uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES ET POSTOCTORALES

uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSDOCTORAL STUDIES

Ada Aizenberg
AUTEUR DE LA THÈSE / AUTHOR OF THESIS

M.A. (Education)
GRADE / DEGREE

Faculty of Education
FACULTÉ, ÉCOLE, DÉPARTEMENT / FACULTY, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT

From Kindergartners to Kindergarten Teachers: The Compromise of a Profession in Late Nineteenth Century Ontario

TITRE DE LA THÈSE / TITLE OF THESIS

Timothy Stanley
DIRECTEUR (DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS SUPERVISOR

CO-DIRECTEUR (CO-DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS CO-SUPERVISOR

Lorna McLean

Sharon Cook

Gary W. Slater
Le Doyen de la Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales / Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

From Kindergartners to Kindergarten Teachers: The Compromise of a Profession in Late Nineteenth-Century Ontario

Ada Aizenberg

Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the MA degree in Education

Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa

© Ada Aizenberg, Ottawa, Canada, 2009

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-65493-4
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-65493-4

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the professional status of women kindergartners in Ontario in the late nineteenth- early twentieth century, by exploring the origins of the Kindergarten and the transformations that occurred to this system as it integrated into the provincially-controlled public education system.

The masculine nature of the professions in nineteenth century, together with the gendered ideology that made the care of young children women's work, is critical to understanding what happened to the kindergartners as they moved from women-run private institutions to male run institutions of education in Ontario. This thesis examines the position, training, and inspection, of kindergartners in the provincial education system of nineteenth-century Ontario, while at the same time analyzing the meaning that "profession" had, together with its gendered and class connotations, and how this influenced the status of the kindergartners. I argue that kindergartening was a specialized profession when it was first introduced to Ontario in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and that the entry into the already existing teaching hierarchy, with its gendered social relations, began a process of de-professionalization, as control over the training of the new kindergarten teachers, as well as the support provided thereafter, moved from the hands of expert, professional women kindergartners into the hands of male government officials at the Ministry of Education.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii
CONTENTS iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v
INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

ONE METHODOLOGY, LITERATURE REVIEW, AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK 7
- Methodology and Primary Sources 7
- Literature Review 10
- Profession 18
- Gender 24
- Kindergarten 27
- Conceptual Framework 31

TWO HISTORICAL CONTEXT: THE RISE OF KINDERGARTEN AND MASS PUBLIC EDUCATION 33
- Government Controlled Schooling in Nineteenth-Century Ontario 36
- Kindergarten as Part of Wider Social Reforms 40
- Kindergartner's Training at the End of the Nineteenth Century 42
- Feminization of Teaching 46
- Women Entering the Professions 49
- Summary 51

THREE INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION: MAKING PLACE FOR THE KINDERGARTEN SYSTEM 53
- Teachers' Associations 53
- The Normal School as a Professionalization Tool 56
- Establishment of the Public Kindergarten in Ontario 57
- Professional Hierarchy: The Model School System 62
- Kindergarten Teaching as a Speciality 65
- The Kindergarten Teacher 69

FOUR THE INSTITUTION IN MOTION: DECLINE OF A PROFESSION 73
The Educational Institution of Ontario: Hierarchical Design 73
Inspectoral Control 76
Rise and Fall of a Specialized Kindergarten Inspectorate 81
A Shift in Focus: A Move from Quality to Quantity 89

CONCLUSION 97

BIBLIOGRAPHY 103

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first and foremost like to thank the two most important people in my life, my children, for being so patient and understanding throughout this journey. I am so proud of you both.

I am very grateful to my thesis advisor, Dr. Timothy J. Stanley, for believing in me even when I had doubts, and for his wonderful use of humour as encouragement. I also would like to thank the committee members, Dr. Sharon A. Cook who motivated me to delve into this research and Dr. Lorna McLean for her elucidating comments. You all inspired me with your commitment, energy, knowledge, and love of research.

I am grateful to my parents whose extended visits took over the everyday care of home and family, which allowed me to concentrate on my work with a clear mind, and to my sister-in-law who took time to edit my early drafts, and provided me with food-for-thought.

And finally I owe a great deal of thanks to my husband, for "nagging" me to sit and write in my moments of procrastination, and for providing me with time and space to do so. Your support and love mean so much to me.

INTRODUCTION

Today's public kindergarten is an official part of the primary division within the Ontario public education system. It is "designed as the foundation for a continuum of learning from Kindergarten to Grade 8."[1] The Ontario kindergarten curriculum stresses that this program should be "developmentally appropriate" to promote "positive outcomes for all children."[2] Kindergarten is then the entry level to a fourteen year school system which takes into account the different developmental stages of childhood, and the importance of addressing those accordingly. Although the kindergarten is unquestionably a part of the public education system, it is also very much an entity on its own. This is an argument neither for nor against the way the system is currently organized in Ontario, but rather one that brings focus to an existing tension whereby kindergartens seem to both fit and not fit within the school system as it is at present. It is set aside by what may seem to be superficial differences, such as its name, its length of day, and its specific (and separate) curriculum document, but is in fact a result of social, political, and economic decisions made throughout the history of the kindergarten system in Ontario.

The term 'kindergarten' alone distinguishes it from the rest of the school system, as children do not go to school from grade one to grade fourteen, but rather they spend the first two years in the kindergarten, and then enter the twelve grades of school. Unlike grades one to eight, kindergarten is not mandatory, and is offered as a half day program in most English public

---

[1] Ontario Ministry of Education, *The Kindergarten Program* (Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2006), 5. The publication is available on the Ministry of Education's website, at http://www.edu.gov.on.ca.

[2] Ibid., 2.

schools in Ontario. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education's curriculum for kindergarten is a separate document that is organized differently from the curriculum documents for grades one to eight, which are grouped together as a continuum, based on subjects. The kindergarten curriculum is presented in one document, *The Kindergarten Program*, that includes all the teachable subjects within it: Personal and Social Development, Language, Mathematics, Science and Technology, Health and Physical Activity, and The Arts.[3] On the other hand, the Curriculum for grades one to eight appears together in several separate documents, each under the heading of the teachable subject, such as: *The arts*, *French As a Second Language*, *Health and Physical Education*, *Language*, *Mathematics*, *Science and Technology*, and *Social Studies/History and Geography*.[4]

Although there are obvious differences that set the kindergarten aside from the rest of the public school system, kindergarten teachers today are trained in the same manner as all primary, and some junior teachers are. They are trained as generalists to teach children from junior kindergarten up to grade six. My own path to becoming a kindergarten teacher led me to an eight months Bachelor of Education program, which in turn granted me an Ontario teacher's certificate for the Primary/Junior Divisions, as well as membership in the Ontario College of Teachers, the regulatory body for the teaching profession in Ontario since 1997. Throughout this experience I began to question a number of the practices I encountered, such as the two-and-a-half hour kindergarten day that exists in most of the English public schools in Ontario, and the quality and

---

[3] Ibid., 30-56.

[4] See Ontario Ministry of Education. Curriculum Documents. http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/subjects.html (accessed August 26, 2009).

effectiveness of the training to becoming a teacher, specifically a kindergarten teacher. After I received my teaching certificate I felt uncomfortable with my newly gained 'professional' status. I strongly believe it is not possible to give the necessary amount of theoretical and practical attention to the needs of a kindergarten child in such a short time, especially as it is combined with becoming a teacher for six other grades. And the fact that to be a kindergarten specialist one needs to take a number of additional qualification programs only supports this claim, because after all should one not be a specialist in order to be professional? In today's reality, a public school kindergarten teacher is not required to take those additional courses (it is a matter of choice), as they are not part of the teacher's original education and training. To gain an understanding of this process demanded research into the origins of the kindergarten system with a focus on the qualifications of its teachers. This type of research is also called for by Gordon Cleveland et al., who reviewed the state of early childhood learning and development in Ontario at the start of the twenty first century. They stressed the need to determine what practices work best to facilitate children's development, and the need for further research on the education and training of staff. They also focus on topics likely to inform the development of policy and programs in Canada, such as research on the integration of kindergarten into the public school system, a system whose quality depends on the availability and capability of its teaching personnel.[5] This thesis concentrates on the specialization of the early kindergartners who paved the way for kindergarten education to be available to all children in Ontario. Without them there would be no kindergartens.

---

[5] Gordon Cleveland, et al, *A Review of the State of the Field of Early Childhood Learning and Development in Child Care, Kindergarten and Family Support Programs* (Canadian Council on Learning, 2006).

The route to becoming a certified, public kindergarten teacher in Ontario today began over one hundred years ago. Matters such as women's positions in the labour force, the influence of the two World Wars, changing views of child culture and the increased interest in child psychology and child development, all contributed to the changes that occurred in this profession, much of which remain outside the realm of this thesis, as it is limited by the available time and the scope required for it. It was as early as 1881 that the Ontario Teachers' Association (OTA) - an association that according to Gidney and Millar represented the voice of the educated elite[6] - passed a resolution urging that "all Normal School students [should] receive training in the principles and practices of kindergarten work."[7] This was before kindergartens entered the Ontario public education system. It was at a time when high regard was developing for the kindergarten system, among the educated elite, and the belief that its principles and practices should be used as a base for all teaching and learning was encouraged.

Preliminary research into the origins of the kindergarten system and the training of the kindergartners who ran them, brought forth a different set of requirements than we have today for one's certification. The original route to become a kindergartner was more rigorous, and had a more 'specialized' tint to it, both in its theoretical and practical requirements. Furthermore, I argue in this thesis that the early kindergartners were well educated, and though unrecognized at the time, they were professional women. Changes to their specialization began with the entry of

---

[6] Robert D.Gidney, and Winnifred P. J. Millar, *Professional Gentlemen: The Professions in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Toronto: OHSS, 1994), 234.

[7] Minutes of the Twenty First Annual Convention of the Ontario Teachers' Association, Toronto, August 1881, Archives of Ontario Microfilm, Amicus # 12169826, p.12 (hereafter cited as Minutes of the OTA). The OTA and who it represented is further discussed in CHAPTER THREE of this thesis.

the kindergartens into the provincially controlled public school system, and with the move of the kindergartners' training from private institutions to provincially controlled institutions for teacher's training. Although both systems were run by upper-middle-class individuals from the educational elite, the original private institutions were run primarily by upper-middle-class women, who were themselves kindergartners, while the provincially controlled institutions were run primarily by upper-middle-class men.

The argument central to this thesis is based my research, in which I explored the following questions:

(1) Was the kindergartner a profession in nineteenth century Ontario, and if so, did it remain such as Kindergartens were integrated into the government-controlled school system?

(2) How did gender and social class shape who taught kindergarten, their training and education, as well as how they were supervised, and how did these change over time?

This thesis examines the type of education/knowledge that was required to become a kindergarten teacher, the length of the kindergarten program and how theory and practice were implemented, the training of a kindergarten teacher compared to that of the primary teacher, what the certification process entailed, who the decision-makers were with respect to the kindergarten program and its graduates, and finally the role of the supervisory bodies within the Ontario public education system as they related to the kindergartners and their specialization.

Consistent with current research on social relations and women, specifically women in the professions, this thesis examines the process of professionalization, or de-professionalization of the kindergarten teacher in Ontario during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It

focuses on the kindergartners' loss of control of their professional direction, and the changes that took place as they became a part of the government-controlled teaching hierarchy. It exposes the countervailing tendencies of this process. By doing this, I hope to promote a discussion that will add to the re-thinking of the decisions made with respect to the implementation of the kindergarten teacher education program as it stands today.

CHAPTER ONE

METHODOLOGY, LITERATURE REVIEW, AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The central argument of this Thesis is that the early kindergartners were specialized professionals whose integration into the provincially-controlled education system of Ontario, lost them their status as such. I begin this chapter with a description of the methodology and sources I used to introduce and support this argument, and then move to discuss relevant literatures that expose the gendered nature of control over schooling in nineteenth-century Ontario. Finally, I present the three concepts that provide the framework to this research: (1) Profession; (2) Kindergarten; and (3) Gender.

Methodology and Primary Sources

This thesis is based on historical research, the study of change over time by putting particulars in context. It entails positioning the early kindergartners in the provincial education system of nineteenth-century Ontario. It concentrates on the reasons for the change in their professionalization process in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. This is done by analyzing a variety of documents, such as annual reports to the Minister of Education, inspectors' reports, and letters produced in Ontario by principals of the Normal Schools, superintendents and kindergarten inspectors who corresponded with each other in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, while positioning them in a specific context – that of the overall development and control of the Ontario education system of the time. They are examined for their significance as

social and historical documents. The focus of this research is as much on the textual primary sources, as on the contextual secondary sources, because being historical entails that the meaning needs to arise from the social understanding of that period of time, from the ways people understood it in the past.[1] Therefore, in this historical document analysis the history element provides the context, it provides a sense of the 'past' and with that, the ways in which the 'present' came about.[2] The primary documents situated in the social-historical context provide direct information from that past, leading to the analysis part that helps illustrate the nature of the process, as it proposes a meaning.

