. It was not coercion that Wist, MacCaughey, and Farrington were advocating, but cooperation. They were writing about growing away from paternalism. They were not advocating authoritarianism but democracy.

It was the hope of Wist, MacCaughey, and Farrington that the authoritarian methods used on the plantation and in the schools would succumb to the gentle prodding of the progressive reformers. Cooperation between these two institutions could mean enhancement for both, but more important, cooperation between the plantation and the

laborer would lend credence to the fact that the laborer of Hawaii had a choice.

It seems likely that from Superintendent MacCaughey's point of view, a man with Wist's outlook and conviction, coupled with his ten years' experience in Hawaii's schools, would be a valuable asset.

From the outset, Benjamin Wist envisioned the public school as an agent of change, and his job as teacher educator was to prepare a teaching force that could produce a new Hawaiian society. Through the public schools, Wist hoped that the autocratic lifestyle of the plantation would give way to a more democratic one. For this to occur, public schools would first have to have shed their own autocratic formalistic methods to set the example. For Wist, the Americanization process meant living, learning, and working in a democratic environment. He wrote to his students in 1924,

If I were asked to state just what the outstanding objective of the work of the Normal School is, and by Normal School I mean faculty, student, and alumni, my answer would be: The building of an American community.<sup>12</sup>

To supply Hawaii with teachers who were capable of accomplishing such an awesome task, teacher training had to be transformed into teacher education. The Territorial Normal and Training School would have to undergo drastic changes in philosophy and practice.

Wist and Hawaii were not alone in believing that the role of teacher was changing and therefore education of

the teacher must also change. More and more normal schools on the mainland were making strides toward providing American school children with better prepared teachers. The trend was unmistakably in the direction of a four-year teachers' college. In 1920 there were 46 teachers' colleges and 137 state normal schools on the mainland. After a short span of thirteen years, there were only 50 state normal schools and 146 state teachers' colleges. Similar losses were recorded for city normal schools.<sup>13</sup> In 1921, Wist and the normal school were a long way from being a teachers' college, or so everyone thought.

The reorganization of the normal school under Wist was a formidable task. Wist's overall plan included: (1) upgrading the student body, (2) differentiation of the curriculum, (3) reorganization of the administration, (4) a clear distinction between high school work and professional work, (5) improvements in practice teaching, and (6) introducing extension work.<sup>14</sup> Wist also affiliated the Territorial Normal and Training School with the only existing accreditation organization in the United States, the American Association of Teachers' Colleges.<sup>15</sup>

In 1921 when Wist took over as head of the normal school, there were essentially three schools in one. Students who had been accepted into the normal school in 1919 had been graduates of only the eighth grade. The students

accepted in 1920 had received only two years of high school classes. In 1921, a high school diploma was a requirement for entrance. Wist had been tasked by the Board of Education to upgrade the normal school as soon as possible, but he did not want to exclude those students who were already matriculating at the school. Therefore, Wist proposed that the students who had entered the normal school from eighth grade should work on a high school diploma; thus the normal high school was established. The freshman class was eliminated in 1922 and the sophomore class in 1923. Once these students had completed their high school work they were encouraged to continue in the two-year collegiate course. The students who had entered the school in 1920 with two years of high school were allowed to finish their two-year requirements to teach.<sup>16</sup>

Wist agreed with the Federal Survey and with the trend on the mainland that the requirement of a high school diploma for those students wishing to pursue a teaching career was more than desirable. Wist believed that separation of the general curriculum from the professional sequence was mandatory, because this method would "demand more mature, better and more specifically trained teachers," and that attempting to teach high school courses along with professional ones presented an unreasonable demand on the student.<sup>17</sup>

The new school attracted many students. Wist wrote to Professor Symond of Teachers' College in 1924 that

'instead of 150 incoming high school graduates, we have 230, which means we have reached in point of numbers, the point I thought it would take us six years to reach.'<sup>18</sup> Higher standards yielded good returns in regard to the Hawaiians. Edgar Wood had predicted that, if a high school diploma were required for entrance into the normal school, the Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians would be left by the wayside. Wist was concerned that this prediction would come true; but he happily reported in 1924 that 'higher standards, instead of eliminating the Hawaiian group as some had feared, is (sic) attracting them in greater numbers than ever before.'<sup>19</sup> With the increase in applicants came the luxury of selection. In 1925 not only was a high school diploma required, but the students were to have a 'B' average as well. They were also required to take and pass the Thorndike College Entrance Psychology Examination and be recommended by their high school principals. The principals would recommend those students they felt would both make good teachers and who had a good command of the English language.<sup>20</sup>

In 1926 the normal school took on the task of testing students in oral English. Wist wrote to Superintendent Crawford to explain the new test to be given. Seven faculty members of the normal school were assigned to devise an oral English test. They decided that each student would be judged on voice, enunciation, inflection, grammar, and use of idioms. Wist reported that 19 percent

of a class of 212 had been eliminated on the basis of the oral English test.<sup>21</sup>

Wist believed the extra scrutiny of the pupils applying to the school underwent was well worth the time and trouble. He wrote, "The . . . machinery for student selection has brought a better character of student body. It is giving us an intelligent and versatile individual for training."<sup>22</sup>

Once accepted into the normal school, the student was not assured of graduating. To graduate, the student had to acquire sixty-five credit hours and 137 grade points, and be proficient in English. "This tends to put the student on his mettle and cause him to do his very best," proclaimed Wist. Along with credit hours the student was required to do well in "certain subjects of Education and English, regardless of the number of credits earned," wrote Wist. "This ensures for our future teachers a better understanding of their life work and greater facility in their use of the English language."<sup>23</sup>

Yet, no matter how selective the admissions requirements or how demanding the curriculum became, Wist was plagued with a nagging problem of poor English speakers attending and graduating from the normal school.

During my incumbency at the Normal School, scarcely a week has gone by that has not produced a statement from one source or another critical of the oral English of our graduates. At first I thought that the raising of the standards would tend to eliminate the criticism, such has not been the case. Supervising principals, principals, commissioners,

superintendents, even business men have joined in the hue and cry. We are stressing English more than any other subject, spending more money on it, stricter in our rating of students in English than in others.<sup>24</sup>

However, oral English problems continued to plague the normal school. The proper use of English had, for a long time, been the badge of Americanization in Hawaii, so much so that the Federal Survey team had recommended the creation of English Standard Schools, or public schools, high schools, and elementary schools, that would require the student body to be selected on the basis of their proper use of oral English. The only source of Island-educated teachers, the Territorial Normal and Training School, would have to supply teachers who could speak proper English.

In 1928, Wist reported that after much research a new plan was in practice at the normal school that he hoped would help with this nagging problem. Wist included three phases of his plan. First, there would be conversation classes; second, there would be drill in oral English; and third, every teacher of the school was to be an English teacher.<sup>25</sup> It is interesting to note that seven years after Edgar Wood had been replaced at the normal school, largely due to the Federal Survey that condemned his use of drill in English instruction, Wist would turn to this method as a new approach to an old problem.

Academic prowess and use of oral English were not the only requirements to enter and to graduate from the normal

school. The teacher not only had to be the model for American democracy and the American language, but she/he would have to stand as an exemplar of American middle-class values. As previously mentioned the prospective student of the normal school would have to secure a recommendation from her/his high school principal. These principals were to recommend students on what the principal believed to be the proper make-up of a teacher. For example, Harold Lopes, principal of Kauai High School, did not recommend Adilaide Souza, even though her use of oral English was very good. Lopes explained that Miss Souza 'lacks refinement. Not the type of personality for a teacher. Loud and coarse. A crude and cheap 'flapper'.'-26

Even if students had been accepted, they were expected to adhere to a certain code of conduct. If they did not, they were faced with expulsion. Stanley Kunishi was expelled because of cheating. Wist wrote to Kunishi's parents, 'In a teacher-training school it is very important that stern measures be taken against any for dishonesty.'-27 The Dean of Women, who was in charge of most disciplinary matters, had several occasions to expel, suspend, or delay students' graduation for breaches of conduct. In 1925, she wrote the sister of two normal school students telling her of the girls' behavior and its consequences. She reported that the girls had been known to be loud and rude, which was unbecoming of a future

teacher. They both lacked honesty, according to the dean, and had been seen with a man who was drunk. The dean reminded the sister "that even though they should pass in their studies, they would not be allowed to graduate unless they had a reasonable degree of refinement."<sup>28</sup> "Refinement" was the demonstration of American middle-class values.

American values were thought by Wist and other progressives to be best taught by experience. To this end, Wist strongly encouraged student activity programs.<sup>29</sup> Under him, plays were presented, sports teams and clubs organized, musical groups begun, and a yearbook published. It was through these activities that the normal school students, or cadets as they were called, could exercise camaraderie, leadership, and cooperation with other students. Wist encouraged the cadets to join as many organizations as they could. A joint committee of faculty and students was formed to plan social programs. "The plan of a joint committee organization is perhaps more significant," wrote Wist. "in a teacher training institution inasmuch as prospective teachers will have use for all these experiences when they themselves are teachers."<sup>30</sup>

The participation in student activity programs brought to the normal school students a sense of cooperation and democracy that would not only enhance their teaching careers, but would, it was hoped, be spread by these young teachers throughout the Islands. As they

played on the field or voted on officers of the club, the students were experiencing firsthand the independence and responsibility of being an American citizen.

The upgrading of the student body could not have been done without also upgrading the normal school faculty. The faculty Wist inherited from Edgar Wood was not academically prepared to assume the role of the education of teachers on a collegiate level. The faculty that had taught stain removal from clothing could not be the same one that taught the philosophies of Dewey, Thorndike, and Harris. Experimental work and research in education by these men and others had contributed greatly to the wealth of pedagogical knowledge that was available to the teacher educator. To transmit this new knowledge, in addition to the cultural and academic subjects essential to a well-rounded education, an upgraded faculty was required.