I analyzed the primary documents with the assumption of a specific understanding on the part of the audience they addressed, and it is these assumptions that I engaged with by employing my own cultural understanding (reflexivity), alongside an understanding of the context in which the documents were produced. The analysis entailed attending to each document's provenance, looking for information such as the type of document, its characteristics, its author/publisher, its audience, the date, and its purpose. On the level of content I focused upon relationship within the text, looking at the internal consistency of the document (external criticism), as well as its relationship to other texts (internal criticism), tracing continuity between the documents to understand how it relates to the larger issue. This process entailed repeated visits to the Archives of Ontario, as I developed an argument to account for what I found.

---

[1] Gidney and Millar 1994, *Professional Gentlemen*, xii.

[2] Tim May, *Social Research: Issues, Methods, and Process* (Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 2001), 207.

This research began with an exploration into the overall rise and development of the Ontario public education system of the nineteenth century, taking into account the social, political, and economic relations of the time. This is an important component of my thesis as it provides the contextual basis upon which the various documents were analysed. It is also important because the context provides information that helps to explain the changes that occur over time. In this case, it enables us to reflect on issues of the kindergarten teacher's occupation as it is today, and it is through the different 'voices' (the writers of the different documents), their views, recommendations, quests or arguments, within their social-historical context that an understanding of the professionalization (or de-professionalization) of the kindergarten teachers in nineteenth-century Ontario is introduced.

Using primary documents, I explore the intentions, regulations and actions of those in various positions of power in the Ontario education system while keeping in mind their gender, social class, and the already existing hierarchy they were a part of. These documents consist mainly of the RG-2 Education Papers files located in the Archives of Ontario in Toronto, which hold official records of provincial agencies that were made responsible for schools from the founding of the first Upper Canada Board of Education in 1824. They also include several Reports of the Minister of Education, a number of published articles and books written by prominent kindergarten supporters, and newspaper articles from the time.

The primary documents I used in this analysis were written as correspondence or reports to a specific audience, and are therefore an important source of data for providing the in-depth understanding of the subject at hand. In my analysis I assumed a specific social understanding on

the part of the audience they were written for and as recommended by Tim May, it is these assumptions that I engaged with by employing "reflexivity, [and my] own cultural understanding, alongside an understanding of the context in which the document was produced."[3] The documents provided me a window into the way people viewed this occupation, fought for its quality and its status, made accommodations in the process, and created it from its early days.

It is made clear, from the literature review that follows, that this system could be analyzed from different perspectives and focuses such as religion, race, social-class, or gender for example, and that its development and implementations varied across the country. For the purpose of understanding the kindergartners role as professionals, it is unmistakably called for an understanding of the role that gender played in this process, and limitations of space and time required me to limit my focus to that. I focus on the role of gender in this process of professionalization as women entered male-run institutions in Ontario, where public kindergarten originated in Canada.

Literature Review

Several historians of education discuss the educational reforms that occurred in the mid-to-late nineteenth century in Ontario, emphasizing the New Education Movement and the influence of child study on the education system.[4] The New Education Movement was created

---

[3] May, *Social Research*, 94.

[4] See Maria V. Pacini-Ketchabaw, "Young Children as 'Others:'Discourses Within the Ontario Child Care System, 1850-1940" (PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 2002); Paul

by followers of Froebel, the founder of the kindergarten, and one of his mentors, Pestalozzi, a Swiss educator, who was influenced greatly by Rousseau. The movement emphasized the importance of child development. They focussed on the individual child and stressed the importance of teaching the child through his/her own activity. Douglas A. Lawr, and Robert D. Gidney state that the Child Study Movement, which began in America in 1879, introduced a new interest in children, helping to understand them in new ways.[5] It recognized the needs and rights of individuals. Robert M. Stamp agrees that the roots of the 'New Education' could be traced to European education reformers such as Pestalozzi and Froebel, but adds that the source of immediate inspiration for the Ontario school reformers came from the United States, from individuals such as the psychologist G. Stanley Hall and the educational philosopher John Dewey who provided child study with a scientific base.[6] Stamp points to Hall's 1880 published article, *The Contents of Children's Minds upon Entering Schools*, in which he argues that his central thesis was that "young children have special characteristics which must be studied and appreciated before effective teaching and learning can take place."[7] He adds that Dewey's

---

Axelrod, *The Promise of Schooling: Education in Canada, 1800-1914* (Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1997); Bruce Curtis, *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871* (London, Ont.: Althouse Press: Falmer, 1988); Susan E. Houston, and Alison Prentice, *Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth-century Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988); George S. Tomkins, *A Common Countenance: Stability and Change in the Canadian Curriculum* (Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-hall Canada Inc., 1986); and Robert M. Stamp, *The Schools of Ontario, 1876-1976* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983).

[5] Douglas A. Lawr, and Robert D. Gidney, *Educating Canadians: a Documentary History of Public Education* (Toronto, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1973), 185.

[6] See Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*, 52.

[7] Ibid., 52. In 1894 Hall delivered a series of lectures on child study in Toronto, and the following year a child-study section was formed within the Ontario Educational Association. For

theories, published in his book, *Psychology*, introduced Ontario Normal School students to scientific psychology and child centered teaching methods.[8]

This new scientific focus is at the centre of Maria V. Pacini-Ketchabaw's thesis on young children in Ontario at that period. She illustrates how they became "objects of specialized knowledge ... [where] their whole nature, their bodies, and their minds were debated specifically in connection to what they could and could not accomplish."[9] She adds that experts accepted young children as different from adults, and that they acknowledged that there are different developmental stages. Here, Pacini-Ketchabaw further demonstrates Stamp's argument that the involvement of scientific based knowledge gave authority to viewing childhood as a special stage in development. This, in turn, supported the more child-centered teaching methods, and brought to focus the child's age when entering school. The fact, recorded by Susan E. Houston, and Alison Prentice, that in the second half of the nineteenth century more and more young children attended schools,[10] coupled with the increased understanding of child development contributed to the discussion regarding the appropriate age for participation within the Ontario school system.

---

more about Dewey and Hall also see Elizabeth D. Ross, *The Kindergarten Crusade: the Establishment of Preschool Education in the United States*. (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1976), 67-71.

[8] See Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*, 52. According to The Center for Dewey Studies in Southern Illinois University, Dewey published his first book, *Psychology* at 1887. And by1899 he published his first major work on education, *The School and Society*. See The Centre for Dewey Studies, Chronology of John Dewey's Life and work, http://www.siu.edu/~deweyctr/resources.htm#chronology or go directly to the pdf file at http://www.siu.edu/~deweyctr/CHRONO.pdf (accessed April 15, 2009).

[9] Pacini-Ketchabaw, "Young Children as Others," 60.

[10] Houston and Prentice, *Schooling and Scholars*, 210-214.

After the Annual Convention of the Ontario Teachers' Association in 1869, where "the knowledge constructed around the nature of young children was used to support the argument of their unsuitability for the methods used in elementary education,"[11] children aged five and under were excluded from the elementary school system. Pacini-Ketchabaw argues that this promoted their construction as a special focus group within the education system, and society at large.

The introduction of the kindergarten into Canada and its public school system is recorded in various ways. Some historians use a pedagogical point of view, while others take a more critical, socio-political stance. Barbara E. Corbett uses the pedagogical point of view to investigate the origins and practices of kindergarten. She focuses on the arrival of the Froebelian kindergarten into Canada, and the changes that took place in the curriculum of Ontario schools from 1887 to 1987.[13] She is a strong advocate of the Froebelian kindergarten herself and became the Director of both the Froebel Foundation and the Froebel Institute in Mississauga, Ontario in the early 1970s. Corbett's personal involvement with kindergartens and the philosophy of education in them brings forth a very supportive account of the need for them. Kari Dehli, on the other hand, has no specific interest in that philosophy and she looks at the development of kindergartens from the more critical, socio-political lense. She argues that "state formation, particularly in contexts of local educational politics and administration, was an important element in the institutionalization and popularization of kindergartens and their particular

[11] See Pacini-Ketchabaw, "Young Children as Others," 68; Houston and Prentice, *Schooling and Scholars*, 214.

[13] Barbara E. Corbett, *A Century of Kindergarten Education in Ontario, 1887 to 1987*. (Mississauga, Ont.: Froebel Foundation, 1989).

versions of moral regulation."[14] She also stresses the importance of the women who were "the active promoters, organizers and practitioners of kindergartens ... [and] saw themselves as part of a broad educational and social movement to extend the virtuous and moral influences of women."[15] Dehli focuses on the active position the creation of the kindergartner opened for women, a position of "a crusader on behalf of children in the public sphere,"[16] a position which developed in the second half of the nineteenth century; a time when there was an increased move from educating children by private or voluntary means towards state schooling of children.[17] While emphasizing women's forms of resistance that allowed for the establishment of the kindergartens, Dehli also stresses the regulatory role kindergartens then had on the lives of middle and working class women.

The position of the kindergartner was primarily, if not solely, occupied by women. Within the vast literature about the professionalization of occupations I did not encounter specific mention of the kindergartner, but rather a discussion of the teaching profession as a whole.[18] The literature introduces discussion regarding the feminization of the teaching

---

[14] Kari Dehli, "The Rule by Sympathy: the Feminizations of Pedagogy," *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 19, no.2 (1994): 196.

[15] Ibid., 206.

[16] Ibid., 207.

[17] See Robert D. Gidney and Winnifred P.J. Millar, "From Voluntarism to State Schooling: The Creation of the Public School System in Ontario," *Canadian Historical Review* LXVI, no. 4 (1995): 443-75.

[18] For literature about professions see for example Gidney and Millar 1994, *Professional Gentlemen*; Judith S. Glazer, "Feminism and Professionalism in Teaching and Educational Administration," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (August 1991): 321-42.; Ruby Heap, Wyn Millar and Elizabeth Smyth, eds. *Learning to Practise: Professional Education in*

occupation and the creation of a gendered hierarchy in its professionalization process; a hierarchy that no doubt influenced the kindergartner's status as it joined this profession, and became a kindergarten teacher, who taught the youngest and newest students. Alison Prentice makes it clear that the feminization of teaching does not refer to women's entry into the teaching occupation itself, as women were already the most common teachers in informal settings, but rather to their entry into the public space of teaching in the early nineteenth century, and to their becoming a majority among elementary school teachers by the third quarter of the nineteenth century. She argues that this change related to two educational campaigns under way at the time. The first promoted the idea of grades in the school system, with the goal of establishing a division of labour where well trained, experienced teachers would teach the advanced grades and the less well trained would teach the younger grades at lower rates of pay. The second was a campaign, led by schoolmen pursuing higher salaries to "raise the status of teaching as a profession."[19] Keeping this in mind, it is important to note that women were viewed, and actively promoted, as best suited to teach the young.[20] This, in turn, helped to create an educational hierarchy where women were kept on a lower pay scale, and were not encouraged to make teaching their life long career. Bruce Curtis agrees that the "educational authority

---

Historical and Contemporary Perspective (University of Ottawa Press, 2005); Elizabeth Smyth, Sandra Acker, Paula Bourne, and Alison Prentice, eds. *Challenging Professions: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Women's Professional Work* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).

[19] See Alison Prentice, "The Feminization of Teaching," in *The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History*, eds. Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, c1977), 50-51.

[20] Ibid., 54.

structures were gendered," and he echoes the idea of educational hierarchy by stating that "the feminization of the occupation allowed for the extension of male power, and authority, by creating urban educational career lines for men ... [where] male teachers could become supervisors of female teachers."[21] Curtis focuses on the reasons for the creation of the government-run Normal Schools to train teachers regarding the credentials of the occupation and its standing among other, existing, respected, and better paid professions. He concludes that the Normal School was created with the intention to "diffuse the most effective and efficient techniques of instruction throughout the province and to elevate the occupation into a profession."[22] Curtis also uses a more social-political stance where he claims that by 1871, the government requirements for the practices and regulations within the Normal School contributed to defining teachers as agents of the state.[23] Given this argument, I posit that by bringing the training of the kindergartner into the Normal School, kindergartners too became agents of the state, which in turn, created a shift in the focus of their training.

Examining academic literature from the United States is of special importance to this research because a large number of the first kindergartners in Ontario were trained there, including the first kindergarten 'Directress' at the Normal School in Toronto, Miss Bessie Hailman of Indianapolis.[24] Both Kristen Dombkowski and Elizabeth D. Ross researched

---

[21] See Curtis, *Building the Educational State*, 257.

[22] Ibid., 246.

[23] Ibid., 222.

[24] Local News, "The Normal and Model Schools," *The Globe*, Toronto, Friday, August 14, 1885, in http://heritage.theglobeandmail.com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/PageView.asp (accessed May15, 2008).

kindergartners' training in the USA from the mid-nineteenth century to the early twentieth century. Dombkowski concludes that kindergartners became legitimized as teachers and specialists when their education (training) moved from private- to state-run institutions.[25] Although this is also inferred from Ross' work, her emphasis is on the contribution of the kindergarten training system to the growth of teaching institutions. She provides a number of examples of private kindergarten training schools that formed the base for different teachers' colleges in the United States. Ross also states that in the United States "the training courses offered by prominent kindergartners attracted the attention of the better normal schools."[26] Kindergarten departments were common in a large number of these normal schools, but Ross stresses that the private training schools for kindergarten teachers were more selective in their admission procedures.[27] This illustrates two arguments that do not negate each other, and are important for this thesis. First, it could be argued from a professional point of view that this selection was based on the search for the most qualified individuals, who would keep the quality of this specialization. Second, it could be argued from a social class point of view, that the private schools were selective according to social standing. This issue is discussed by Dehli who argues that social differences between women were taken for granted, and incorporated into the early kindergarten training schools. She posits that "working-class and immigrant women were to be trained only in those rudiments of Froebel's methods that they required to work as

---

[25] See Kristen Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training in England and the United States 1850-1918," *History of Education* 31, no.5 (2002): 484.

[26] Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 54-60.

[27] Ibid., 54-60.

domestics or assistants," whereas middle-class college graduates received "a second year of extra course-work in theory and management, enabling them to become kindergarten directors."[28] Her argument points to an occupational hierarchy, one that is not unlike the hierarchy that developed in other professions. The difference is that early childhood education was, and for the most part still is, a woman's occupation, and as is discussed in the following section, the concepts of women and profession simply did not go hand-in-hand in nineteenth century Ontario. I argue that this hierarchy, with its inclusions and exclusions was actually a part of the kindergartner profession. To better understand this, I now turn to discuss what it meant to be a professional in nineteenth century Ontario.

Profession

Multiple authors agree that 'profession' is a fluid concept that changes over time, and that it is historically and culturally contingent.[29] It is multifaceted and has connotations which cross the type of occupation and into education qualification and social reputation.[30] Influenced by feminist scholarship, Smyth, Acker, Bourne, and Prentice discuss 'professionalism' as "something between a mystique and a conspiracy, rather than as a series of admirable traits."[31] I believe this stems from the argument that "the professional ideal is based on the male experience

[28] Dehli, "The Rule by Sympathy," 201-202.

[29] See Gidney and Millar, *Professional Gentlemen*, 207 & 239; Smyth, Acker, Bourne, and Prentice, *Challenging Professions*, 4.

[30] Gidney and Millar, *Professional Gentlemen*, 207.

[31] Smyth, Acker, Bourne and Prentice. *Challenging Professions*, 6.

and on values generally associated with masculinity ... [namely] status, exclusivity, individualism, and power."[32] This gendered point of view is extremely important when researching professions, especially when considering 'women's professions' in a society that adopted this concept, together with its male connotations, in its everyday use of language.

If the concept profession is a continual re-presentation of a man-made (and it was introduced by men, not women) concept with stringent gate keepers who "play a critical role in pressing for, establishing, and monitoring standards of professional education,"[33] as well as set limits to recruitment into professional schools, then, as will be seen later in this thesis, it largely applies to the early kindergartners, who in fact, considered themselves professionals.[34] I believe they based their professional understanding on the only model available to them; a male one. This idea is supported and argued for by Judith S. Glazer who critically analyzes the concept of professionalization and its relationship with gender. She considers the rise of women's professions in the twentieth century to illustrate that although different occupations may enter the ranks of profession at different times, they continually follow the prevalent male-based model.[35] This feminist lense promotes a more clear understanding of the way that the professionalization, or the de-professionalization of the (women) kindergartners took place, as it provides meaning to the way it was constructed, distributed, and legitimized in society then and now.[36]

---

[32] Glazer, "Feminism and Professionalism," 324.

[33] Heap, Millar and Smyth, eds. *Learning to Practise*, 2.

[34] See Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 52.

[35] Glazer, "Feminism and Professionalism," 324.

[36] Heap, Millar and Smyth, eds. *Learning to Practise*, 321.

This male-model definition of profession has an institutionalized, restricted meaning that according to Gidney and Millar followed the professions for centuries.[37] It allows for some specialized occupations to be included, while denying others. Gidney and Millar also discuss the gendered aspect of profession during the nineteenth century, when the terms professional and woman were considered contradictory.[38] It is no wonder then that kindergartners were not acknowledged as professionals by the society of the day. After all, kindergartners were not only women but their specialty was gender oriented as well, and how could a woman's occupation be a profession?

Given that the meaning of profession is fluid and is dependent partially on those defining it, it is important to position it in context of time and place, but it is also beneficial to look at it with a new understanding that will benefit the study of change over time. It is my twenty-first-century understanding of these issues that leads me to argue that the original conception of the kindergartner fits the characterization of profession.

The professional community of the early nineteenth century, the 'learned gentlemen' of the higher educated class, nurtured its aspiring professionals by actively engaging in their education towards that goal. Gidney and Millar demonstrate how this male-model of professional education was "based on learning from the exemplary practitioner, in whatever particular context that learning took place." They add that "the Benchers, the Medical Council,

---

[37] See Gidney and Millar, *Professional Gentlemen*, 239-240.

[38] Ibid., 239.

the presbytery or synod, which regulated studies and examined students, consisted of practitioners."[39] It was the practitioners themselves who taught, interpreted, and wrote about the profession.[40] The same could be said of the kindergartners. Although not 'learned gentlemen,' these educated ladies came from upper-class homes that could afford education for their daughters, an expense that sometimes entailed sending them overseas to study under the guidance of those regarded with highest expertise. Kindergartners in the nineteenth century put great efforts into their students who required specialized training. They interpreted much of Froebel's work from German, they published articles and books about the kindergarten, and they themselves taught both theory and practice for an extensive amount of time, regulating the teaching material as well as the requirements for entering such a school, and graduating from it. They closely guarded the quality of their profession.

Drawing on a number of studies about professionalism of the nineteenth century, Smyth, Acker, Bourne, and Prentice introduce a list of characteristics that represent what it meant to be professionals at that time:

> Professionals ... had special bodies of knowledge, acquired through extensive study, which defined them as highly educated experts; they accepted fees for particular work, rather than hourly or weekly wages; many had been 'called' to their profession and believed their work constituted service to clients whom they agreed to serve, rather than customers whom they have not chosen; all had concerns about the ethical conduct of their occupations; Professionals had organizations to define pertinent bodies of knowledge and appropriately ethical practices.[41]

---

[39] Ibid., 179.

[40] Ibid., 178-179.

[41] Smyth, Acker, Bourne and Prentice. *Challenging Professions*, 5.

I borrow their list to illustrate how these characteristics apply to the early kindergartners. Kindergartners too 'had special bodies of knowledge, acquired through extensive study.' They were well educated women, who went on to receive specialized two-year training by prominent kindergartners who ran their own private training schools. They were 'highly educated experts' in what is called today early childhood education. Their expertise was utilized not only within the kindergarten but also through 'mother meetings' where they passed their knowledge of the Froebelian principles of education; they educated mothers about child development and trained them in kindergarten techniques.[42] Ross also notes that the early kindergartners were well paid.[43] As I do not have much more information regarding the pay system for the kindergartners, I can only assume that the fees of the private kindergartens for children of middle- and upper-class families were high, but many early kindergartners did not receive this high pay, by choice, as they were truly committed to their profession and to their chosen clients who were primarily children from the lower working class and their mothers.

In the USA a great number of the early kindergartens were established by philanthropic organizations "for the children of the poor as one of the many reforms of the Progressive era ... in the hope that the cycle of poverty could be broken."[44] The kindergartners most definitely saw their profession as a vocation.[45] Furthermore, ethical conduct was at the forefront of the

---

[42] Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 42 and 56.

[43] Ibid, 20.

[44] Gillian Weiss, "An Essential Year for the Child: The Kindergarten in British Columbia," in *Schooling and Society in Twentieth Century British Columbia*, eds. J. Donald Wilson and David C. Jones (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1980), 140.

[45] Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 8.

kindergartners profession as they were educating and socializing the young, the future of society. And although not supported by government funding, they too created, often with the support and involvement of influential men, 'organizations to define pertinent bodies of knowledge and appropriately ethical practices.' These organizations acted as the gate-keepers for the profession. Organizations such as the American Froebel Society (1877) were formed by prominent men and women, for the purpose of enforcing high quality kindergarten training. They published the *Kindergarten Messenger* which gave scattered kindergarten pioneers a sense of community, and provided scholarships to qualified, promising young women. They continually supported the graduates of kindergarten training classes who were taught by "those best qualified to teach them ... [those] whom offered solid courses in Froebelian theory and practice," those who were the practicing professionals themselves.[46]

Although it is clear that kindergartners were not included among the professional groups of the nineteenth century, the characteristics of these well educated women were parallel to the characteristics of the 'learned gentlemen' of the time, most of whom came from the same class, and who had social connections, or familial relations, with these 'ladies.' The fact that the term 'profession' applied only to male occupations in the nineteenth century is not surprising as it fits in with the gendered space of the time, where women and men were scripted to play different and complementary roles in society. In the following section I discuss further the concept of gender, and the importance of its role in the kindergartners' status.

---

[46] Ibid.,10-11.

Gender

Introduced by feminist scholarship, gender is a major category of analysis. It is an essential conceptual tool for the exploration of the gendered nature of professions, and therefore vital for this thesis. Gender points to a social system based on 'natural' binaries where, as stated by Marjorie Theobald, "beliefs about the proper relationships between men and women, and the differing material realities of their lives, come in across the grain of notions such as professionalism, status and merit."[47] It is important to consider the level of education as well as the social class of the 'professionals' of the nineteenth century because, as stated earlier, they were as important as the type of the occupation itself. Here again, gender played a role, as the options for men and women differed. Towards the end of the nineteenth century "young women whose social class and personal aspirations allowed them to pursue higher learning," could do so through a "network of private schools, seminaries, academies, and convents," but those were subordinate to the men's higher institutions of education, of which "universities [were] designed to educate young men for the professions," an institution that did not immediately welcome women.[48] The use of university for professional education created yet another distinction as to who was to be included and who was to be excluded from this acclaimed status.

Gender has been a central dynamic at every historical moment in the history of teaching,

---

[47] Marjorie Theobald, "And Gladly Teach? The Making of a Woman's Profession," in *Women Teaching Women Learning: Historical Perspectives*, ed. Elizabeth M. Smyth and Paula Bourne (Toronto: Inanna Publications & Education Inc., 2006), 66.

[48] Dianne D. Hallman and Anna H. Lathrop, "Sustaining the Fire of "Scholarly Passion:"Mary G. Hanilton (1883-1972) and Irene Poelzer (1926-)," in *Women Teaching Women Learning: Historical Perspectives*, ed. Elizabeth M. Smyth and Paula Bourne (Toronto: Inanna Publications & Education Inc., 2006), 48-49.

the occupation kindergartners joined at the end of the nineteenth century.[49] It played a major role in the professionalization of teaching in Ontario, as a gendered hierarchy was being developed within it, partially in order to achieve the sought after title of profession by men in administrative positions. As women came to hold the majority of teaching positions, it was largely men who held the more acclaimed, better paid, supervisory positions. By the early 1880s, the time kindergartners joined the teaching occupation, "virtually the whole of [its] administrative apparatus had been professionalized ... the leading figures in Ontario education, moreover, were highly educated men," who to a large extent graduated with university degrees.[50] According to Alan Sears, women were largely employed for their maternal 'nature,' a trait that rendered schooling more acceptable.[51] Furthermore, they were encouraged to teach the elementary grades, which in turn required lower grade certification, with less pay. They were seen as a cheaper and more compliant labour force.[52] The underlying gendered characteristics of the teaching profession related to the values and norms held in society regarding women's 'natural' tendencies. According to Prentice, the teaching profession was a continuation of the gender roles prevalent at the home in the late nineteenth century.[53]

This gendered nature of teaching and the extension of the mother-role into the elementary

---

[49] Theobald, "And Gladly Teach?" 66.