When Benjamin Wist took office, only 29 percent of the faculty had degrees and these were all bachelor's degrees. Wist was convinced that "while faculty leadership and ability cannot be measured by academic degrees, it is never the less true that advanced academic training does tend to broaden the scope."<sup>31</sup> Not only would a degreed faculty give a broader scope to the normal school, but they would also lend the status of professionalism that Wist so ardently sought. Wist did what he could to encourage the faculty to work on degrees or advanced degrees, and his hiring practices reflected

his desire to advance the normal school's professional stature and adhere to the accreditation standards of the American Association of Teachers' Colleges. In 1923, Wist hired only graduates of recognized colleges and universities. Five years later he hired only those people who had earned a master's degree. It was through these actions that Wist could report in 1926 that 71 percent of the faculty had degrees, ranging from 4 percent with Ph.D.s, 29 percent with master's, and 32 percent with bachelor's.<sup>32</sup>

Another way Wist upgraded the normal school was to differentiate the curriculum. The expansion of graded classrooms in Hawaii's schools and the new research in education promoted curriculum specialization under Wist. Where Wood had prepared all students in a general course, prepared to teach all eight grades, Wist divided the curriculum into primary, grammar, industrial arts, and economic arts. Wist conceived this as a better method of teacher education, because,

within each curriculum are the courses which will give the student the best possible training for the work he will undertake upon graduation. This system had the advantage of permitting the individual specifically to fit himself for the particular work for which he is best endowed, being easier to handle from an administrative standpoint, giving proper emphasis to all phases of education and preventing the indiscriminate choice of subjects.<sup>33</sup>

Added to this curriculum was a Smith-Hughes course for strictly vocational work. The course would prepare

students to work in the school in non-instructional capacities, such as cafeteria workers and maintenance men. A dental hygiene program was initiated in 1926. This program trained dental hygienists for work in the schools and for private dentists. Kindergarten work was also begun, even though there were no public kindergartens in Hawaii. Those who completed this course worked for one of the many private kindergartens.<sup>34</sup>

A significant addition to the normal school was made in 1925 entitled Special Class. This Special Class was destined to offer post-normal school courses in elementary education. The prerequisite to this nonrequired course was a collegiate diploma from the normal school. Wist, in initiating this course of study, was trying to accommodate the mounting numbers of students who wanted to do advanced work in elementary education and did not want to or could not go to the mainland. The University of Hawaii did not offer any work in elementary education. Another justification for the work, according to Wist, was,

It should tend towards the relief of a long felt need in Hawaii-teachers who can undertake the instruction of children who for one reason or another do not fit into the typically graded academic curriculum of the elementary school.<sup>35</sup>

Thus began special education in Hawaii. The upper division classes would play a major role five years later in the association with the University of Hawaii.

In Wist's view the upgrading of the normal schools and the teaching profession in Hawaii meant the recruitment of men into the field through the faculty and student ranks. Addition of men did not add to upgrading instruction, but in Wist's mind added status and salary increases. In correspondence with a student, Monroe Kaya, Wist expressed his views on the subject. Kaya wrote Wist in July 1922, "Well, owing to your anxiety and great interest in having 'he men' in your and our old Normal School, I have tried my best in explaining the conditions of our school to some of the boys in my vicinity."<sup>36</sup> Wist answered his letter by thanking him and saying he was pleased to have any men at the school. In August Wist again wrote Kaya, stating, "Needless to say that I am happy to hear several boys are planning to enter the Normal School this year."<sup>37</sup> In December 1922, Wist wrote to the Interscholastic League inquiring whether the Normal School could participate in sporting events of the school system. He gave as his reason that "the teaching profession in Hawaii is sorely in need of men teachers and the Normal School desires very much to attract virile young men."<sup>38</sup> Wist favored men on the faculty as well. He wrote to Miss Elizabeth Snell, placement officer of Stanford University, in regard to a vita she had sent him for a Miss Nolds. Wist had taken no action on the vita in the hope that a man might apply. He explained, "As I told you, I prefer men if I can get them."<sup>39</sup> Unlike Wood, Wist

preferred men and assigned them to all the key administrative positions at the normal school, which had been considerably enlarged in the first year of his administration.

Wist's progressive philosophy dictated complete reorganization of the normal school's administrative structure. If the schoolroom was to be the model of democracy, then the institute that educated the teachers could not be anything less.

The first task Wist undertook was to flatten the hierarchical model that had so long reigned under Edgar Wood. Wist used a departmental model, much like a college or university, which had directors for each department. He created six departments and assigned a director to each. The Director of Education was in charge of preparing the students professionally for practice teaching and ultimately for their role as teacher in the community. Wist believed that a professional school differed greatly from nonprofessional schools or a university or high school. The major difference was that the nonprofessional school was primarily interested in subject matter, whereas the teacher training institute's primary purpose was professional education. Wist gave this example,

As an example, we are not teaching history for history's sake, but to enable the student to teach history. And here too, we are primarily interested in history as a vehicle for giving children those life habits essential to social success. In other words, we are preparing for children not subjects.<sup>40</sup>

Therefore, Wist assigned one Director of Education to facilitate one educational philosophy, because in a professional school there was only one goal: learning how to teach children.

The Training and Practice School was for Wist "the heart of the institution." Therefore, Wist assigned a Director of Training who held equal status with the Director of Education. The duties of the Director of Training included supervision of student teachers and the Practice School, counseling the student in curriculum choice, and placement.<sup>41</sup>

The business matters of the school were delegated to the Director of Business, who acted as a purchasing agent and bookkeeper. Discipline matters were given over to the Dean of Women and the Dean of Men. The Director of the Extension Service ran the extension courses and extracurricular activities were defused throughout the faculty.<sup>42</sup>

The President's (title changed in 1924) job was that of determining school policy, but, according to Wist, not his alone. "Good educational practice demands democracy in administration," exclaimed Wist. To accomplish this, Wist organized a group called the Administrative Faculty. The function of this group was to determine and carry out the administrative function of the school. The members of the Administrative Faculty were the President, Directors of Education, Training, and Special Departments, Extension, Secretary-Registrar, Librarian, and Dean of

Women.<sup>43</sup> In 1928, Wist took this concept a step further when he initiated a faculty in-house survey. Wist proudly reported,

A continued inside-survey of the institution is being made by the faculty, each member serving on a special committee to study some phase of the training program, comparing it with that of other teacher-training institutions and attempting to recommend ways and means of improvement. The outcome of such a study is splendid. Not only does it furnish the administration with aids to improvement, but it gives the instructor insight into other phases of the institution than his own particular work, thus broadening his horizons and helping him to evaluate his work in terms of the whole teacher-training program.<sup>44</sup>

The structure of Wist's administration reflected the entire philosophy of the school: democracy in education. Through his administrative structure, Wist also promoted the professionalization of teaching by giving Hawaii a professional institution for the education of teachers.

Wist acknowledged that the practice sequence of the normal school was the heart of the institution. He believed, as Dewey had taught, that the student teaching sequence was of paramount importance and therefore should wait until the student was thoroughly prepared to assume the responsibility. To put the student prematurely into actual teaching situations was ineffective and undesirable, because this forced the student teacher to focus on classroom management and discipline almost exclusively. The result was that the teacher mastered techniques rather than an understanding of the underlying educational goals. The inexperienced teacher required as

much preparation and observation as possible before entering the classroom. When the student teachers did enter the classroom for the first time, they should have ideal conditions as well as total control with minimal criticism.

To carry out his philosophy of student teaching, Wist established at the Practice School model observation classes, where the cadet could observe actual classroom situations without being directly involved. Next, he concentrated all students teaching in the senior year, believing that the students would benefit from all their preparation and be able to give their total attention to the student teaching experience. To offer what he believed was the ideal situation for the student teacher's first experience in the classroom, Wist removed all the overage and incorrigible students and had the class size reduced.<sup>45</sup> With these changes, Wist hoped student teachers would be able to strengthen their teaching skills to a point that when they were sent out into the field they would not have to resort to mechanical techniques, but rather could incorporate the totality of their educational experiences.

When Wist assumed the presidency of the normal school, the only practice facility available to the school was eight grades that were housed on the school grounds. Wist saw the need for more and better practice opportunities for the cadets. He approached the Board of

Education in February 1922 and requested that a practice school be established that would give the students experience in rural education. Wist determined that the school at Waimanalo was the best setting for this rural experience, because it was in the heart of a plantation town. Here the student teachers would have firsthand experience in rural education, much the same that they would experience in the first few years of their teaching careers.<sup>46</sup> Wist did not stop here. By 1926 the normal school could boast of no fewer than four facilities dedicated to practice teaching. In addition to the rural unit and the central unit, there was a kindergarten and an annex of eight grades at a public school near the normal school.<sup>47</sup>

Wist did not limit his energies to the students of the normal school. He took on the challenge of helping to educate the teachers that were already in-service, many of whom had been trained under Wood, whose education had consisted of raw training in technique and method. Wist initiated an extension service that emanated from the normal school. It was in the area of in-service education that Wist did more to change the course of education in Hawaii than any other educator since Henry Townsend.

There were seven different aspects of the extension service, which was headed by its own director. They were (1) extension classes, (2) correspondence courses, (3) testing service, (4) an educational research department,

(5) the publication of the Hawaiian Educational Review,  
(6) summer school, and (7) a visual aids education  
department.<sup>48</sup>

The correspondence work and extension courses filled a tremendous void in teacher education. As had been the practice of the Department of Public Instruction, all new teachers were assigned to the outer islands for at least their first few years. This included graduates of the Territorial Normal and Training School. Many of the teachers remained in their Island homes for their entire teaching careers. When the normal school became a collegiate institution, the teachers holding noncollegiate diplomas were eager to have an opportunity to earn additional credits leading to the collegiate diploma.<sup>49</sup> For these men and women, further course work in their field meant traveling to the normal school or summer sessions on Oahu, which was financially impossible for many. The supervising principals were there to help with problems the teacher had but not to act as teacher educators. Another reason for extension and correspondence work was Wist's desire to upgrade the entire teaching force of Hawaii and transmit Progressive Education philosophy to those already in-service. This was not an easy undertaking. Wist confided in Dr. Frederick Whitney, Director of the Department of Educational Research at Colorado State Teachers' College,

"We have found it necessary, in developing our in-service work . . . to bring such work as had to be done down to the level of a large number of our teachers who had come through the mill where it had not been necessary to do much thinking."<sup>50</sup> However, progress was made. In 1928, Wist reported that the extension services had joined with the research division for the purpose of enhancing educational practices throughout the Island chain. He reported,

The Research Division has undertaken a plan for a gradual change in classroom procedure. This plan, known as the "activity curriculum," involves a new point of view and a different technique on the part of the teachers. To bring these about, the Division of Research has turned to the Extension Department of the Normal School, with the result that, for a large part, teachers all over the islands have been actively studying the methods and philosophy of the progressive movement.<sup>51</sup>

The response to extension classes and correspondence work was rewarding. In the school year 1923-24, 275 were registered in extension classes and 163 were enrolled in correspondence course work. Five years later the total enrollment had grown to over 1,700.<sup>52</sup>

The Research Department of the normal school, initiated by Wist and first headed by normal school faculty member Helen Pratt,<sup>53</sup> soon became an independent Research Division under the direction of the Department of Public Instruction. It was through this division that the Kawanakoa Experimental School was opened. This school, under the principalship of Dewey disciple George Axtelle,

became a center of progressive educational practices in Hawaii.