[50] Gidney and Millar, *Professional Gentlemen*, 235.

[51] See Alan Sears, *Retooling the Mind Factory: Education in a Lean State* (Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press, 2003), 41.

[52] See Curtise, *Building the Educational State*, 252-56.

[53] See Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-nineteenth Century Upper Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 171.

school was a large component of the kindergarten system. The original Froebelian kindergarten promoters, many of whom were well educated women from the upper-middle class, drew upon these notions of maternal love and feminine morality, and promoted themselves as part of "a broad educational and social movement to extend the virtuous and moral influences of women."[54] To a large extent, they used the existing gender ideology to support their cause. They stressed "the responsibilities and beauties of motherhood" as a proponent of kindergartening, and addressed arguments that "any form of higher education for women made them "unfit" for their womanly duties" by reassuring that the general and specific education kindergarten training provided, made women not only better kindergartners and teachers, but also better daughters, better sisters, better wives, and most importantly better mothers, "simply because it made them better women."[55] Kindergartners represented the idea of an educated motherhood, and this helped in gaining them social acceptance, a foot in the door of the growing Ontario public school system, and a way to introduce the kindergarten system to it, but their social understanding of women's role in society and the gendered nature of their profession, also played a part in positioning them on the lower end of the already-existing teaching hierarchy, which was the start of the de-professionalization of their occupation. The following exploration of the concept of kindergarten in nineteenth-century Ontario, as well as the position of women within it, provides further understanding of this process.

---

[54] Dehli, "The Rule by Sympathy," 206.

[55] Ross, *The Kindergarten Crusade*, 52-53.

Kindergarten

Kindergarten was not the first early childhood education program introduced to Europe and North America. Programs such as nurseries and infant schools opened in the late 1700s to provide care for small children outside of their home. With time, there were two major ideas that influenced these programs; first was the everyday social need to "provide care for small children left alone because their mothers worked outside the home,"which became more widespread with the industrial revolution.[56] The second influence was educational, which focussed beyond physical care and protection of the young to include the need of every child to be fully developed, and it was this educational focus that promoted the idea of the original kindergarten.

The discussion of kindergarten in this thesis refers to the original Froebelian kindergarten, as it is the system that the early Ontario public school kindergartens were based upon. The founder of the kindergarten, 'the garden of children,' Friedrich Froebel (1782-1852), was one of the most influential educational reformers of the nineteenth century. In 1837, he opened the world's first kindergarten in Germany, with the desire for it to be free from the influences of the day's formal education, where learning and development were achieved by memorizing, reciting information, and following the teacher's directions. He did not intend "the children to be 'schooled,' but rather to be allowed under gentle treatment to develop freely."[57] Concentrating on self-activity and individual expression, the purpose of kindergarten education

---

[56] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 4.

[57] Carroll Atkinson, and Eugene T. Maleska, *The Story of Education* (Philadelphia and New York: Chilton Books,1965), 126.

was not to impress ideas upon the children, but rather help them to realize their natural potential in a 'child-centred' education system.[58] Froebel believed that "real education is from within, by making the inner outer, and not from without inward,"[59] and play had deep significance as it was "an outer expression" of the child's "inner being."[60] Play was the keystone of Froebel's pedagogical philosophy. It continued to "unfold in the progressive course of the development and education of the child in a logical sequence ... and generate new things ... in a manner suited to the existing stage of the child's development."[61] He believed that play was fundamental to developing the child's physical, intellectual, and moral development, as a unity. Froebel's developmental approach entailed a deep understanding of the child's nature. It required treating the child for "what [s]he is, what [s]he has, and what [s]he will become."[62] His curriculum intended to "awaken and nurture the heart and body of the child."[63]

The kindergarten then, was a system where great emphasis was put on "the activity of the

---

[58] It was Rousseau and Pestalozzi, Froebel's spiritual ancestors that initiated the idea of 'child-centred' education, but Froebel "was the first to apply it on an elaborate theoretical and practical basis." See Donald J. Wilson, Robert M. Stamp, and Louis-Philippe Audet, *Canadian Education: A History* (Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1970), 311.

[59] James L. Hughes, *The Triumph of the Kindergarten Philosophy* (Toronto: Briggs, [n.d.]), 10.

[60] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 31.

[61] Friedrich Froebel, *Pedagogics of the Kindergarten*, trans. Josephine Jarvis (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1900), 146.

[62] Ibid., 12.

[63] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 20.

child, on 'learning by doing,' and on the overriding importance of play and physical activity."[64] It comprised materials designed to "help the child form accurate and clear impressions of the world" and aid "in his all sided development."[65] These included what Froebel called Gifts (soft geometric solids), Art Occupations (materials whose form underwent change while in use, such as clay, sand, and cardboard), songs and games (which Froebel wrote and designed himself to promote social cooperation), and stories.[66]

Froebel developed much of his ideas by "watching mothers and their children in 'natural' settings."[67] He regarded the quality of the child-mother bond as essential for the care and development of the child. Furthermore, he "looked to women to execute his idea" as he believed that "the kindergartner had to embody the ideals of motherhood," and "his system needed the devotion of not only sensitive but intellectually active women."[68] This belief introduces two important aspects concerning the Froebelian kindergartners. First is the gendered nature of their role, discussed in the former section. The roles of teacher and mother were united and became "a central feature of nineteenth-century kindergarten rhetoric and practice."[69] Social assumptions about female 'nature,' such as maternal love and feminine morality encouraged the "naturalized

---

[64] Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*, 52.

[65] Ibid., 20.

[66] For more on this see Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 30-38; Warren H. Button, *History of Education and Culture in America* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983),170-171; and Wilson, Stamp and Audet, *Canadian Education*, 311.

[67] Pacini-Ketchabaw, "Young Children as Others," 81.

[68] Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 7-8.

[69] Ibid., 200.

relations between teachers and children as a form of mothering."[70] The second aspect points to the fact that being a woman and having those 'natural' mothering capacities was not enough to become a kindergartner, but rather one needed to be well educated and then specifically trained in order to be qualified as such. Hence, some women were more appropriate for this role than others. Madame von Marenholtz Bulow was one of Froebel's earliest disciples who for years advocated his views both in Europe and North America. She considered that "for those who intend to take up the [kindergartner] employment professionally, a year is the shortest time that should be given to the study of the system, practically and theoretically, while an additional year as an assistant is further requisite to fit anyone to become directress."[71] Originally, assistants were unpaid women students who wished to become professional kindergarten directors. Being an assistant was part of the training process to become a professional kindergartner. This is a reminder that the kindergartners regarded their specialty as a profession and had clear expectations as to the requirements to become a professional kindergartner, or what they regarded as kindergarten directress/director. The early kindergartners discussed in this thesis are these professional kindergarten directors. It is important to note the difference between being an assistant and a director because, as I illustrate later in this thesis, those distinctions become vague within the provincial teacher training schools.

---

[70] Dehli, "The Rule by Sympathy," 196.

[71] Emily Shirreff, *Kindergarten: Principles of Froebel's System* (London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Allen, 1880), 58.

Conceptual Framework

Profession, gender and kindergarten provide the conceptual framework for this thesis, as they are understood in the context of the overall development and control of the Ontario public education system in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Profession is understood as a fluid concept with meaning that is dependent on place and time. The type of an occupation was one important aspect of the 'professions' in the nineteenth century. To better understand who were represented as 'professionals' it is as important to consider their level of education, social class, and gender. This thesis points, not only to the gender of the early kindergartners themselves as a reason for their exclusion from being considered professionals, but more so to the gendered nature of their occupation. Although not accepted as professionals by society of the time, this thesis illustrates that the main characteristics of the professions in mid-nineteenth century indeed applied to the early kindergartners. They were highly educated specialists, who considered their profession a vocation. They were actively engaged with the education of new kindergartners, they taught, they interpreted material and they wrote of their profession, they controlled the training of the profession, and finally, they used institutional enforcement to regulate their profession. In the 1880s, as they entered the government-controlled, public space of education, the characteristics of their occupation changed, and was gradually de-professionalized.

The gendered nature of the professions in the nineteenth century, together with the general gendered ideology that existed at the household, is critical to understanding what happened to kindergartners as they moved from women-run private institutions to the male run

institutions of education in Ontario. The gendered nature of their profession, which emphasized the 'natural' mothering role, lent itself to the acceptance of their occupation into the public sphere of late nineteenth-century society, positioning them with other primary women teachers in the already existing gendered hierarchy of the Ontario education system. Chapter four of this thesis illustrates how the kindergartners professional characteristics disappeared one after another, as the kindergarten system spread throughout the public schools of Ontario.

These early public kindergartens were based on the Froebelian kindergarten system, where the child's interests and needs were put at the centre. It focussed on learning by doing and self experience, and put a large emphasis on the importance of play as a developmental tool. It was a system of intellectual, moral, and physical education, where children were encouraged to achieve their full potential through self-activity guided by trained women kindergartners.

These early Froebelian kindergartners came from the intellectual elite and had connections to 'men of power.' They were highly educated women whose families could afford to provide them with lengthy specialized training, unlike many of the later kindergartners trained for the public school kindergartens of Ontario.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL CONTEXT: THE RISE OF KINDERGARTEN AND MASS PUBLIC EDUCATION

By mid nineteenth century early childhood education existed in various forms both in North America and in Europe. Most notable was the British infant school which was imported to the USA in the 1820s, and to Canada in the 1830s.[1] This system was based on a strictly academic or didactically moral content and method. According to DombKowski "by the time the kindergarten arrived in England and the USA in the 1850s, the infant school for children aged five and under was more or less institutionalized as a feature of English education." She adds that

> between 1850 and 1918, the English and US kindergarten movements drew on their respective skills and strengths in an effort to extend kindergarten education to as many children as possible. These movements were shaped by the particular challenges they each faced in harnessing professional, political and public support. They were also influenced by the intersections of class, gender and politics in which they operated.[2]

Froebel's humanist-inspired kindergarten system was brought to the USA and later to Canada by German intellectuals who had fled Germany after the abortive revolution of 1848.[3] It was a time when social and political roles for middle-class women came into question, and the Froebelian

---

[1] See Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 5; and Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 475.

[2] Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 475.

[3] Freeman R. Butts, and Lawrence A. Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953).

kindergarten movements may be seen as "part of a growing set of potential solutions to the `woman question,' attempting to create a respectable and paid vocation for unmarried middle-class women as kindergartners."[4] This is tied to the efforts of middle- and upper- class women to "place themselves in new public and political roles as caretakers of society."[5]

The first kindergartens were established by former students of Froebel and were small, private institutions, conducted in the German language. In 1859, during her visit to Boston, Margaret Schurtz, a former student of Froebel's who ran a private kindergarten in Wisconsin, met Elizabeth Peabody, and introduced her to the concept. Peabody was deeply involved in "a number of major educational and literary experiments associated with the transcendentalist movement in philosophy ... [that] laid an important foundation for her acceptance of kindergarten ideals and practices."[6] Soon thereafter, in 1860, Peabody proceeded to open the first English-speaking kindergarten in the USA. She later went to Europe to study the Froebelian theory more thoroughly, and upon her return gave up teaching and became a vocal promoter of the kindergarten. Her efforts lead to the opening of public kindergartens in the USA. After a number of failed trials, in August 1873 in St. Louis, Missouri, the first successful public kindergarten program in the USA began, under the instruction of Susan E. Blow.[7] A year later, she opened a public training school for kindergarten teachers which she insisted upon running

---

[4] Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 477.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Button, *History of Education*, 173.

[7] Susan E. Blow was first introduced to a kindergarten class while visiting Germany with her father in 1871. Prior to opening the public kindergarten Blow went to New York, to study under Maria Boelte, who was a student of Froebel's widow. Ibid.

herself. Ross clarifies that she did this in order to "assure the competence of each kindergarten teacher entering the St. Louis public school system."[8] Over time, her training classes provided kindergarten teachers throughout America, as well as in Canada. Her books, *The Mottos and Commentaries of Friedrich Froebel's Mother Play,* and *Songs and Music of Friedrich Froebel's Mother Play* were later among the reference books used in the Ontario Normal Schools for training kindergartners-to-be.[9] These books were part of an International Educational Series edited by W. T. Harris, the United States Commissioner of Education at the time, who made a collection of what was considered the best writings on educational subjects to provide teachers in general. Blow's books concentrate on songs and games for the mother with her child, as applied to the kindergarten between the kindergartner and the children. These, as mentioned earlier, were considered the key to Froebel's philosophy of the kindergarten. The use of 'mother' in the titles of these books illustrates the link made between mother and teacher in the nineteenth century, and points to the gender-specific role of the kindergartner as previously discussed.

Kindergarten educators came largely from the social and intellectual elite. They used their money and influence to keep the kindergarten alive, while spreading Froebel's ideas.

Dombkowski describes this as follows:

> Beginning in the 1870s, kindergarten supporters ... developed a significant network of organizations and associations for the advancement of kindergarten education. These

---

[8] Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 14.

[9] The full list of the reference books is available at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), Toronto. See Department of Education of Ontario, *Calendar: Provincial Normal Schools (Toronto, Ottawa and London)* (Toronto: L. K. Cameron, 1902), 4-5.

> groups, including the American Froebel Society (1877, later the American Froebel Union) and [the] International Kindergarten Union (1892) ... sought to advance their kindergarten cause at a number of levels. ... [They] propagandized and proselytized; they sought donations and held lecture series and demonstration classes for teachers and parents; they lobbied school administrators and government policy makers. They also struggled to maintain the integrity of the Froebelian system ... while adapting Froebel's pre-industrial German programme into something relevant for their own urban industrial societ[y].[10]

These groups, and the active individuals within them, did not let the kindergarten idea wither away. Their persistence and strong belief in the benefits of the Froebelian kindergarten brought their vision to life.

Government Controlled Schooling in Nineteenth-Century Ontario

With its social unrest, persistent tension amongst religious and ethnic sectors of the population, clear divisions of class, and an increased gender tension within the public sphere, Canadian society was undergoing fundamental changes in the second half of the nineteenth century.[11] The school system was seen as a crucial vehicle for inclusion (and controlling) of the increasing working-class in society. Suggested and supported primarily by middle-class men in positions of power, the Common School Act of 1871 was introduced. It stated that public school education in Ontario was free (tax supported), universal, and compulsory province wide.[12]

---

[10] Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 477.

[11] See Harry Smaller, "Gender and Class: State formation and Schooling reform in 1880s Toronto," in *Women Teaching Women Learning: Historical Perspectives*, eds. Elizabeth M. Smyth and Paula Bourne (Toronto: Inanna Publications & Education Inc., 2006), 134-135.

[12] Sears, *Retooling the Mind Factory*, 38. Schooling was compulsory in the sense that children aged seven to twelve were required to attend school for at least four months per year.

School became a place where all children of the community were brought together. After Egerton Ryerson's retirement in 1876 his position of Superintendent of Education, a role the governing Liberal party saw as "much too independent of party control," was eliminated to give way to a new role, Minister of Education, which was created as a position more directly related to the controlling party.[13] According to Smaller, this allowed for education matters in Ontario to "be drawn much more directly into the management sphere of the cabinet, including much closer congruence with the larger political-economic agenda of government officials, whose guiding principles were frugality, efficiency, and centralization of power."[14] These "state officials" worked to "enhance very specific sets of social structures, practices, and ideologies within the provincial schooling system."[15] This was part of a continuing struggle over influence and control of schooling that ensued among politicians, school officials, trustees, and church leaders.[16]

As part of the growth process following the introduction of the universal education, it was "not unusual to have at least 50 children in a primary class ... [often including] children under the age of six."[17] Smaller argues that this, coupled with cutbacks to teaching materials due

---

See Tomkins, *A Common Countenance*, 47.

[13] Egerton Ryerson is considered the "father" of the Ontario school system. He was the Superintendent of Education between the years 1844 to1876. See Smaller, "Gender and Class," 135.

[14] Ibid., 135-136.

[15] Ibid., 132.

[16] Ibid., 135.

[17] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten,* 39. Corbett points to the Public School Act of 1885 which permitted boards to make provisions for children who were five years old but she stresses that it was not until 1887 that the kindergarten was formally accepted in Ontario. However, she

to turbulent economic times, did not encourage the change towards more progressive teaching methods, which were called for across the Ontario education system in the 1880s, but rather it often led teachers to continue (or return to) the rote teaching techniques and the use of corporal punishment as a classroom management tool.[18] Nevertheless, the Child Study Movement which was gaining recognition in North America, continually introduced new ways of thinking about young children within the education system. It was a time when "young children in Ontario became objects of specialized knowledge."[19] According to Pacini-Ketchabaw, this was encouraged by the authority of health professionals such as doctors and psychologists. It could be argued then, that childhood was seen as a specialization in need of professional specialists to manage and direct it.

In order for public schools to serve their public functions to the fullest there was a need to expand the purposes of education, and for changes in the curricula and methods of teaching, so that they suited the needs of the day. This change in teaching methods was most apparent in the Normal Schools, the official institute for teachers training, where the emphasis began to shift from concentrating primarily on academic content to emphasizing the psychology of learning and methods of instruction.[20] The New Education Movement, which had its roots in the works of Pestalozzi and Froebel who inspired the Ontario school reformers, pushed towards a shift

---

makes clear that the Act did delegate to the school boards the responsibility of establishing kindergartens. See ibid., 43.

[18] Smaller, "Gender and Class," 138.

[19] Pacini-Ketchabaw, "Young Children as Others," 60.

[20] Wilson, Stamp and Audet, *Canadian Education*, 316-317.

from a book-centered to a child-centered curriculum.[21] The alternative new education reform was formally introduced to Ontario teachers in 1886, three years after the first public kindergarten was introduced in Toronto. It promised to develop the whole being - mentally, morally, and physically, stating that school "should develop the child's own powers and faculties rather than impart facts, [and] show not so much what to learn as how to learn."[22] The foremost advocates of this 'new education' in Canada were the husband-and-wife team of James and Ada Hughes, who advocated both the social and the pedagogic dimensions of the Reform Movement. James Hughes, the Toronto Public School Inspector from 1874 to 1913, was also the person primarily responsible for bringing the public kindergarten to Ontario. He studied Froebel's philosophy in depth and his book, *Froebel's Educational Laws for All Teachers*, aimed at exposing the "most important principles of Froebel's educational philosophy, and to make suggestions regarding [their] application ... to the work of the schoolroom in teaching and training" of children throughout their schooling.[23] He strongly advocated Froebel's philosophy as applicable to all grades; it was seen by him as "an organic part of a complete scheme of juvenile instruction."[24] Ada Hughes was the first public kindergarten teacher in Toronto. The

---

[21] See Robert S. Patterson, John W. Chalmers and John W. Friesen, eds., *Profiles of Canadian Educators* (D.C, Heath, Canada Ltd, 1974); Axelrod, *Promise of Schooling*; Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*; etc. Pestalozzi was one of Froebel's spiritual ancestors that initiated the idea of 'child-centred' education. See Wilson, Stamp and Audet, *Canadian Education*, 307-308.

[22] Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*, 51.

[23] James L. Hughes, *Froebel's Educational Laws for All Teachers*, vol. XLI of *International Education Series*, ed. William T. Harris. (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1903), xii.

[24] Ibid., x.

two of them were also involved with the International Kindergarten Movement, and in 1906 Ada Hughes became president of the International Kindergarten Union, the only Canadian to ever hold that position.[25] Together, they viewed the 'new education' as crucial for wider social reforms, and advocated the kindergarten as a good starting ground for change.[26]

Kindergarten as Part of Wider Social Reforms

Middle-class social reform movements developed in Toronto, Ottawa, and London, among other centers in Ontario in the second half of the nineteenth century. These included the Kindergarten Movement, the New Education Movement, and the loosely-knit Child Saving Movement, which all viewed schools as a "vehicle for reintegrating the child into the existing [middle-class] social structure."[27] Central to this 'child saving crusade' was the need to improve the quality of childhood and the nature of family life. The "child savers" viewed themselves as "altruists and humanitarians, dedicated to rescuing those who were less fortunately placed in the social order."[28] Educational reforms were conducted along with changes in society, and the link between the social and moral crusades of the child savers and the curricular reforms of the 'New

[25] See Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000),18; Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 43.

[26] See Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society*, 172-174.

[27] Wilson, Stamp, and Audet, *Canadian Education*, 301.

[28] Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*, 53.

Education' was exemplified in the kindergarten program.

James Hughes was a "social reformer with broad interests in introducing order and efficiency into an urban-industrial world which he believed to be in the process of disruption."[29] This prompted him to promote the kindergarten as the "foundation of a democratic public school system, acting as a bridge [to] harmonize the home with the school."[30] According to Hughes, the school had a social purpose; it was a place to improve the quality of childhood and the very nature of family life. This premise was based on the underlying promotion of middle-class values seen clearly by Stamp's argument that "while not denying the benefits of [the] pre-school experience for middle- and upper-class children, reformers above all emphasized the necessity of the [public] kindergarten for the children of the poor ... [where they] could learn desired [middle-class] social relationships and moral values ... [as well as] socially desirable patterns of behaviour."[31] This desire to change the patterns of behaviour of the poor is also evident in the evening classes that Ada Hughes ran for the mothers of the children who attended her kindergarten, where they discussed such topics as cleanliness, values, and morals. Michael S. Shapiro posits that in attempting to reach the poor urban child at an early age, the reformers hoped to "eliminate poverty, ... save the child, and improve the nation."[32] Froebelian ideas were meant to reform the whole school system so schools would "become 'gardens' ... in which each

---

[29] Wilson, Stamp, and Audet, *Canadian Education*, 318.

[30] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten,* 49.

[31] Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*, 55-56.

[32] Michael S. Shapiro, *Child's Garden: The Kindergarten Movement from Froebel to Dewey* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983), 85.

child [can grow] to be its grandest, most complete self."[33]

Kindergartner's Training at the End of the Nineteenth Century

While many agreed with the kindergarten pedagogy, not all agreed with its organization as part of the public school system. An example of this can be seen in the words of J.H. Putman, Inspector of Public Schools in Ottawa, who in 1913 remarked that the school system may do without the specialized kindergartens. He saw the two systems as separate entities.[34] Also, within teaching itself, friction and discontent was developing between kindergarten and primary teachers. Patterson, Chalmers and Friesen discuss the resentment primary teachers often had towards the special privileges, such as small classes and half-day teaching, that their kindergarten colleagues had. They add that by often viewing their work as a "closed system complete in itself, having little relation to the next stage in the life of the child,"[35] the public kindergartners' themselves contributed to this rising tension.

The kindergartners argued that the kindergarten system should be differentiated from the regular primary school teaching, which they believed "developed as something of a default job for lower-middle-class people (increasingly young women) who had only limited education themselves."[36] As discussed earlier in this thesis, for the early kindergartners teaching was a

---

[33] Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society*, 175.

[34] J.H. Putman, is quoted in Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten,* 49.

[35] Patterson, Chalmers and Friesen, *Profiles of Canadian Educators*, 202.

[36] Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 478.

vocation, not simply a job, and they developed a significant network of organizations and associations for the advancement of kindergarten education, as they struggled to maintain the integrity and quality of the Froebelian system.[37] The training of the kindergartner was at the centre of the Kindergarten Movement, and was tied directly to program quality and the professional status of the occupation.

According to Ross, the early Froebelian kindergartens in the USA were models of organization. The kindergartners themselves were "carefully chosen ... well-educated women with professional training and experience in kindergartening."[38] Interest in the kindergarten system was present, but basing it on highly trained kindergartners did limit its expansion. The scarcity of these highly trained kindergartners, coupled with a growing demand for more kindergartens to open, resulted in the rapid increase in opportunities for training in the 1870s and 1880s in the USA. The rapid growth of kindergartens made it difficult to keep the balance between quality and quantity. For example, due to the increased demand for trained kindergartners, in 1872 Mathilde Kriege and her daughter Alma, "ran a 'crash course' kindergarten training school ... squeezing the two year German syllabus into seven months."[39] Their act was met with anger from other Froebelians who saw it as a rushed superficial training, and sought to expand kindergarten training which preserves the 'pure' Froebelian ideology. These efforts included the opening, in 1872, of the New York Normal Training Kindergarten by

---

[37] These included the American Froebel Society, 1877 (later the American Froebel Union), and the International Kindergarten Union, 1892. Ibid., 477.

[38] Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 20.

[39] Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 480.