The testing service the normal school offered served a twofold purpose. First, it provided standardized testing materials to the schools, and, more important, it gave advice and guidance in conducting tests and using their results.<sup>54</sup>

Another responsibility Wist undertook, as part of the normal school program, was publishing the Hawaiian Educational Review. Wist's ambition for the journal was to 'make the magazine as professional as possible, one that will be of interest to educators on the Mainland as well as here in Hawaii.'<sup>55</sup> The Review, 'the teachers' official organ preached progressivism.'<sup>56</sup> Every teacher in the public schools of Hawaii was expected to read the Review and keep abreast of educational trends and methods.

The summer session, held in Hawaii since 1895, continued as part of the normal school under Wist. The summer session served those teachers who could attend refresher training on Oahu.<sup>57</sup> Here, as with the extension classes, the philosophy and practice of progressive education were promoted.

The department of visual education furnished visual aids to the classrooms as well as putting on motion picture programs for school children.<sup>58</sup>

The extension services, under Wist's direction, did more than offer additional credit hours for teachers and

produce film festivals for children. Through the extension services the normal school, as an educative institution, reached more people than any other educational means. While the Superintendent of Public Instruction, some supervising principals, principals, and teachers touched the lives of a portion of the public school children, the work of the normal school touched them all in some capacity. The individual efforts of many could not surpass the efforts of the normal school, in its key position under the direction of Benjamin Wist, in the transmission of progressive education.

For all the contributions the normal school made to Hawaii, the legislature continued their historic practice of not furnishing adequate funds to house the institution. In three out of four reports Wist made to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, he requested improvement in the physical plant. The other report did not include such a request because, as Wist stated, "At the time of writing the 1925-26 report, it was confidently expected that provisions for a new plant would be made by the 1927 legislature."<sup>59</sup> There was some new construction, however, at the rural practice unit, Waimanalo, and repair work was done at various times. The request for a dormitory to house off-island students finally came into being in 1922. At the Board of Education meeting in April 1922, Wist asked that the new dormitory be named "Edgar Wood Hall." The board, still smarting from Wood's

administration, tabled the move, and the dormitory was named Hunialani Home instead.<sup>60</sup> Even with a new dormitory and rural practice unit, the normal school proper was never adequately housed. The Territorial Legislature never made appropriate provisions for the growing institution. But even without the needed physical structure, reorganization of the normal school continued.

For Benjamin Wist, reorganization of the normal school meant more than just upgrading the entrance and graduation standards and expanding the curriculum. It meant revolt against the strict autocratic educational practices that mirrored the oligarchical government of Hawaii and ran contrary to American democratic ideals. Americanization did not come from books alone; democracy did not come from pledges and salutes, but from living, working, and learning in a democratic environment. To this end, the reorganization of the normal school was fashioned. The administration of the school was tremendously expanded and democratized. Entrance and graduation requirements were standardized to ensure that ability was measured, not skin color. The faculty and staff had to meet certain requirements for employment, which added to the professionalization of the teaching corps. Also, the curriculum was specialized, adding to the status of teacher education. The theory of practice teaching was changed to ensure that the new teachers could rely on themselves rather than a dictated dogma. The

extension services were launched to spread progressive philosophies and aid in-service teachers in their quest for advancement. A more democratic force was at work at the normal school, one that would have been applauded by John Dewey and other progressive educators. Lawrence Fuchs put it well when he wrote,

The teachers of the 1920's and '30's were the godparents of modern Hawaii. Although Hawaii undoubtedly had many indifferent and inadequate teachers, probably no community in the world was blessed with so devoted a group of educators as were the Islands during those two decades.<sup>61</sup>

## NOTES

### CHAPTER SIX

<sup>1</sup>Benjamin Wist, A Century of Public Education in Hawaii (Honolulu: Hawaii Educational Review, 1941), pp. 145-146.

<sup>2</sup>Lawrence Fuchs, Hawaii Pono (San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Publishers, 1961), p. 218.

<sup>3</sup>Fuchs, p. 215.

<sup>4</sup>Fuchs, p. 51.

<sup>5</sup>Elizabeth Carr, Interview with Mrs. Benjamin Wist, 1967 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 2.

<sup>6</sup>Men of Hawaii (Territory of Hawaii, Honolulu Star Bulletin, Ltd., 1925), pp. 891-892.

<sup>7</sup>George F. Nellist, ed. The Builders of Hawaii (Territory of Hawaii: Honolulu Star Bulletin, Ltd., 1925), pp. 891-892.

<sup>8</sup>Fuchs, p. 280.

<sup>9</sup>Pacific Commercial Advertiser 16 July 1919, p. 2, col. 1-2.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., 18 December 1919, p. 2.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Benjamin Wist The Cadet (Honolulu: 1924), p. 11.

<sup>13</sup>Willard S. Elsbree The American Teacher (New York: American Book Company, 1939), p. 325.

<sup>14</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Hawaii's Public Schools Being the Biennial Report of the Department of Public Instruction, 1921-1922 (Honolulu: 1922), pp. 69-70.

<sup>15</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Biennial Report to the Governor and Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (Honolulu: 1924), p. 51.

<sup>16</sup>Hawaii (Territory), "Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Education 1895-1931" (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), 25 February 1922, p. 101.

<sup>17</sup>Hawaii, Hawaii's Public Schools, p. 70.

<sup>18</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Professor Symond, 22 October 1924 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>19</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1924), p. 60.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>21</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to W. W. Kemp, 26 November 1926 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>22</sup>Hawaii (Territory) Biennial Report of the Department of Public Instruction of the Territory of Hawaii (Honolulu: 1928), p. 101.

<sup>23</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1924), p. 63.

<sup>24</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to B. B. Taylor, 5 February 1927 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>25</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 108.

<sup>26</sup>Harold Lopes, "Principal's Recommendation," August 1926 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>27</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Mr. Kunishi, 12 February 1925 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>28</sup>Dean of Women, Letter to Miss Edith Thoene, 29 January 1925 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>29</sup>Paul Violas, The Training of the Urban Working Class (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing, 1978), p. 95.

<sup>30</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 106.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>32</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1924), p. 52.

<sup>33</sup>Hawaii, Hawaii's Public Schools, pp. 73-74.

<sup>34</sup>Hawaii (Territory), Biennial Report of the Department of Public Instruction of the Territory of Hawaii (Honolulu: 1926), pp. 89-94.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>36</sup>Monroe Kaya, Letter to Benjamin Wist, 6 July 1922 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>37</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Monroe Kaya, 21 July 1922 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>38</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Interscholastic League of Hawaii, 7 December 1922 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, pp. 1-2.

<sup>39</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Miss Elizabeth Snell, 24 March 1924 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>40</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1924), p. 56.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 105.

<sup>42</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 106.

<sup>43</sup>Benjamin O. Wist, "Administrative Organization of the Territorial Normal School," Hawaii Educational Review, 7, No. 8 (April 1924), p. 135.

<sup>44</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 106.

<sup>45</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1924), p. 62.

<sup>46</sup>Hawaii, "Minutes of Board of Education," 25 February 1922, pp. 99-100.

<sup>47</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1926), p. 94.

<sup>48</sup>Francis E. Peterson, "Territorial Normal School Extension Service," Hawaii Educational Review, 8, No. 8 (April 1925), 173.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Frederick Whitney, 19 March 1928 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>51</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), pp. 103-104.

<sup>52</sup>Peterson, p. 173; Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 104.

<sup>53</sup>Peterson, p. 173.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid.

<sup>55</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Vaughn MacCaughey, 2 October 1922 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>56</sup>Fuchs, p. 284.

<sup>57</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 104.

<sup>58</sup>Peterson, p. 173.

<sup>59</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 109.

<sup>60</sup>Hawaii, "Minutes of Board of Education," 15 April 1922, p. 104.

<sup>61</sup>Fuchs, p. 282.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### FROM THE NORMAL SCHOOL TO TEACHERS' COLLEGE 1921-1931

The development and transmission of the progressive reform in Hawaiian schools and the society were certainly goals that Wist aspired to attain. Yet there was another goal that Wist and those who had placed him as head of the Territorial Normal and Training School sought to reach. They advocated upgrading of teacher education to a four-year degreed position. The goals were complementary; however, the latter required more than administrative prowess, it also required legislative action, money and public support. In a time of impending economic depression, it would be hard to convince Hawaii's economic elite to increase educational opportunities. In fact, there was growing support on Merchant Street to not only limit educational spending but to sharply curtail educational opportunity for Hawaii's public school children.

In 1929, the year of the stock market crash, the problems that had plagued the haole elite had changed little since 1890. As in 1890, haole public school population was less than 10 percent while they continued to pay a majority of the taxes.<sup>1</sup> "King Sugar" was still requiring more and more field hands whose demand was not

being met without importation of labor. The old argument that public schools of Hawaii were educating Hawaii's children away from the plantation was still seen by the planters as valid, although not critical as long as labor supplies were abundant and public schools remained inexpensive. However, by the end of the prosperous decade of the 1920's the situation began to change.

Mostly as a result of the 1920 Federal Survey, secondary public education was growing by leaps and bounds. There were no junior high schools in Hawaii in 1920; by 1929 there were fifteen. Senior high schools grew to number nine by 1930. Hawaii's high school population grew from 4,719 to 19,700, a 315 percent increase in nine short years.<sup>2</sup> Elementary schools' attendance also soared, and, as stated before, the Normal School was graduating more teachers than could be placed even in this expanding system. Because of the growing expense and the threat to the oligarchy's ultimate control of the Islands "(e)ducation in Hawaii became as important to Merchant Street as labor and politics."<sup>3</sup>

Governor Lawrence Judd, in reply to the worried sugar planters, assigned a committee to once again investigate the public school system.<sup>4</sup> As with the 1913 Legislative Survey, the watch word was economy, but unlike the 1913 and 1920 surveys, it was Hawaii's business sector who initiated, planned and financed the survey.

Governor Judd appointed George M. Collins to chair the advisory committee. Collins in turn selected a committee which included Richard Cooke, president of C. Brewer, and Walter Dillingham, director of six corporations and perhaps the most powerful man in Hawaii during the 1920's.<sup>5</sup> To actually conduct the survey, the committee chose Dr. Charles A. Prosser, president of a small technical college in Minnesota, and an avid supporter of vocational education. Prosser was to lend educational legitimacy to the economic goals of the group who hired him. According to Lawrence Fuchs, "There was never any question how the report would turn out. The 1920 Survey . . . had forced an expansion of educational opportunities in Hawaii. The 1930 survey was intended to reverse the process."<sup>6</sup>

The Prosser Report, released in 1931, recommended that for the next five years high school enrollment and expenditures would be frozen at 1931 levels. University of Hawaii would work under the same restrictions. The vocational program was to be expanded in the elementary and junior high schools. The Normal School should be merged with the University of Hawaii. The Prosser Report was designed to limit educational opportunities and narrow the choices of many public school students. Hopes were high (if the program was initiated) that the children of plantation laborers would be limited to following their parents into the fields.