Maria Kraus-Boelte and her husband, John Kraus.[40] They offered "a rigorous two year course including one year of course work followed by one year of practice teaching."[41] They fought the temptation to lower the standards of qualifications and maintained their high standards of certification. By 1881, they had nearly 200 women graduates. In an effort to consolidate and standardize these different kindergarten training schemes, that arose in the USA between the 1870s and 1890s, many kindergarten advocates lobbied state education agencies for the examination and certification of kindergartners, as was the procedure for other teachers. According to Ross, some states took on this role in the 1890s, adopting the high standards of academic rigour initiated by the top kindergarten colleges.[42]

Touching upon issues of class, Kari Dehli points to the social differences between women that training schools for kindergarten teaching incorporated.[43] In her inquiry she quotes the *Canada School Journal* from 1878, which declares that "any Canadian ladies who wish to be instructed properly in the system cannot elsewhere in America receive so good a training" as in Kraus-Boelte's school in New York. She adds that at the same time the writer "warned 'teachers and their friends' to 'BEWARE' of 'unscrupulous persons' and 'sham kindergartens,' who were attempting to make a living off the kindergarten's growing popularity, without even knowing

---

[40] This is the school where Ada Hughes was trained to become a kindergarten teacher. See Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 42; and Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*, 53.

[41] Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 480.

[42] See examples in Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 54-60.

[43] Dehli, "The Rule by Sympathy," 202.

what a kindergarten is."[44] Dehli argues that the language and choice of words used in the journal brings forth important assumptions held at the time, primarily that *good* instruction was for Canadian *ladies*. This certainly points to a class system, whereby not everyone was able to receive the same type of education. It was dependent on one's economic resources, a process that was similar to the acquisition of knowledge for other professions of the time. The early professional kindergartners, or the directors as they were called, came from families that did not depend on them for economic need, rather had the means to provide them with the highest degree of education and send them to lengthy training programs, often oversees. According to Dehli, while middle-class college graduates took extra course work in theory and management, which enabled them to become kindergarten directors, working-class and immigrant women were trained only in the basics of Froebel's methods, enabling them to work as domestics or low paid assistants.[45] This was training that required less time and was more affordable for those women who needed the work to provide for their families. Whereas the hierarchy within the early kindergarten system was based on class and economic means, similar to other professions of the time, the teaching hierarchy they joined in the early 1880s was based on gender in a 'feminized' occupation.

Feminization of Teaching

Alison Prentice, the Canadian pioneer in this field, brought to attention the complexity of

---

[44] Ibid., 209. Emphasis is in original.

[45] Ibid.

the feminization of teaching. Together with Marta Danylewycz, she stresses the importance of understanding that the feminization of teaching does not refer to the entry of women into the teaching occupation as already "large numbers of women taught in colonial and pre-industrial communities."[46] Women have always taught, but not in public spaces. Prentice emphasizes that there are several aspects to the feminization of teaching. One aspect took place at the same time that elementary education itself was moving out of the private household and into public institutions (schools). This was the movement of women into the public sphere of teaching. Another aspect points to the time when women became a majority among common or elementary school teachers.[47] Wilson, Stamp and Audet explain that as more and more men were attracted to other professions, and the demand for teachers increased, school boards increasingly turned to women who were willing (or did not have a choice) to work for a lower salary.[48] An analysis of public school teachers based on an 1881 national census led Eric Sager to note that although "the wages of women teachers were well bellow those of male teachers" many of these young women teachers made an important contribution to their household economy, which led him to argue that increasing numbers of women joined the profession despite its exploiting nature, because of its material benefit.[49] Here we see a stark difference between women teachers and the early kindergartners. Whereas public school teachers seemed to have primarily a working class

---

[46] See Marta Danylewycz, and Alison Prentice, "Revising the History of Teachers: a Canadian Perspective," *Interchange* 17, no.2 (1986): 141.

[47] Prentice, "Feminization of Teaching," 50.

[48] Wilson, Stamp, and Audet, *Canadian Education*, 317.

[49] Eric W. Sager, "Women Teachers in Canada, 1881-1901: Revisiting the 'Feminization' of an Occupation," *The Canadian Historical Review* 88, no. 2 (June 2007): 226.

background, and joined teaching for its economic benefit, the early kindergartners came from the upper-middle class, and considered their profession a calling, often even volunteering their expertise.

By 1871 women came to dominate the teaching occupation in Ontario, as they held a slight majority of the teaching positions.[50] The increase in women teachers was observed and encouraged by influential individuals such as Chief Superintendent Ryerson, who announced in his 1866 annual report that "women were best suited to teach the young, and therefore the fact that there were increasingly more women teachers in the common schools was seen as progress in the right direction."[51] This re-enforcement of women's 'natural' position within the education system is also seen in Smaller's discussion of the certification and training of teachers where he makes note of the purposeful gendered language used by officials, such as James Hughes.[52]

Bruce Curtis argues that the feminization of the teaching occupation relates to the scarcity of 'respectable' employment for women who desired (or needed) to work outside the home. He emphasizes that this directly relates to the low wages paid to women (similar to the wages women received for domestic work). He too discusses the gendered structure of the education system, stating that the educational authority structures are continuous with the pattern of authority relations in the household, which allowed for the extension of male power and authority by

---

[50] See Curtis, *Building the Educational State*, 252; and Prentice, "Feminization of Teaching," 54.

[51] Quoted in Prentice, "Feminization of Teaching," 54.

[52] Smaller, "Gender and Class," 139.

creating educational career opportunities for men.[53] Danylewycz and Prentice argue that in the urban school systems in Ontario (and Quebec) of mid-nineteenth century, "women were shown to be typically segregated into lower paying positions as the instructors of junior grades, while men monopolized the better paying jobs as senior teachers, principals, and inspectors."[54] Male teachers were supervisors of female teachers, who came mostly from the working- and lower-middle class, especially in the elementary grades.

Another aspect of feminization which Prentice recognizes is in its relation to "two contemporary educational movements of the time: the first, a campaign to promote the grading of school children ... and the second, a passionate campaign to raise the status of teaching as a profession."[55] The first movement's main goal was to establish an efficient division of labour, with "the more experienced teachers taking the advanced grades and the less well trained, engaged at lower rates of pay, taking the younger children or beginners."[56] At the same time, the second movement was being led by men who were pursuing higher salaries, and used this as "an essential part of their campaign to make the teaching profession respectable and to induce well qualified people to remain in it as a lifetime career."[57] She shows how the two goals were incompatible to a degree, and the gradual introduction of female teachers to the public institutions seemed to partially solve this problem. Lower salaries were given to women to teach lower

---

[53] Curtis, *Building the Educational State*, 257.

[54] Danylewycz and Prentice, "Revising the History," 136.

[55] Prentice, "Feminization of Teaching," 50.

[56] Ibid., 51.

[57] Ibid., 51.

grades, while higher salaries were then available to give male superintendents, inspectors, principal teachers, and headmasters. As women were hired for economic reasons, a professional hierarchy emerged.

Women Entering the Professions

In this discussion, it is imperative to recall that in early nineteenth century concepts such as 'women' and 'professional' were not deemed compatible. According to Smyth, Acker, Bourne, and Prentice, in the early nineteenth century "members of the most powerful professions [ie., physicians, lawyers and clergymen] characterized themselves as 'learned' and 'gentlemen.'"[58] Being a professional went beyond one's occupation, and covered one's academic level, and social standing as well. As the century progressed "the question of what constituted a profession became a serious issue ... [as] the professions became crowded, and interlopers increasingly demanded access to the work that professional [learned] gentlemen had formerly monopolized," and by late nineteenth century "members of professional bodies [were] worried ... about creating boundaries to keep the 'right people' in and the ... unworthy or undesirable out." Women were "among the most anomalous of those demanding entry to the professions."[59]

By mid-nineteenth-century Ontario, a growing number of women with more education had better opportunities of entering male-traditional jobs. Many entered the expanding elementary school system, some entered the high schools, and a few entered fields such as

---

[58] Smyth, Acker, Bourne, and Prentice, *Challenging Professions*, 4.

[59] Ibid., 4-5.

dentistry, pharmacy and medicine. They also entered churches, both as deaconesses, and foreign and domestic missionaries.[60] Although most women entered the workforce for economic reasons, Gidney and Millar demonstrate how some chose certain occupations for the physical and intellectual challenge it provided, and others saw their chosen occupation as a calling. They discuss the varied levels of opposition encountered by women who attempted to enter occupations from which they were traditionally excluded.[61] They give credit to women's organizations for their push to gaining access to professional training, but also point to the powerful support the women had from some influential males, such as "the editor of the Globe through to Principal Grant of Queen's."[62] But although opinion was divided with regard to women's entry into the professions, when access was gained it "was almost universally mediated through the rhetoric of the separate spheres."[63] This gendered ideology brings to focus the countervailing tendencies of joining the institutionalized male professions. Whereas this ideology led to the opening of some doors to new opportunities, at the same time, it helped keep them partially closed, limiting the direction of entry to those who came through. And it was largely middle-class men who controlled these entries and had the power to shape the varied professions as they saw fit. Women worked, organized and accommodated themselves within a familiar reality.

---

[60] Gidney and Millar 1994, *Professional Gentlemen*, 322.

[61] Ibid., 323.

[62] Ibid., 325.

[63] Ibid., 325.

Summary

Canadian literature touches upon the history of the teaching profession in Ontario in various ways, many of which are not included in the above review, as they do not focus on the area of interest. In the literature, there is discussion of the search for recognition of teaching as a profession. It points to the role of state institutions in providing such recognition, discussing the programs that were put into place to qualify one as a professional teacher. There is discussion of the gendered nature of the teaching profession, and the hierarchy that occurred within it, putting it in context of time and place. And although there is mention of the history of kindergarten, its arrival to Ontario, and some discussion of the kindergarten curriculum, it focuses on the individuals who brought it, the theories and ideas behind it, and how these influenced schooling in general. Canadian academic literature, however, lacks information with respect to the training of kindergarten teachers in Ontario, and the countervailing tendencies of their move to become a part of the institutionalized teaching profession.

The following chapters focus on exactly that, taking into account the different issues touched upon in the review above, such as the kindergartners' gender and class/status, the province's economic and social setting, the hierarchy within the institutionalized teaching occupation, and the effect the move from a female run system to a male run system had on this process.

CHAPTER THREE

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION: MAKING PLACE FOR THE KINDERGARTEN SYSTEM

In the second half of the nineteenth century, upper-middle-class men attempted to elevate the teaching occupation into a profession. The organization of the Normal School and the government regulated Teachers' associations played a large part in this process to gain recognition as professionals. These institutions played a major role in establishing and monitoring the standards of teachers' education, and that role became more complex as the state became more involved with teachers' affairs.[1]

Teachers' Associations

Teachers' associations began appearing in communities across Upper Canada as early as the 1840s, with the rise of the state schooling. These were local associations run by the active classroom teachers themselves, and independent of governmental control. Their members' primary concern was their own material protection. By the mid nineteenth century, the provincial government developed regulations which took over these associations, and teachers were no

[1] See Harry Smaller, "Regulating the Regulators: the Disciplining of Teachers in Nineteenth-century Ontario," in *Discipline, Moral Regulation, and Schooling: A Social History*, eds., Kate Rousmaniere, Kari Dehli, and Ning de Coninck-Smith (New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997), 97-116.

longer free to meet under their own terms.[2] Now teachers' associations were promoted by the provincial schooling elite, who saw these organizations as a tool to regulate the teachers and their occupation. One such organization was the Ontario Education Association (OEA), which was created in 1860.[3] It introduced its objectives a year later, in the Constitution of 1861, as follows:

1. to secure the general adoption of the most approved systems of imparting instruction.
2. to secure the improvement of text-books.
3. to enlarge the view of teachers and stimulate their exertions for the advancement and diffusion of knowledge.
4. to encourage the frequent interchange of ideas ... among the members of the profession throughout the country.[4]

Their concerns were clearly different than those of the early associations, as they focussed on professionalizing this occupation. This organization, as well as others, involved few classroom teachers and were run by governmental education officials well into the 1900s. The Ontario Association for the Advancement of Education was established in 1861, and in its 1881 Convention its name was officially changed to the Ontario Teachers Association (OTA).[5] It too,

---

[2] For further elaboration on these associations and their discourse see Smaller, "Regulating the Regulators," 111-114.

[3] See History of Ontario Education Association (OEA), 1860-1937, Archives of Ontario, MU8108 #1, F1209, Chapter 3 (hereafter cited as History of OEA).

[4] Ibid.

[5] See Minutes of the OTA, Archives of Ontario, Amicus # 12169826, Microfilm, p.15. In "Regulating the Regulators," Harry Smaller discusses the founding of a provincial organization called the Teachers' Association of Canada West (TACW). He states that it was founded in 1861 by a number of education officials, including Ryerson, and that it was renamed the Ontario Teachers' Association by 1867. Smaller, too, stresses that it was not teachers themselves who ran the association, but rather it was under the control of education officials, who had a "clear agenda of legitimizing and promoting increased professionalization, centralization, and bureaucratization in the minds of teachers across the province." See Smaller, "Regulating the Regulators," 113.

was not representative of the average teacher, but rather "functioned as the voice of the educational elite" whose background was reflected in the issues they thought important, such as establishing a well-educated workforce with a secure career.[6] The officials of the OTA often compared the education system to the one used by medical men, clergymen, and lawyers; the already established, respected, high-status professions. As formerly mentioned in this thesis, by the early 1880s the whole administrative apparatus of the Ontario education system had been professionalized, "entry requirements had been rigorously tightened, and standards of preliminary education raised for all certification categories."[7] Whereas the original associations were primarily concerned with salaries and job security, the latter concentrated on "legitimizing and promoting increased professionalization, centralization, and bureaucratization in the minds of teachers across the province."[8] The associations encouraged the hierarchy within the education system which included primarily male, professional, administrators at the top, and primarily female teachers at the bottom, more subordinate positions.

I argue that the early kindergartners did play a major role in their associations, just like the teachers in the earlier days, prior to government regulations, but unlike those teachers, they were more concerned with issues similar to those of the government controlled associations. After all, as discussed earlier, the early kindergartners did come from the same educational elite as the administration of the public education system; they were part of the same social circle, and held similar values, morals, and concerns.

---

[6] Gidney, and Millar, *Professional Gentlemen*, 234.

[7] Ibid., 235.

[8] Smaller, "Regulating the Regulators," 113.

The Normal School as a Professionalization Tool

Ontario's Superintendent of Education from 1844 to 1876, Egerton Ryerson, was largely responsible for the creation of the Provincial Normal School in Toronto, in 1847. In his discussion of Ryerson's vision for the Normal School, Bruce Curtis demonstrates that the Normal School was to provide professional training for teachers, where they would become more efficient and save teaching time. It was to ensure higher wages for teachers, and most importantly, it was to end the transient nature of the occupation. According to Curtis, Ryerson believed that teaching would be seen as a 'vocation' in which one would stay for life, and that professional training would eliminate incompetent and immoral teachers, so the ones left would "respect themselves, and be respected as other professional men."[9] In comparing academic education generally to professional education in early twentieth century, Bob Gidney concludes that "professional education was about 'learning how,'with its own distinct and peculiar characteristics," and this is what the teaching occupation had with the Normal School, a place to shape and dispense professional knowledge; a place to "cultivate 'practical competence.'"[10] Furthermore, it was legitimized by the provincial government which controlled the credentials of teachers, by enforcing specific entrance requirements, as well as graduating requirements. Normal training then "was to diffuse the most effective and efficient techniques of instruction throughout the

---

[9] Bruce Curtis, *True Government by Choice Men?: Inspection, Education, and State Formation in Canada West* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, c1992), 219.

[10] Bob Gidney, "Madam How" and " Lady Why," in *Learning to Practise: Professional Education in Historical and Contemporary Perspective*, ed. Ruby Heap, Wyn Millar and Elizabeth Smyth (University of Ottawa Press, 2005), 16.

province and to elevate the occupation into a profession."[11] This infers that prior to this, teaching had a transient and inefficient nature, and was held by some who were not properly trained, incompetent, and even immoral. It was an occupation that was not well respected, nor well paid.

Unlike teachers, I argue that the early kindergartners saw their occupation as a vocation from the start. These upper-middle-class, well-educated, 'ladies' entered lengthy training programs to become childhood specialists. They were highly educated, regarded themselves as highly moral, and were highly competent. They were already professionals when they joined the hierarchy of the education system in Ontario, a move that was encouraged by men in powerful positions within the Ontario education system, who like the kindergartners themselves wanted to make the kindergarten system available to as many children as possible.

Establishment of the Public Kindergarten in Ontario

The kindergarten system was shaped by challenges faced in gaining professional, political, and public support, as well as by upper-middle-class values and norms regarding gender and class.[12] It was encouraged by government officials at a time when the Ontario public school system was "imbued with the rhetoric of frugality and need for fiscal cuts."[13] But it was also a time when the provincial government's officials sought to enact reforms in society, and according

---

[11] Bruce Curtis, *True Government by Choice Men*, 246.

[12] See Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training"; Shapiro, *Child's Garden*; Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*; Dehli, "The Rule by Sympathy"; and Curtis, *Building the Educational State*.

[13] Smaller, "Gender and Class," 143.

to Smaller, interest in the kindergarten system was largely due to its early socialization approach. The public kindergarten was an obvious way to reach a majority of children, specifically those of the lower working classes. Smaller posits that "the fact that these kindergartens were established mainly (or solely) in those areas of cities with high numbers of working class, minority and migrant families, suggests that schooling officials had a very specific clientele and agenda in mind."[14] They wanted to socialize the poor with middle class morals and values. It was a way to reach the children of the poor at an early age, and teach both them and their parents (primarily their mothers) basic cleanliness, nutrition and domestic skills valued by the middle class.[15] It was these 'practical' needs that helped promote the entry of the kindergarten system into the public school, but these 'practical' needs also changed the purpose of the kindergarten system.

A government official most influential in bringing kindergarten into Canadian public education was James Hughes who was one of Froebel's most influential disciples in North America.[16] It was shortly after his appointment as Toronto's chief public school inspector, and during a visit to Boston, that he was first introduced to "a system of education designed to develop the whole child."[17] It was the kindergarten system, and in 1876, while attending the American Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, he was again so impressed by the Froebelian kindergarten system displayed that, during his return journey to Toronto, he made a stop in New York to discuss kindergarten education with Maria Kraus-Boelte. She was one of the main

---

[14] Ibid., 143.

[15] See Weiss, "An Essential Year for the Child," 140.

[16] Wilson, Stamp, and Audet, *Canadian Education*, 318.

[17] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 39.

organizers of the display and a prominent educator of the Froebelian method. He asked her to recommend a kindergarten teacher who could possibly open a private kindergarten in Toronto and she recommended a former student of hers, Ada Marean, who at the time was a kindergartner in a private kindergarten at Saint John, New Brunswick.[18] Hughes followed-up on Ms. Kraus-Boelte's recommendation, and in 1878 Ada Marean moved to Toronto and opened a private kindergarten.

Given his interest and position, Hughes, accompanied by a trustee of the Toronto School Board, was sent by Adam Crooks, the Ontario Minister of Education, to St. Louis to investigate their public school kindergarten.[19] This was followed by a Special Report to the Minister of Education in 1882. The report was very supportive of the public kindergarten system which they promoted as the foundation for all public school education. These men were impressed by the idea of the education of the 'whole child' and supported the requirement for specializing in this field. After thanking the courtesy of Miss Susan E. Blow for enabling him to thoroughly investigate and obtain valuable information regarding the kindergarten system, Hughes argued that it was difficult to estimate "the real value of a system which trains and develops the entire being morally, mentally, physically and socially" due to being "so accustomed to regard the functions of the school as limited to the cultivation of the intellect alone." He stressed its complexity and emphasized the thirty years it took Froebel to complete his system; a system which reached "effectively every part of the nature of the child" including the moral, the social,

---

[18] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 42-43.

[19] Adam Crooks was the Minister of Education for the years 1876 to 1883. This position took the place of the Superintendent position held by Ryerson until then.

the physical, the industrial, and the mental, and promoted his "vigorous and healthy growth." Adhering to Miss Blow's recommendation, Hughes also made a point of stating that one required "at least a two years course to become a proficient kindergartner."[20] Like the early kindergartners, Hughes believed that Froebel's kindergarten system demanded "thorough training and broad culture on the part of all who have the privilege of training childhood."[21] In 1883, the Toronto School Board opened the first public school kindergarten in Canada, with Ada Marean appointed as its director, seven assistants (unpaid women students), and approximately eighty children.[22] And by 1885 the Ontario government approved the kindergarten as an official part of the provincial public education system, becoming the first province to do so.[23]

Joining the public school came hand-in-hand with joining the teaching occupation, which meant that the training of kindergartners moved into teachers training institutions such as the Normal Schools in Ottawa and Toronto, where kindergarten became a subject. Another avid supporter of the kindergarten system was George W. Ross, the Ontario Minister of Education from 1883 to 1899. Being proud of the Education Department's accomplishments with regard to kindergarten teachers' training, he made an effort to make it known to different boards of trustees. In a letter to a board chairman, Ross wrote about the establishment in 1885 of training schools for

---

[20] Ontario, Department of Education, *Annual Report of the Minister of Education* [hereafter, *ARME*] (Toronto, 1882), 229-33.

[21] Hughes, James L. *Froebel's Educational Laws*, 2.

[22] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 40. The first public school kindergarten in Ontario was opened at Louisa Street Public School in Toronto.

[23] Henry F. Johnson, *A Brief History of Canadian Education* (Toronto and New York: McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada, 1968), 84.

kindergarten teachers. In his correspondence, he called the Chairman's attention to what was done in connection with the Provincial Normal Schools in Ottawa and Toronto, and to the department's means of disposal for aiding in opening a Kindergarten School under the management of the respective Board. He provided information with regard to the availability of qualified teachers, writing that "by this means we have now, available for the public service, a number of well-trained teachers, and on the first of July next we expect to license a good many more." Although he assumed that the Chairman is "no doubt familiar with the aims and ends of Kindergarten Schools, and their value in the primary training of children between three and six years of age," he chose to stress a few of the found benefits of the system. He stated that "it is found that children who take the course in the Kindergarten overcome, much more easily, the early difficulties of ordinary public school work, because of their quickened perceptions and increased powers of observation." Ross's support for the kindergarten system was clearly endorsed as he ended his letter by saying that he knew "of no way that a Board of Trustees can contribute more towards the cultivation of right methods in the elementary classes of a public school than by the establishment of a kindergarten."[24] By 1900, over 11,000 children, attended 166 kindergartens in Ontario.[25]

---

[24] G. W. Ross to Chairman of Board of Trustees, April 17, 1888, Archives of Ontario, MS 5634, RG 2-42-0-2185. Though it is not clear from the document to which board of trustees this was directed, the correspondence was indeed official as it is on an official Department of Education letter head.

[25] Johnson, *A Brief History*, 84.

Professional Hierarchy: The Model School System

Upon the request of Dr. Pyne, the Minister of Education at 1914, Mr. J. J. Tilley wrote a report that included the history of the training of teachers in Ontario until that year.[26] According to him, an important change was made to the training courses of the Normal Schools in 1877, when it was "made entirely professional and was restricted to Second Class teachers."[27] This change was made after Ryerson's retirement in 1876 when, as discussed earlier, the then new Liberal government quickly eliminated his position of Superintendent of Education, which they believed was much too independent of party control, and introduced the role of Minister of Education instead. This meant that provincial education matters were moved "more directly into the management sphere of the cabinet ... whose guiding principles were frugality, efficiency, and centralization of power."[28] One of their first reforms included the creation of the Model School System, where local municipalities designated certain elementary schools to train student teachers. The students were trained for three months, by which they observed and assisted teaching during the day, and participated in lectures by the principal after school.[29] According to Tilley, these teachers graduated with Third Class teaching certificates. He stresses that "placing the Normal Schools upon a professional basis and requiring all young teachers to attend County

---

[26] Mr J. J. Tilley was an ex-inspector of Model Schools. He wrote this report upon the request of Dr. Pyne, the Minister of Education at the time. See Report of Mr. J. J. Tilley, in *Relative to the Training of Teachers and Other Matters* (Toronto: L. K. Cameron, 1914), 5-6. OISE Library, Toronto.

[27] Until 1877 the Normal Schools were still granting First Class and Second Class certificates with both professional and non-professional courses of study. Ibid., 6.

[28] Smaller, Gender and Class, 135-136.

[29] Ibid., 138.

Model Schools for professional training was the first step taken by the province to require all teachers to have some professional training before being licensed to teach." It is important to note, however, that whereas the Normal School students' final examination "was conducted by examiners appointed by the Minister of Education," the Model School students' "granting of certificates was left with [the] County Boards."[30] This system opened the doors to official teacher training for many women who otherwise had no access to the programs in the two Normal Schools in Toronto and Ottawa. It resulted in thousands of new teachers, from working- and lower-middle class, holding basic qualifications. But it provided a lower quality of training, compared to the Normal School, and with that it lowered the requirements for the teaching certification.[31]

This system was not necessarily introduced to create an overt hierarchy within the teaching profession, but rather to create a system of steps to becoming a professional teacher of the highest level. Tilley's report makes it clear that the idea behind establishing a Model School system was to provide only an initial training for all young teachers on their way to becoming fully professional. Originally, the certificates granted by the County Boards were limited to three years, and were accepted only within that county. Tilley states that receiving a Third Class certificate was supposed to be only tentative, with the idea of later continuing to the Normal School to obtain a permanent professional certificate, valid throughout the province, and granting the holder a higher salary. But he adds that "the removal of the limits ... upon Third Class certificates as to time and area of validity, and the ease with which these certificates could be

---

[30] Report of Mr. J. J. Tilley, 6.