The Prosser Report was bad politics, it went too far and backfired. It mobilized all the production forces including friendly industrialists, and the kamaaina missionary descendant, and especially the women. It angered Hawaii's Orientals, who were increasingly influential at the polls. It infuriated many of Hawaii's teachers. . . .<sup>7</sup>

The Territorial legislature ignored every recommendation made by the Report, save one, and continued to support public education with new buildings and money. Defiance of the Prosser Report by the legislature and the people of Hawaii is proof positive that the "many" were breaking away from the dominant influence of the "few".

The one recommendation of the Prosser Report, that of merging the Normal School and the University of Hawaii did become a reality. It must be remembered, however, that this particular recommendation was not new in 1931. The 1913 and 1920 surveys of Hawaii's schools and normal school had made the same recommendation.

Of the three recommendations to merge the normal school and the university, two were strictly economic in motivation (the 1913 investigation of the normal school and the Prosser Report). These two plans were controlled by sugar industrialists. The third, the 1920 Federal Survey, advocated the joining of the two institutions for the sake of giving the pre-service teacher a broader education and access to expanded facilities. Of the three, the Federal Survey served as the major impetus to upgrading teacher education in Hawaii. The existing

economic situation in 1931 dictated the relationship between the normal school and the university.

It was the recommendations of the Federal Survey that were the deciding factors in replacing Edgar Wood at the normal school, which in turn prepared the way for the normal school to be transformed into a collegiate institution. At the May 1921 meeting of the Board of Education, the commissioners assigned a committee to investigate "a program of close cooperation and articulation between the University of Hawaii and the Territorial Normal School." At the very same meeting the commissioners selected Benjamin Wist to head and reorganize the normal school. Therefore, from the very outset, Wist was charged with the task of preparing the normal school for some association with the university.

As noted in the previous chapter, Wist was quick to enroll the normal school in the only existing accreditation of Teachers' Colleges. Wist made their requirements his own and strove to be fully accredited by them. This was also a popular move on the mainland. As normal schools advanced to teachers' colleges, accreditation agencies served as a springboard because of "public demand for better post-secondary education and a desire to secure recognition by means of accreditation."<sup>8</sup>

As also noted in the previous chapter, Wist was extremely successful in upgrading the student body and attracting more and more students to the normal school. In

fact in 1923, only two years after Wist had taken over as head of the normal school, the requirements to enter the normal school were higher than those of the University. The normal school required sixteen high school units, while the university required fifteen. This not only put the normal school, for the first time, in direct competition with the university for students, but also presented a problem for Wist. Wist wrote to Superintendent W. E. Givens requesting that the Normal School be able to reduce their requirements to match those of the University. This request was made because so many students were getting into the university with the lower number of units and then transferring to the normal school for the senior year. Wist explained, "Obviously, if they are actually going to teach, they would be better off for having spent two years at the Normal School." The request was granted, but with the provision "that the 16th unit of credit be made up by such students before a diploma is granted."<sup>9</sup>

As the requirements for admission to the normal school were raised, more and more students attended. By 1927, for the first time, the normal school graduated more students than it could place in teaching positions. Wist wrote to a former student that twenty-one of the class of 1927 had not been placed, and he had encouraged three of them to return to the normal school for upper division classes.<sup>10</sup> The situation became worse with each graduating class that followed. Consequently, more and more students were

returning to the normal school for advanced work. As these students attained three and four years of work beyond their high school diplomas, pressure built for recognition of their work in the form of a degree. In his 1927 Report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wist made his plea for the authority to grant degrees. He asserted,

There are a great many teachers in Hawaii who are ambitious and want to do the work required for a degree, but they also want to continue in the elementary service. . . . They can do this only at the Normal School. . . . The Normal School is strictly a professional institution. It does not lay claim to the provision of training in the field of arts and sciences. . . . We propose a strictly professional degree: Ed.B. (Bachelor of Education).<sup>11</sup>

At the 1927 legislature this request was made. Wist wrote that there was an earnest effort to pass a bill that would enable the normal school to grant degrees, but it was defeated. He was sorely disappointed by this defeat. He relayed his feelings on the matter to his friend, W. W. Kemp.

I very much regret to inform you that the Normal School suffered a very severe defeat at the hands of the legislature which has just completed its regular session. Neither the new plant nor the degree granting privilege which we were working was granted us. This political game is rather trying, isn't it?<sup>12</sup>

In his message to the graduating class of 1928, Wist offered the class this reason to support the normal school in its quest for degree-granting privileges: "The four-year degree-granting privilege is necessary if your Alma Mater is to maintain her position in the vanguard of American teacher-training institutions."<sup>13</sup>

With no degree-granting privileges and a mounting number of pre-service and in-service teachers acquiring more and more course work equivalent to degree requirements, something had to be done. Affiliation with the university seemed the likely step. Wist informed the teachers, "The failure in 1927 to obtain for our teachers this recognition (a degree) justified the attempt to get it in some other manner. Hence the affiliation measure of 1928."<sup>14</sup> He again mentioned the reason he backed a move toward affiliation when he wrote, "The proposed merger would automatically bring about degree-granting privileges."<sup>15</sup>

In 1927, Wist would not have backed affiliation under any circumstances. He wrote to Kemp,

University control might be feasible except for the fact that Dr. Dean would do away with teacher training as an integrated process. In other words, he believe (sic) that teachers do not need special training but do need subject matter. The Department feels that any affiliation which would tend to tear down the well organized programs of training would be most unfortunate.<sup>16</sup>

However, David L. Crawford succeeded Dean at the university in 1927, and Wist felt that Dean Crawford had, "a more sympathetic attitude toward the Normal School and its needs."<sup>17</sup> Yet, Wist did not want the university to have control over teacher education. He simply advocated an affiliation with the university. Wist went on record as believing that,

any plan for the affiliation of the Normal School with the University should guarantee:  
 . . . as little dual control by the Commissioners of Education and University Board of Regents as possible.<sup>18</sup>

However, the plan that was submitted to the legislature of 1929 advocated dual control of teacher education. The plan read,

Teachers' College shall consist of the present Territorial Normal and Training School and the Department of Education of the said University. The affairs of said Teachers' College . . . shall be under the management and control of the Board of Regents of the said University . . . except that there shall be coordination with the Department of Public Instruction in the manner hereinafter set forth.<sup>19</sup>

The areas that the Department of Public Instruction would control were many. The dean and other officers of Teachers' College would be nominated by the Board of Education. The administration and conduct of the programs, including curriculum, teaching methods, and requirements for graduation, would be initiated by the Department with the approval of the Board of Regents. The Department would have initial control over the school's budget as part of the budget for the rest of the public schools of Hawaii. All these initiatives were subject to approval by the Board of Regents.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless the Department of Public Instruction would still maintain vital control of teacher training while receiving the benefits of degree-granting privileges.

The bill was presented to the legislature by Representative Nolle R. Smith. Smith was interviewed by a reporter from the Oahu Teachers' Association Journal before the bill was presented to the House of Representatives. Smith believed the bill had a good chance for two reasons. First, he asserted, "Our educational system must keep pace

with other outstanding systems of the nation, and until we require our teachers to be as well prepared for their positions as are the teachers of other systems, we shall be far behind. . . .<sup>21</sup> Secondly, according to Smith, Hawaii had 'just about reached the saturation point as far as numbers of teachers with . . . two years' training. . . .<sup>22</sup> Yet the bill did not pass, and the normal school remained independent and without degree-granting privileges.

Wist explained to the teachers of Oahu why he believed the attempt to affiliate the institutions failed. He summarized,

I think that no one will question that the Department of Public Instruction enjoys a vested right in the matter of training of teachers it must employ. The 1929 bill attempted to protect these rights and to maintain the integrity of teacher-training. This led to a form of dual control with which no one was entirely satisfied. . . . The outstanding reason for failure is the fact that not enough people are convinced as yet that ! ! ! (the) bill supplied the best solution to our problems.<sup>23</sup>

With no solution to the problem, Wist's position of continually having to graduate students he could not place became a burden. He confessed that he was 'in an awkward position not being able to place a considerable number of our graduates.'<sup>24</sup> Added to this, almost half of the Summer School sessions were being attended by those who already held a two-year diploma. Something had to be done. A compromise had to be reached.

The Department of Public Instruction did not want to release control over the training of teachers they had to hire. The Board of Regents wanted to maintain control over their institution. Benjamin Wist did not want the professionalism of teacher training subordinated by the university. The pre-service and in-service teachers wanted jobs and recognition of the work they had done beyond the two-year diploma. The Territorial Legislature wanted to save tax dollars. Everyone, including the legislators, wanted Hawaii not to fall behind in the standards set by the mainland, which were clearly in the direction of a four-year degree-granting teachers' college.

One solution proposed and supported by graduates of the normal school, was a four-year teachers' college like those on the mainland, independent of the university, and under the control of the Department of Public Instruction. Representative Smith took the stand that 'this is, of course, impracticable. We cannot support two colleges. The amalgamation of the two institutions would materially reduce the cost of the buildings, libraries, and upkeep.'<sup>25</sup> Yet the alumni were anxious over the university's taking over teacher training. Wist tried to waylay some of this apprehension by telling them, 'We are taking every precaution to protect our alumni and the teachers of the Territory in the event of affiliation.'<sup>26</sup>

A second proposal submitted for consideration was another form of dual control, between the university and the normal school. A teachers' college would be established as a separate institution whose students would be accepted after completing two years at the university. Control would remain with the Department of Public Instruction and the school would train both elementary and secondary teachers.<sup>27</sup> Governor Judd was in favor of the bill, and Wist saw it as a feasible form of affiliation. However, the Normal School Alumni Association opposed it vigorously on the grounds that students would tend to stay at the university rather than transfer to a two-year teachers' college. Wist wrote of these concerns, "The alumni believe this will result in a gradual reduction in the number of students at Teachers' College to such a point that the school will be turned over to the University in toto."<sup>28</sup> Wist conceded that this was a real possibility.

As the argument continued, the normal school class of 1930 graduated. Only 33 of a graduating class of 154 were placed in teaching situations in Hawaii. The Star Bulletin reported, "In several cases those graduating with honors have not received appointments."<sup>29</sup> Wist had reached the point where he was no longer concerned about which governing board had control of teacher training. His strongest concerns were for solving the problem of unemployed honor graduates and others. He wrote his friend W. W. Kemp in 1930,

It seems to me that the real contest is going to come in arriving at satisfactory terms for amalgamation. It is not politic to fight for something (independent teachers' college) when you know you are going to lose. In this case it is more politic to discuss the peace treaty . . . the big thing now is to see that the amalgamation . . . will be satisfactory to the Educational interest of the islands by educational interest I do not mean superintendents, presidents, and principals but rather every person in the schools.<sup>30</sup>

In 1931, Wist writing to his former student, Monroe Kaya, stated,

My personal stand in the controversy is this: I believe sincerely that we should provide teacher training facilities which would result in the requirement of a bachelor's degree for all new elementary teachers. I believe that this training should be carried on in a professional institution devoting itself solely to teacher preparation. If the above two criteria are met, the question of whether this institution be controlled by the Department of Public Instruction or by the University Board of Regents becomes a secondary consideration.<sup>31</sup>

Feeling some step had to be taken to facilitate some move toward degree-granting privilege, and believing the chances for an independent teachers' college were very slim, Wist began to campaign among the teachers to promote their support for amalgamation with the university. He appealed to their emotions and to their sense of patriotism when he wrote,

Obviously, no program for teacher-training will be satisfactory which does not have the support of teachers themselves. The unselfish, constructive thinking of each of us will bring about a program for the training of teachers of which not only Hawaii but the United States can be justly proud.<sup>32</sup>

Another campaign was started in the summer of 1930. That summer, pressure was building to strike some kind of compromise in the 1931 legislature. In August, Superintendent Crawford took action to slow down the output of teachers from the normal school. He initiated a three-year normal program, to go into effect September 1930, and he limited the class of entering freshmen to one hundred with no graduating class at the normal school in 1932. He said that legislative action was needed to change the name of the institution to Teachers' College and to give the power to grant degrees, but he could and he would extend the normal school to a four-year program if the territorial legislature did not take some action with regard to the normal school.<sup>33</sup> This was heartily endorsed by the Territorial Alumni Association and other teachers' groups.

In the Honolulu Star Bulletin of September 1, 1930, there appeared a picture of an architect's proposed plans for a new teachers' college campus. The plans had been drawn up in case amalgamation did not occur. They included provisions for a teacher training school, administration building, science building, auditorium, dormitories for men and women, and a caretaker's house. The buildings were to occupy the land across the street from the university.<sup>34</sup>

The campus was designed to be complete in and of itself. The plans were intended to establish a campus,

but more than likely their usefulness lay in stimulating the economy-minded legislature and their constituents.

By April 1931, the hue and cry was for economy. The low price of sugar, compounded with the Great Depression that was beginning to be felt in Hawaii, brought out serious concerns about supporting two institutions of higher education. A letter to the editor at the Honolulu Star Bulletin, signed 'Businessman,' advocated combining the two institutions because it was better business than to pay for two.<sup>35</sup> The Bulletin also ran an article stating that amalgamation would produce teachers at a lower cost.<sup>36</sup> Dr. Dean, former President of the University, even favored a merger on the grounds that it would result in 'better training of teachers for less money.'<sup>37</sup>

In April 1931, two bills were introduced to the legislature. In the House of Representatives, House Bill #174 proposed a Teachers' College independent of the university. This bill was tabled.<sup>38</sup> In the Senate, Bill #19 joined the normal school and the Department of Education of the University of Hawaii under the name Teachers' College. This bill was passed and amalgamation assured,<sup>39</sup> but not without a fight from Senator Jarret. Jarret opposed amalgamation because,

There is no good reason why the legislature should not create a Teachers' College under the control of the department of public instruction which does the hiring of the graduates and should have the power of supervising their

instruction. The students could get degrees from such a Teachers' College and most of the states on the Mainland have teachers' colleges distinct from the state university. When you place the Teachers' College under the regents of the university you are beginning to take the normal school away from the people and the people should have some say as to how it should be run and what course of study should be given. I move to table this bill.<sup>40</sup>

However, his motion failed to gain enough support to defeat the amalgamation movement. Yet it did influence the Senate enough to assure that the Department of Public Instruction would have a say in the curriculum of the new institution and representation on the Board of Regents.<sup>41</sup>

The Governor signed the bill into law on April 29, 1931. On April 30, 1931, Benjamin Wist was appointed Dean of Teachers' College University of Hawaii.<sup>42</sup>

Wist wrote to his friend Glen Woods, "The Normal School becomes Teachers' College under University control next fall. So that issue has been finally settled."<sup>43</sup>

## NOTES

### CHAPTER SEVEN

<sup>1</sup>Lawrence Fuchs, Hawaii Pono (San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Publishers, 1981), p. 292.

<sup>2</sup>Fuchs, p. 273.

<sup>3</sup>Fuchs, p. 292.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Fuchs, p. 164.

<sup>6</sup>Fuchs, p. 293.

<sup>7</sup>Fuchs, pp. 294-295.

<sup>8</sup>Willis Rudy, "From Normal School to Multi-Purpose College," History of Education Quarterly (Summer 1980), 199.

<sup>9</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Superintendent Givens, 18 September 1923 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>10</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to a former student, 9 September 1927 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>11</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to W. W. Kemp, 29 April 1927 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

<sup>13</sup>Benjamin Wist, The Cadet, (Honolulu: 1928), p. 12.

<sup>14</sup>Benjamin Wist, "Teacher Training in Hawaii," Oahu Teachers' Association Journal (May 1929), 2, 16.

<sup>15</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 111.

<sup>16</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to W. W. Kemp, 17 July 1927 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 3.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

- <sup>18</sup>Hawaii, Biennial Report (1928), p. 112.
- <sup>19</sup>Hawaii (Territory), "Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Education 1895-1931" (Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives), 28 January 1929, p. 130.
- <sup>20</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>21</sup>George Peavey, "Act to Establish Teachers' College at University Discussed by Representative Smith in Interview," Oahu Teachers' Association Journal (April 1929), 7.
- <sup>22</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>23</sup>Wist, "Teacher Training," p. 16.
- <sup>24</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Charlotte Turner, 10 January 1930 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.
- <sup>25</sup>Peavey, p. 7.
- <sup>26</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to David Kalaaua, 15 February 1929 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.
- <sup>27</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to W. W. Kemp, 23 November 1929 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.
- <sup>28</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Ralph Silverman, 31 January 1930 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.
- <sup>29</sup>Honolulu Star Bulletin, 13 June 1930, p. 1, col. 6-7.
- <sup>30</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to W. W. Kemp, 2 November 1930 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, pp. 1-2.
- <sup>31</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Monroe Kaya, 12 March 1931 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.
- <sup>32</sup>Wist, "Teacher Training," p. 16.
- <sup>33</sup>Honolulu Star Bulletin, 19 August 1930, p. 1, col. 1.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid., 1 September 1930, p. 1, col. 1.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., 8 April 1931, p. 4.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., 24 April 1931, p. 1, col. 3.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 26 April 1931, p. 1, col. 2.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>Hawaii (Territory), "Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii 1907-1931" (Honolulu: Office of Regents, University of Hawaii), p. 298.

<sup>43</sup>Benjamin Wist, Letter to Glen Woods, 4 May 1931 (Honolulu: University Of Hawaii Archives), Benjamin Wist Collection, p. 1.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study has explored the nature of teacher preparation during the era of Hawaii's Territorial Normal and Training School under the influence of two opposing forces--oligarchy and democracy. It is both descriptive and interpretive in nature and is intended, in part, to search out the contributions of this legacy to today's teacher educators.

The Territorial Normal and Training School was a social institution that prepared teachers for the government school's elementary grades. It was through the portals of the governments' elementary schools that the rising generation of children of alien parents passed. The atmosphere and philosophy of the teacher preparation institution played a vital role in the education of the youth of Hawaii. From its key position the normal school was used by the oligarchy and later by a more democratic force to promote the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors deemed necessary for the next generation of public school children.

The knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors deemed important by the oligarchy were those that promoted the status quo in the Island chain. While Americanization was

advocated by the oligarchy, their definition meant little more than training up the public school student to put on the trappings of an American in speech, dress, religion, and social mores. Americanization, according to the oligarchy, did not mean creating a society where choices and opportunities were available to all citizens.

James L. Dumas was the first principal of the Territorial Normal and Training School. Dumas' normal school administration was short-lived because his political and educational ideas clashed with those of the oligarchy. He believed and publicly stated that the government should distribute wealth rather than retain it for the benefit of the few. Dumas' political ideals would easily filter into the curriculum and methods. Clearly Dumas' political and educational ideas would not produce future teachers that held the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors to support the status quo of Hawaii's oligarchy. Dumas was forced out by the Department of Public Instruction on economic grounds yet he was admonished in writing because he did not "avoid things likely to cause friction or lead to misunderstanding and disagreements between himself and other members of the Department."<sup>1</sup> In other words, Dumas was not providing the kind of training that reflected the needs and desires of the society the institution was built to serve. i.e. the oligarchy.

Edgar Wood, Dumas' successor, was effective in providing the oligarchy with an institution that reflected

their needs. Wood tutored future teachers of varied ethnic backgrounds in the infancy stages of Americanization through vocational education programs and Herbartian psychology. The vocational education department of the normal school stressed knowledge in American lifestyles, industry, and agriculture. Herbartian psychology

---

introduced Western literature and history. Through these studies the future teacher would attain the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors that would be most important to emulate in order to establish an American society in Hawaii.

As important as these initial stages are for new American citizenship, they are just that--initial. Wood, with oligarchical support through the Department of Public Instruction, maintained and enhanced this initial stage of Americanization. The vocational education department of the normal school was expanded and soon became the focus of the school. The vocational slant to the school which trained teachers for the territorial system was aimed at developing a domestic labor force for Hawaii's plantation system. Wood's authority reigned supreme over all aspects of the normal school, mirroring the same total control enjoyed by the oligarchy over the Territory. Wood's explicit control molded future teachers with unquestioned loyalty to established authority. These future teachers were then expected to go out into the government schools and recreate, unaltered, the lessons they had learned.

---

The normal school under Wood acted as the guardian of the status quo in Hawaii. Yet societies by their very nature change. The question facing Hawaii was what direction that change would take. Would Hawaii become increasingly autocratic and therefore further away from the American model sought by the oligarchy? The obvious answer was no. The direction of change had to be toward a more democratic society. Education of the future citizens would have to meet these new democratic demands. The normal school played a major role in the individual and social transformation of the Islands' populace.

The normal school became the focus of the reform movement in Hawaii. Those agitated for change, e.g. the supervising principals, women of the college club, classroom teachers and mainland educators, had special interests and goals. The Supervising principals wanted curricular reform, the women of the college club were concerned with the toll of economic/social injustices, the classroom teacher wanted better preparation, Benjamin Wist and his supporters wanted a more professional teaching force. Yet, as a whole, these progressives were unified by the belief that the public educational institutions of Hawaii, particularly, public teacher education, needed to change in order to prepare the rising generation of Hawaii's young to participate fully in a democratic society. As a unified group the reformers of Hawaii saw Wood at the normal school as a barrier to the changes

believed necessary to transform Hawaii into a more democratic society. The future citizens needed more than training. They needed an education, one that would provide them with self-discipline, self-reliance and self-respect in order to be able to test the validity of values, standards, rules, and truths of their society. The new demand was for an education that would encourage enthusiasm for innovation and creativity in problem solving and decision making. Finally the new citizens needed an education that promoted understanding and cooperation between peoples and prepared them to be full time participants in a democratic society.

The reformers were successful in bringing change to the normal school. Edgar Wood was replaced by Benjamin O. Wist in 1921. Wist immediately began restructuring the normal school in order to provide future teachers with the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors needed for their role in a democracy.

In order for teachers to learn their new lessons the normal school had to practice what it preached. "Good educational practice," wrote Wist, "demands democracy in administration." Wist organized the normal school's administration thereby flattening the hierarchical structure of the Wood era. He divided responsibilities into departments, each with its own head. Wist also appointed a seven member panel, the Administrative Faculty, to carry out the administrative functions of the

school. In addition, Wist began an in-house survey of faculty members. In summary, Wist fulfilled the role of administrative facilitator rather than dictator and set a democratic example for the pre-service teacher.

The curriculum under Wist also responded to the need for reform. Wist's students had already met the requirements for high school graduation, therefore, the new curriculum focused on professional education. His views on professional education reflected his desire to prepare future teachers to educate the whole child. Subject matter was important as a vehicle to social success in a democratic society not an end in and of itself. As Wood strove for emulation in all aspects of teacher training, Wist was determined to provide a foundation and forum for problem-solving skills.

How better to learn problem solving than to directly experience it? Wist provided the forum at the normal school for the pre-service teacher to experience these new skills through student government, social clubs, team sports, and committees. Through these extra-curricular activities the normal school teacher would be introduced to and given an opportunity for the exercise of democratic qualities such as: self-reliance, cooperation, innovation and creative problem solving, decision making skills, and an understanding and appreciation of opposing points of view. To cap this extra-curricular program, Wist established a board of faculty and students to coordinate

and create extra-curricular activities. Wist encouraged leadership and individual thinking as opposed to the stifling autocratic rule of his predecessor.

Wist was not satisfied in limiting the lessons of democracy to normal school students alone. He felt a compelling need to spread the progressive educator's message to in-service teachers, particularly those trained under Edgar Wood, by instituting in-service instruction, summer sessions, and professional journals. Wist was able to reach all of the Islands' teachers. Also, he was not satisfied with the availability of continuing education programs and services for the school teachers. Wist was instrumental in creating a research division, experimental school, testing services, and a visual aids center. Under Wist the normal school soon became the center of a more democratic force in Hawaii. In contrast to Wood, who limited his energies to the normal school, Wist embraced all of Hawaii's teachers.

Another task assigned to Wist at the very outset of his administration was to follow mainland trends and transform the normal school into a teachers' college. To this end, Wist was quick to enroll the normal school into the only existing accreditation organization for teachers' colleges, The American Association of Teachers' Colleges. Only two years after Wist took office, entrance requirements at the normal school were higher than those of the University of Hawaii. Also, Wist took advantage of

a surplus of pre-service teachers in the late 1920's to expand the curriculum at the normal school to a three year post secondary education program. Wist had the full support of the superintendent of schools and the Department of Public Instruction in achieving these goals. Only ten years earlier, Wood had been clinging to a pre-secondary teacher training institution.

The nature of the relationship between two forms of government--oligarchy and democracy--and teacher preparation in Hawaii during the normal school era is apparent; oligarchy required training and democracy required education. Wood trained teachers through the totality of the normal school's curriculum, requirements, and milieu to be obedient to his model, conformers to the status quo, and resisters to change. Wist attempted to educate teachers (within the existing system) to be questioning visionaries and innovators for change. He accomplished this not only through the curriculum, but also through extra-curricular activities, administrative example, and expanded educational opportunities.

A nagging question remains. Did Wist's ideas find their way through the normal school graduates and those in-service into the daily practice of the public school classroom? This can only be deciphered through more research into the workings of those classrooms. Yet the Prosser Report does give evidence that those in charge of Hawaii's economic factors strove to halt educational

opportunities in Hawaii in 1931. The disregard of the Report's recommendations by the legislature is one bit of evidence that the Progressives, led by men like Wist, were making progress toward a more democratic society at the beginning of that decade.

For all of his accomplishments, Wist failed to provide Hawaii with an independent teachers' college. Bowing to economic situations and Hawaii's strong tradition of centralized education, Wist was forced to amalgamate the normal school with the University of Hawaii to obtain a four year degreed program for Hawaii's elementary teachers. The amalgamation could be perceived as progressive in that it "opened the doors" of the arts and sciences to the pre-service teacher; however, the results were not entirely progressive. When the normal school joined the University it "closed the doors" to the possibility that Teachers' College of Hawaii would evolve, as many mainland teachers' colleges have, into a new and independent state college/university. A separate institution may have provided choices and opportunities in public higher education for future generations of Island students and more closely aligned Hawaii with other American communities.

With total centralization of higher education there was little hope that the long established tradition of centralized public education would falter. Decentralization of the public schools would have been the next

logical step given the improved education of the Islands' teachers. Decentralized public schools would have provided a better forum for the normal school graduates to practice in the classrooms of Hawaii the more democratic attributes they had learned under Wist, such as innovation, creativity, leadership, etc. Yet the leadership of Hawaii still lacked the confidence in individual teacher's ability to provide for the educational needs of the next generation. Therefore public schools remained and continue today under the control of the few, not of the many.

What happened to the progressive movement in regards to expanding democracy in education toward local control of the schools? Why did Wist and his contemporaries fail to carry through with total democratic reforms in education? In the end were the reformers of education, especially those promoting change at the normal school, satisfied with the professional development of the role of teacher only to enhance their own position of power within the oligarchy? Did the public school classroom teacher reap the financial/status benefits that the faculty and administration of the normal school/university achieved? Did the public school student of the 1920's, 1930's and beyond learn the lesson of democracy or did they find schooling as a means of achieving success only to gain economic status so they could emulate the oligarchy? Is Hawaii's lack of support of public schools in the 1980's

more closely aligned to oligarchical standards or more democratic ones? In short, was the influence of the normal school under Wist short-sighted, limited, and short-lived in the total scheme of democratic reform? These and other questions are important to the story of Hawaii's educational history and future. Further research on the continuing story of public teacher education between 1931 and the present are strongly recommended.

Today Hawaii stands as the only state in the union that has totally centralized education. In the 1980's the other states are emulating Hawaii in the direction of more centralized state control of education. The quality of teacher education is the driving force behind this movement.

At the beginning of the normal school idea in the United States, educational reformers had to convince the American public that teachers needed special schooling for their task. This concept was hard fought and won. It was soon thereafter that educational reformers tried to convince the American public that the more schooling a teacher received, the better the teacher's performance in the classroom would become. This assumption was easily accepted by Americans who had always believed that education was good in and of itself. More was better. Educators also saw the opportunity to improve their own status by requiring more schooling for entry level positions. Thus normal schools became teachers' colleges and/or part of universities. Degrees replaced diplomas

and presently masters degrees are being proposed as a requirement for entry level positions in teaching.

As educators expanded their educational horizons, the American public on one hand continued to support the assumption that more schooling made a better teacher. Yet on the other hand, there continued to be a historical lack of confidence in the classroom teacher to totally direct the education of the next generation. This was demonstrated in Hawaii as a long and continuing tradition of centralized public education on all levels, and in the United States as a whole by the trend toward more and more centralized control of education through the passage of laws, creation of boards, and initiation of educational programs at the local, state, and federal levels in recent history.

Federal involvement in education expanded in many areas during the 1970's. During this decade new programs were established at the federal level, for example, vocational education, special programs for the handicapped, bilingual programs, new science curriculum, program for out of school youth, adult and continuing education, and special needs of minority students. Federal requirements helped reshape school practices throughout the nation.<sup>2</sup>

In the 1980's trends have been away from federal intervention yet the state governments have been strengthened as a result. The federal government has

given the states the authority to dispense federal funds to local boards. Accountability and minimum levels of competency have strengthened state educational agencies.

The local boards and school administrations have been tremendously expanded to accommodate these state programs and regulations. For example, one school district in Virginia employed forty people in administration earning \$320,352 in the 1960's. Those numbers have ballooned to 105 employees drawing \$2.5 million in salaries and wages in the 1980's.<sup>3</sup> Yet during the same twenty year period the percentage of teachers with less than a bachelor's degree has decreased from 14.6% to 0.4%. The percentage of teachers with a master's degree has increased from 23.1% to 49.3%.<sup>4</sup>

However, criticism of the public schools, teachers, and teacher educators has continued to mount. Starting in this decade with 'A Nation at Risk'<sup>5</sup> followed by report upon report from task forces wrestling with the problem of how to improve all three. Some studies include, The Paideia Proposal,<sup>6</sup> the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Foundation, the Governors' Commission on Education, and most recently, Secretary Bennetts' James Madison High School.

The major goals of present day teacher education reformers, the Holmes Group, are to improve American public schools by providing the nation with (classroom) teachers who have all the attributes of a genuine

professional - including prestige, high earnings, and autonomy - that accrue to competent people who are engaged in important matters that are beyond the talent and training of the ordinary person.<sup>7</sup> To achieve these goals the reformers conclude that teacher education must change. The changes proposed are the elimination of the bachelor's degree in education and a requirement for graduate work after four years of liberal education for entry level positions, much like the medical profession. These groups also propose that the public schools must change to accommodate the academic advancement of the teaching profession. The Holmes Group and the Carnegie Foundation have both proposed differentiating the roles of teachers in schools. They foresee a teaching hierarchy that would include a career professional, professional teacher, and instructor teacher. The graduated levels parallel those of qualified physician, resident, and intern. These groups also see the development of "clinical schools" or "professional development schools" to serve the same functions in education as a teaching hospital in medicine. Clearly the model was developed to emulate that of the more prestigious profession of medicine in order to gain the same status for teachers. The major tenet of these reforms are again based on the assumptions that if the teacher gains higher social status and more schooling, good teaching practices will automatically follow.

There is evidence to suggest that higher degrees for teachers serve the purpose of advancing the status of the education profession rather than the actual act of teaching. It is time to reflect on and evaluate the basic assumptions that form the basis for teacher education reform.

Does more schooling produce better teachers? Not according to an American public that continues to place restrictions on the public school teacher regardless of the amount of schooling he or she obtains. And not according to most practices in most American school districts that reward more schooling with promotion out of the classroom. The rhetoric of teacher reform is not reflecting the reality of the public school situation. Perhaps it is not simply more schooling that is needed but a different type of schooling. Perhaps a schooling that will ensure that the profession of education will recognize that good teaching should be rewarded with more challenging teaching roles, not administrative ones.

The normal school model, in the Wist tradition, may very well be part of the solution to persisting educational problems. First, the normal school, at the beginning, prepared teachers for the elementary schools. Preparation of secondary teachers was the responsibility of colleges and universities. In educators' zeal for professional status, elementary and secondary teachers have been grouped together. All endeavors to reform

education have treated the two equally. Yet their missions and required curriculum on the college/university level are quite different. The preparation of the elementary teacher stresses pedagogical education while the secondary teachers' emphasis lies in the content area. Perhaps it is time to require entry level preparation to mirror task requirements.

Prepare the secondary teacher at the college/university level with all that those institutions have to offer in regards to content area. Perhaps, as the Holmes Group suggests, graduate level education courses are required to insure entry level qualifications. But for the elementary teachers, the assumption can be made that they have mastered the content area taught in the elementary grades by graduating from an accredited high school. Therefore, a two year program of pedagogy would suffice for entry level positions.

Second, the normal school reviewed the "common branches of knowledge", in other words, the elementary school curriculum. The normal school model would serve to ensure the elementary school teacher knew the basics of the elementary school curriculum.

Third, the normal school model placed great emphasis on practice teaching. It maintained its own model or practice schools. These adjunct schools were staffed with practice teachers that were screened for their competency in the classroom and were to serve as exemplars to the

pre-service teacher. Here the pre-service teacher would have intensive immersion in classroom skills. The product of normal school type preparation would be teachers who would be para-professionals ready for entry level positions in the elementary schools.

This para-professional status would fit well in the proposals made by the Holmes Group to differentiate the role of the teacher in the schools. The instructor teacher would be a person whose ultimate career aspirations lie elsewhere, would teach for a few years. . . .<sup>8</sup> The professional teacher would be an autonomous teacher in the classroom. The career professional would be people capable of assuming not only full responsibility for the classroom but also for certain aspects of administration of the school. . . .<sup>9</sup> The Holmes Group recognizes the need for differentiating the positions of the work place but fails to differentiate the entry level requirements, insisting that all new teachers obtain a graduate degree.

It is unrealistic to expect pre-service teachers with graduate degrees to fill the position of instructor teacher with para-professional status. Yet the position of instructor teacher is badly needed to help induct new members into the profession. Therefore the revitalization of the normal school preparation could be seen as a viable avenue for providing instructor teachers. It would follow that the professional teacher would be one that

has gone on for a degree after experiencing a para-professional stage. The career professional would be a teacher with an advanced degree and experiences as a para-professional and autonomous classroom teacher. The career professional would then assume the responsibility for the elementary classroom taught by instructor teachers. Therefore the normal school model would be added to enhance the role of the teacher in the classroom while ensuring the nation's schools would be staffed with teachers whose success in the classroom along with advanced schooling are the avenues to advancement in the teaching profession.

Reinstatement of the normal school model, for entry level positions only, may serve to solve many of the problems facing public education in America today. First, it would provide the needed teachers for school systems that are facing teacher shortages. Second, it would reduce the cost of education to the taxpayers, as para-professionals would demand less pay. Third, it would provide the experience for those who are unsure if they truly desire a career in the classroom to make that all-important decision. Fourth, it would attract those teachers who would aspire to career professional or professional teachers by giving them the opportunity to advance in the profession through teaching (not administration) and the opportunity to choose classroom autonomy or supervision of para-professionals.

Surely the revival of the normal school model would not be welcomed by those in the profession. To many it may well be construed as a step backward professionally because it breaks with the tradition of advancing teachers' degree requirements, even when the advanced degrees may only be serving to advance the social status of educators rather than the actual act of classroom teaching. It may be time to abandon the idea that length of schooling of teachers is a measure of their success in the classroom.

The investigation of the contributions of the normal school might also prevent educators from reinventing the wheel. Many of the 'new' ideas for teacher education are not new to the normal school.

The clinical school idea of the Holmes Group is not a new idea. The normal school created and maintained well staffed and supervised practice schools throughout its history. In Hawaii Dumas, Wood, and especially Wist devoted a great deal of time and effort towards this end. Perhaps, instead of looking to the profession of medicine for examples of 'clinical schools', educational reformers should reinvestigate the normal school's practice school and learn from them.

Today educational reformers are seeking a national certification board so they may claim control over those who teach in the nation's schools. Yet as educational reformers believe this is a new idea they fail to see the

normal school's contributions to a self-monitoring profession. For example, Wist required recommendations for pre-service teachers from the rank and file of teacher in the field. This process not only enhanced the selection of students for the normal school, but more importantly it included those teachers in-service in controlling their own profession. This process deserves a second look as an alternative or at least an addition to a national certification board. A national certification board would only contribute to the centralization of education by ensuring that educational decisions would flow from the top down, again usurping the status of the classroom teacher.

The normal school may have other contributions to today's schools. For example, the normal school view of a potentially successful teacher was much broader than GPA and test scores required today. What might be viewed as naive today was Edgar Wood's idea of social intelligence as a major characteristic of the classroom teacher. Yet research reveals that there may indeed be many more intelligences than revealed by the narrow testing of today's youth reveals. If this proves to be true then recruitment of future teachers may rely on a much broader basis of selection. Are there other avenues of reform that the study of the normal school might bring to light?

The point is that investigation of the normal school has and will continue to yield many 'new' ideas for

today's policy makers and reformers of teacher education programs. The history of the normal school cannot be discounted by today's reformers simply because it is not in line with the academic goals educators have set for themselves to improve the social status of teachers on the assumption that good classroom teaching practices will follow. Perhaps the teaching profession can finally abandon its desire to emulate the profession of medicine and look to its own roots, the American normal school, as a partial solution to the nagging problem of modern day public education.

NOTES

CHAPTER EIGHT

<sup>1</sup>Hawaii Young People No. 1 (March 1897), p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>Armstrong, David and Kenneth Henson & Tom Savage, Education: An Introduction. (MacMillan Publishing Co., New York, 1985), p. 62.

<sup>3</sup>Tales Out of School, p. 178-179.

<sup>4</sup>Armstrong, p. 169.

<sup>5</sup>"A Nation at Risk", Final Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, (Washington D. C.: United States Department of Education, April 1983).

<sup>6</sup>Mortimer J. Adler, The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1982).

<sup>7</sup>Frank Murray, "Goals for the Reform of Teacher Education: An Executive Summary of the Holmes Group Report," Phi Delta Kappa, September 1986, p. 28.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Published Sources

#### Books

- Alexander, Mary C., and Charlotte P. Dodge. Punahou 1841-1941. Berkley: University of California Press, 1941.
- Bailyn, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.
- Borrowman, Merle L. The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education. New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1956.
- Callahan, Raymond. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Crawford, Davis L. Paradox in Hawaii. Boston: The Stradford Co., Pub., 1933.
- Cremin, Lawrence. The Transformation of the School. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961.
- Cubberly, Ellwood P. Public Education in the United States. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.
- Curti, Merle. Social Ideas of American Educators. New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1959.
- Daws, Gavan. Shoal of Time. New York: MacMillan Co., 1968.
- Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1930.
- Dunkel, Harold. Herbart and Herbartianism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Herbart and Herbartianism: An Educational Ghost Story. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Elsbree, Willard S. The American Teacher. New York: American Book Company, 1939.

- Fuchs, Lawrence. Hawaii Pono. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1961.
- Gillet, Margaret. A History of Education. Totonto: McGraw Hill, 1966.
- Hofstader, Richard. The Age of Reform. New York: Vintage Books, 1955.
- Hofstader, Richard. ed. The Progressive Movement: 1900-1915. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963.
- King Kamehameha IV. Roster of Legislature of Hawaii. Ed. Robert C. Lydecker. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., 1918.
- Kuykendall, Ralph S., and A. Grove Day. Hawaii: A History. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Lind, Andrew W. An Island Community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Mangun, Vernon. The American Normal School. Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1928.
- Mattingly, Paul. Historical Inquiry in Education. Ed. John Hardin Best. Washington, D.C.: The American Educational Research Association, 1983.
- Men of Hawaii. Territory of Hawaii: Honolulu Star Bulletin, 1921.
- Meyer, Adolphe E. An Educational History of the Western World, Second Edition. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1972.
- Morgan, Edmond. The Puritan Family. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1944.
- Nellist, George F., ed. The Builders of Hawaii. Territory of Hawaii: Honolulu Star Bulletin, Ltd., 1925.
- Parker, Francis W. "Notes on Talks to Teachers" (1882). Rpt. in Alexander Ripa, ed. Educational Ideas in America. New York: David McKay Company, 1969.
- Perkin, H. J. The Varieties of History. Ed. Fritz Stern. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.
- Tanner, Daniel, and Laurel Tanner. Curriculum Development. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.

Wist, Benjamin. The Cadet. Honolulu 1924.

\_\_\_\_\_. A Century of Public Education in Hawaii.  
Honolulu: Hawaii Educational Review, 1941.

### Journals

Hawaii's Young People. 1 (March 1897), p. 8.

MacNaught, Commissioner. 'Annual Report Commissioner of Elementary Education.' Hawaiian Educational Review, 7 (1919), 7-8.

Peavey, George. 'Act to Establish Teachers' College as Discussed by Representative Smith in Interview.' Oahu Teachers' Association Journal. (April 1929), 7.

Peterson, Francis E. 'Territorial Normal School Extension Service.' Hawaii Educational Review, 8, No. 8 (April 1925), 172-174.

Rudy, Willis. 'From Normal School to Multi-Purpose College.' History of Education Quarterly (Summer 1980), 241-246.

Social Process in Hawaii, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, Vol. 29, 1982.

Talbot, John. 'The History of Education.' Daedalus (Winter 1971), 133-150.

Wist, Benjamin. 'Administrative Organization of the Territorial Normal School.' Hawaii Educational Review, 7, No. 8 (April 1924), 134-135.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Teacher Training in Hawaii.' Oahu Teachers' Association Journal (May 1929), 2, 16.

### Newspapers

The Friend, December 1928, pp. 299-300.

\_\_\_\_\_, September 1921, p. 200.

Honolulu Star Bulletin, 13 June 1930, p. 1, col. 6-7.

\_\_\_\_\_, 19 August 1930, p. 1, col. 1.

\_\_\_\_\_, 8 April 1931, p. 4.

\_\_\_\_\_, 24 April 1931, p. 1, col. 2.

- \_\_\_\_\_, 26 April 1931, p. 1, col. 2.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 1 September 1931, p. 1, col. 1.  
Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 4 March 1895, p. 4.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 6 April 1896, p. 4.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 20 August 1896, p. 6.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 19 May 1898, p. 6.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 1 July 1898, p. 7.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 12 July 1898, p. 4.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 27 July 1898, p. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 30 July 1898, p. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 9 August 1898, p. 5.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 12 August 1898, p. 4, col. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 15 August 1898, p. 2, col. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 27 August 1898, p. 5.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 7 December 1898, p. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 23 December 1898, p. 6, col. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2 May 1900, p. 9, col. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 14 June 1900, p. 6, col. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 16 February 1901, p. 11, col. 3.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 18 May 1901, p. 4, col. 2.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 10 July 1903, p. 4, col. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 15 January 1904, p. 4, col. 2.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 22 January 1904, p. 6, col. 3.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 17 April 1904, p. 5, col. 2.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 22 April 1904, p. 7, col. 1.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 18 March 1905, p. 5, col. 2.

- \_\_\_\_\_, 5 May 1905, p. 8, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 10 February 1906, p. 5, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 25 February 1906, p. 4, col. 3-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 6 March 1906, p. 3, col. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 10 March 1906, p. 3, col. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 29 May 1906, p. 10, col. 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 5 June 1906, p. 8, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 7 July 1909, p. 11, col. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 29 November 1910, p. 4, col. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 23 January 1912, p. 4, col. 6-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 26 January 1912, p. 1, sec.2, col. 1-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 24 May 1912, p. 1, col. 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 3 December 1912, p. 5, col. 1-2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 4 December 1912, p. 5, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 9 January 1913, p. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 21 March 1913, p. 9, col. 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 24 March 1913, p. 4, col. 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 4 April 1913, p. 5, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 24 April 1913, p. 1, col. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 25 April 1913, p. 9, col. 2-3.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 26 April 1913, p. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 27 April 1913, p. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 29 April 1913, p. 1, col. 2-3.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 18 July 1913, p. 9, col. 1.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 17 July 1914, p. 2, col. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 16 June 1916, p. 2, col. 5.

- \_\_\_\_\_, 25 August 1916, p. 2, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 9 January 1918, p. 1.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 16 April 1919, p. 3, col. 1.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 23 April 1919, p. 4, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 29 June 1919, p. 4, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 3 July 1919, p. 4, col. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 10 July 1919, p. 4, col. 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 16 July 1919, p. 2, col. 1-2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 21 July 1919, p. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 23 July 1919, p. 2, col. 3-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 14 August 1919, p. 4, col. 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 18 September 1919, p. 2, col. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 29 November 1919, p. 4, col. 1-2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 18 December 1919, p. 2, col. 2-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 15 June 1920, p. 1, sec. 2, col. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 10 June 1920, p. 4, col. 1-2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 11 June 1920, p. 5, col. 1.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 19 May 1921, p. 1, col. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 20 May 1921, p. 1, col. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 16 June 1921, p. 1, sec. 2, col. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 19 June 1921, p. 1, sec. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 15 August 1921, p. 1, sec. 2, col. 7.

#### Others

Atkinson, Atatau T. "Opening Address Delivered Before the Teachers and Pupils of the Summer Normal School."  
Honolulu: Hawaii Star Press, 1901.

Frear, Walter, "Statement of Results of School Investigation by Governor." Hawaiian Pacific Collection. University of Hawaii, 1913.

Stueber, Ralph K. "An Informal History of Schooling in Hawaii." To Teach the Children. Honolulu: Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, 1981.

Government Documents

U. S. Bureau of Education. Report to the Commissioner of Education 1884-1885. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1885.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Inception and the Progress of the American Normal School Curriculum to 1889." Commissioners Report on Education 1888-1889. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1889.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Rise and Growth of the Normal-School Idea in the United States. Circular of Information No. 8, (by J. P. Gordy). Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1891.

\_\_\_\_\_. Report of the Commissioner of Education 1896-1897. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1897.

\_\_\_\_\_. Report of the Commissioner of Education 1899-1900. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1900.

\_\_\_\_\_. City Training Schools for Teachers. Bulletin #47. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1915.

\_\_\_\_\_. Problems Involved in Standardizing State Normal Schools. Bulletin #12, (by Charles H. Judd and Samuel Parker). Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1915.

\_\_\_\_\_. Survey of Education in Hawaii. Bulletin #16. Washington D.C: GPO, 1920.

Hawaii (Republic). Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education to the Legislature of the Republic of Hawaii 1894-1895. Honolulu: Hawaii Star Gazette Co., Print, 1896.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Civil Laws of the Hawaiian Islands. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1897.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education to the Legislature of the Republic of Hawaii 1897-1898. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1899.

- Hawaii (Territory). Report of the Minister of Public Instruction for the Biennial Period Ending December 31, 1899. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1900.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1900. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Print, 1901.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1902. Honolulu: The Bulletin Print Company, 1903.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1904. Honolulu: The Bulletin Print Company, 1905.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1906. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Company, Ltd., 1907.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1908. Honolulu: Bulletin Publishing Company, Ltd., 1909.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1910. Honolulu: Hawaiian Star Print, 1911.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1912. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd., 1913.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1914. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd., 1915.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1916. Honolulu: The New Freedom Press, 1917.
- 
- . Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1918. Honolulu: The New Freedom Press, 1919.

\_\_\_\_\_. Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the Year Ending December 31, 1920. Honolulu: The New Freedom Press, 1921.

\_\_\_\_\_. Hawaii's Public Schools Being the Biennial Report of the Department of Public Instruction 1921-1922. Honolulu: Advertiser Print Company, Ltd., 1923.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biennial Report to the Governor and Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii. Honolulu: 1924.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biennial Report of the Department of Public Instruction of the Territory of Hawaii. Honolulu: 1926.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biennial Report of the Department of Public Instruction of the Territory of Hawaii. Honolulu: 1928.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biennial Report of the Department of Public Instruction of the Territory of Hawaii. Honolulu: 1930.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Education 1895-1931." Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.

\_\_\_\_\_. Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii 1907-1931." Honolulu: Office of Regents, University of Hawaii.

#### Unpublished Sources

##### Letters

College Club. Letter to Governor Lucius Pinkam. 1916. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.

Dean of Women. Letter to Miss Edith Thoene. 29 January 1925. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives. Benjamin Wist Collection.

Dumas, James L. Letter to Minister and Commissioners of Education. 2 September 1897. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.

Gibson, T. H. Letter to Willis T. Pope. 18 September 1912. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.

- Kaya, Monroe. Letter to Benjamin Wist. 8 July 1922.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection.
- Kinney, Henry. Letter "To the Teachers of the Department  
of Public Instruction." September 1914.  
Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Governor Lucius Pinkam. 27 March  
1914. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Governor Lucius Pinkam. 21 January  
1918. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- MacCaughey, Vaughn. Letter to Governor Charles McCarthy.  
19 November 1920. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- Pope, Willis T. Letter to W. Copeland. 31 January 1912.  
Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Board of Education. September  
1912. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- Wist, Benjamin. Letter to Monroe Kaya. 21 July 1922.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii. Benjamin Wist  
Collection.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Vaughn MacCaughey. 2 October 1922.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Superintendent Givens.  
18 September 1923. Honolulu: University of  
Hawaii Archives. Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Miss Elizabeth Snell. 24 March  
1924. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Professor Symond. 22 October 1924.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Interscholastic League. 7 December  
1924. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Mr. Kunishi. 12 February 1925.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to W. W. Kemp. 26 November 1926.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection

- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to B. B. Taylor. 5 February 1927.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to W. W. Kemp. 29 April 1927.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to W. W. Kemp. 17 July 1927.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to a former student. 9 September 1927.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Frederick Whitney. 19 March 1928.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to David Kalaaua. 15 February 1929.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to W. W. Kemp. 23 November 1929.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Charlotte Turner. 10 January 1930.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Ralph Silverman. 31 January 1930.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to W. W. Kemp. 2 November 1930.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Monroe Kaya. 12 March 1931.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Glen Woods. 4 May 1931. Honolulu:  
University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- Wood, Edgar. Letter to Superintendent Pope. 15 February  
1912. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Superintendent Pope. 10 May 1912.  
Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Willis T. Pope. 16 September 1912.  
Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Willis T. Pope. 20 October 1912.  
Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Dr. Frank Bunker. 19 January 1920.  
Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Superintendent Vaughn MacCaughey.  
19 January 1920. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Governor Charles McCarthy. 27  
27 October 1920. Honolulu: Hawaii State Archives.

Other

- Carr, Elizabeth. 'Interview with Mrs. Benjamin O. Wist.'  
1967. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- Clopton, Robert W. 'The Christianization of Hawaii Viewed  
as a Social Movement.' Xerox, 1939.
- Fry, John. 'Edgar Wood and the Territorial Normal and  
Training School: A Source of Americanization 1900-  
1921.' Thesis, University of Hawaii, 1969.
- Iwamoto, Ron. 'Territorial Normal and Training School:  
The Perceptions of One Graduate, Mrs. Ruth (Yokochi)  
Iwamoto.' Unpublished Oral Interview, 1981.
- Lechter, George T. 'Lahainaluna 1831-1937.' Thesis,  
University of Hawaii, 1938.
- Lopes, Harold. 'Principal's Recommendation.' 1926.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Archives.  
Benjamin Wist Collection
- Shaw, Ruth. 'The Output of the Territorial Normal and  
Training School.' Thesis, University of Hawaii,  
1929.
- Stueber, Ralph K. 'Hawaii: A Case Study in Developmental  
Education 1778-1960.' Diss. University of  
Wisconsin, 1964.
- Thomas, Lawrence. 'Identifying Significant Educational  
Variables.' Xerox. n.d.
- Townsend, Henry. 'Hawaii: Education in the 'Nineties.'  
Unpublished Brochure, n. d.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Education in Hawaii.' (1898). Cited by  
Ralph K. Stueber. 'Hawaii: A Case Study in  
Developmental Education 1778-1960.' Diss.  
University of Wisconsin, 1964.