[31] See Smaller, Gender and Class, 138.

obtained, soon flooded the country with Third Class teachers and caused such an underbidding of salaries that there was no encouragement for teachers to incur the expense necessary to obtain a permanent certificate."[32]

Although the intention may not have been to do so, this move encouraged, very early on, hierarchy within the teaching profession. Teachers of the lowest grades became plentiful, and the supply exceeded the demand. Furthermore, many still saw teaching as a temporary profession, and used it as a stepping stone. For many it did not become a 'vocation' as Ryerson originally hoped for. According to Tilley's report, by 1907, the year which the County Model Schools were officially discontinued, female teachers in rural Ontario schools outnumbered male teachers by more than four to one.[33] And Danylewycz and Prentice argue that it is this majority of women together with the gendered connotation that the term 'profession' had in the nineteenth century, that is the core of the disarray about the social position and identity of the teaching occupation as a profession.[34] For how could an occupation with a majority of 'women' move towards becoming a 'profession' at a time when the two concepts were considered contradictory. Nineteenth-century understanding of profession seemed to be solved by the creation of a professional hierarchy where women occupied the lower ranks, and men became 'professional' supervisors. This was the system the kindergartners joined in the 1880s.

---

[32] Report of Mr. J. J. Tilley, 6.

[33] The County Model Schools closed in 1907, and in 1908 a small number of District Model Schools were opened for the purpose of providing a lower grade of teachers. The certificates granted from these were valid for five years, and were known as Limited Thirds. These were an improved version of the former certificates, granted by the County Model Schools. Ibid., 7 and 9.

[34] See Danylewycz and Prentice, "Revising the History," 141.

Kindergarten Teaching as a Speciality

The rapid growth of the Ontario education system around the 1880s, and the shortage in teachers, promoted emergency training programs such as the Ontario model schools discussed earlier. With the promotion of the grading system, and the introduction of new curriculum (which included hygiene, temperance, and calisthenics), the responsibilities of teachers widened, and although those who went to the Provincial Normal Schools were trained for the new curriculum, they were the exception rather than the rule.[35] While the responsibility for teacher training and certification shifted from local to provincial authority as early as 1867, the majority of teachers in the 1880s were certified through other channels, such as the Model Schools, where they presented themselves to local boards of examiners.[36] Danylewycz and Prentice note that this "lack of preparation" troubled many of the teachers.[37]

As mentioned earlier, it was at this time of growth and change that the kindergarten system joined the public education system. As the idea of kindergarten and its approach to early education began to spread among educators and society at large, the age appropriate for admission

---

[35] It was not until the turn of the century that "increasing prosperity enabled ... to expand teachers' colleges and guarantee Normal School training for most teachers. [also,] summer school courses and teachers' institutes were developed to keep the practising teacher abreast of the latest trends." Wilson, Stamp, and Audet, *Canadian Education*, 317.

[36] See Tomkins, *A Common Countenance*, 71-73; and Marta Danylewycz, and Alison Prentice, "Teachers' Work: Changing Patterns and Perceptions in the Emerging School Systems of Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-century Central Canada," in *Women who taught: Perspectives on the history of women and teaching*, ed. Alison Prentice and Marjorie R. Theobald (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 143-144.

[37] Danylewycz, and Prentice, "Revising the History," 141.

to public schools came into focus; it was suggested that children should begin school at the age of seven, rather than the age of five. But as there was no public system in place to accommodate the five and six year olds, the system remained as before. Understanding that there is a need for a different approach to educating the young, the OTA passed a resolution in 1881, which was brought forth by the Public School Inspector James Hughes, that "the students-in-training in the Normal Schools should receive training in the principles and practices of kindergarten work" in order to better their understanding of the five and six year old children in their primary classes.[38] At the same time, another resolution was placed before the Minister of Education by the OTA, "that the age of candidates on entering the [teaching] profession should be for females eighteen, and for males, twenty years."[39] This suggests a need for maturity on the part of the teacher, and maybe the hope that by this point the individual had the time to be appropriately trained and choose this as a permanent profession, rather than a transition job.

In his 1882 special report to the Minister of Education, Hughes strongly recommended the introduction of a kindergarten in connection with the Normal Model School in Toronto and Ottawa, reasoning that

> 1. The kindergarten is the most philosophical system of child education, and should, therefore, be the foundation of all public education.
>
> 2. The physical and musical portions of the kindergarten could, to a large extent, be introduced into the Primary Schools of Ontario, if the teachers in training had the opportunity of becoming acquainted, practically, with them during their Normal School course. This alone would justify the introduction of the kindergarten into the Model Schools.

---

[38] See Minutes of the OTA, 12.

[39] Ibid., 20.

> 3. Children who attend kindergartens would be relieved from hard and unattractive study during those years, when the brain is growing in size most rapidly, and during which it is most susceptible to permanent injury.[40]
>
> 4. It could not fail to be of immense advantage to the students in training at the Normal Schools. They could not, it is true, become kindergarteners during their short course, but they could become acquainted with the pedagogical principles on which the kindergarten is based, and practically with the methods best adapted to interest childhood.[41]

Hughes saw the Normal Model Schools as a perfect way to introduce the kindergarten system to the teaching community, as that was the place where the teachers in training gained their practical experience. Although he knew the course was too short for them to qualify for being kindergartners, he wanted them to gain an understanding of the kindergarten's pedagogical principles and practices, as he had great respect for the kindergarten system, and believed it was the foundation for all public education.

The Kindergarten Movement regarded teacher training as central to the quality of the kindergarten system. As stated earlier in this thesis, the early kindergartners saw kindergarten teaching as a vocation, and they argued that it should be differentiated from regular primary school teaching, which they contended "developed as something of a default job for lower-middle-class people (increasingly young women) who had only limited education themselves."[42] This class-biased remark alludes to the thousands of teachers who received their certification going through the official three months basic training in county model schools during the 1880s.

---

[40] Hughes' reasoning is clearly influenced by ideas from the rising Child Study Movement which focussed on child psychology and development.

[41] *ARME* 1882, 233-34. Note that in his report, Hughes stressed the requirement of "at least a two years course to become a proficient kindergartener." Ibid., 229.

[42] Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 478.

And like many government officials, the Froebelian kindergartners regarded their training and certification requirements as low and insufficient.[43] These upper-middle-class ladies, by way of the gendered nature of their profession, coupled with the age of the children they taught, were 'naturally' positioned together with the primary teachers, at the bottom of the teaching hierarchy. Although they wanted to join the teaching profession, they did not want to be associated with the lowest rank of the teaching hierarchy and the working, lower-class women in it. They continually pushed for their specialization to be recognized.

Congruent with the kindergartners appeals, by 1885 the Ontario Department of Education amended the Ontario School Act to include kindergarten teaching as a speciality. It was to be included as a separate area of study; a separate branch from the elementary teacher training course.[44] Being part of the same class as 'men in power' and having connection to the decision makers played a part in this success no doubt. That year, the first course of study to focus on the training of kindergarten teachers was introduced in the Normal School and kindergarten was added to the Model School. The Globe reported that "the Education Department has engaged Miss Hailman,[45] of Indianapolis, who has been thoroughly trained in the Kindergarten Schools of the United States, to take charge of this branch of the Model School of Toronto ... and

---

[43] See Smaller, Gender & Class, 138.

[44] See Dehli, "The Rule by Sympathy"; and Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*.

[45] Miss Hailman was the first Kindergarten Director at the Normal School in Toronto. She resigned after a year, "on account of ill-health, and Miss Hart of St. Louis was appointed in her place." See *The Globe*, Toronto, January 4, 1888, p.3, in http://heritage.theglobeandmail.com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/PageView.asp (accessed May15, 2008).

arrangements made to make the kindergarten work part of the Normal School course hereafter."[46] Direct entry into this course was possible until 1914, after which entrance was limited to Second-class certificate holders. It remained the only such program in the province for decades. This demonstrates acceptance of the kindergartners' expertise. It is a small but important recognition on the part of professional men that may have come primarily from the gendered ideology of the time, where women were seen as naturally skilled at dealing with young children, but the inclusion of the kindergarten as a separate course within the Normal School does point to an acceptance of it as a specialty, one that needs training none-the-less.

The Kindergarten Teacher

The training of kindergarten teachers for the public school in Ontario began at a time when the Model School system was still very much alive, and although I did not locate documented information with respect to their training other than in the Normal Schools, I believe many kindergarten teachers were trained in that system. It is letters such as the one written by Susan E. Blow, in 1887, that led me to such an understanding. This "beautiful, talented daughter of wealthy, cultured, and deeply religious parents" was trained as a kindergartner, and ran her own high quality training school for kindergartners, for thirteen years at this point.[47] She took it upon herself to write the Minister of Education, G. W. Ross, believing her "cause just enough to

---

[46] See Local News, *The Globe*, Toronto, August 14,1885, p.6. http://heritage.theglobeandmail.com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/PageView.asp (accessed May15, 2008).

[47] Ross, *Kindergarten Crusade*, 13.

intrude upon [his] time." Her correspondence with a former student of hers, Miss Hart, a kindergartner who taught in the Toronto Model School at the time, led her to infer that the Minister had "an opportunity of developing a system of kindergartens superior to any in the world," but she stressed that "on the other hand there are dangers which might - if not met greatly injure the work." She wrote:

> Miss Hart has written to me of the admirable rule that all teachers graduated at any school in Ontario must take a six months course at the Toronto Normal [School] before they are eligible for positions in the Province. Doubtless it has occurred to you that if the same requirement were made of Kindergarten teachers it would give unity and efficacy to the work throughout the province. Failing this, it may become both mechanical and capricious. Ms. Hart is admirably qualified to do work of this kind. I regard her ... as one of [two] best trainers in America.[48]

This excerpt raises a number of important points. First, as mentioned above, it illuatrates the understanding that kindergarten teachers were trained at schools other than the Normal Schools, which she does not believe is good enough. Second, the language with regard to 'kindergartners' is changed here to 'kindergarten teachers.' I believe this is done purposefully in order to position the kindergartners clearly as part of the government run training system for teachers, which should be responsible for the quality of their training. The emphasis of this letter is on the need for quality control, a need that Blow held in the highest regard, and the reason why she ran her own training school where she had full control.

It is clearly written by a woman who is viewed as an expert on the matter at hand and who believes she could influence the reader with her educated advice. If not personally, then at least formally, the Minister must have known who Susan E. Blow was, because the letter is signed by

---

[48] Susan E. Blow to G. W. Ross, 1887, Archives of Ontario, MS 5634, RG 2-42-0-2174.

her private name alone, and there is no other information as to her professional status. Blow first appealed to Ross' ego by stating her admiration to the organized manner of teachers' training in Ontario, and then she challenged his pragmatic side by focusing on the unity and efficiency that a similar route for kindergarten teachers would create throughout the province. But she did not stop there, she even provided him with a name of a qualified trainer, whom she herself trained, and considered one of the best in America. It is clear that Blow provided this advice with the intention to try and preserve the high quality of training for kindergarten teachers-to-be, within this government, male run institution. She was able to do so because of her own social position, her experience of running a training school, and her specialized knowledge of the kindergarten system.

Blow's letter was written three years prior to the joining of kindergarten teachers to the Ontario Education Association (OEA). On 27 December 1890, when kindergartens "were well-established in twenty centers of Ontario as an integral part of the Public School system, employing two hundred teachers and having nearly 8000 children in attendance," a group of kindergarten teachers from the province met in the Toronto Normal School and organized themselves as a section of the OEA.[49] At this meeting, with the support of the members of the OEA, a motion was passed asking G. W. Ross, the Minister of Education, "that the Provincial Kindergarten Examination be given the same status as other Provincial Examinations."[50] The loss of control over the training and certification process of their profession, led the kindergarten teachers on a quest to re-gain status within the already existing teaching hierarchy. The OEA

[49] History of OEA, Chapter 4.

[50] Ibid.

supported the kindergarten system specifically and the new education reforms in general, and consequently formed, by 1895, a child-study section within it.[51] Its Kindergarten section was greatly honoured in 1900, when Ada Marean-Hughes was elected to be president of the OEA.[52]

[51] Stamp, *Schools of Ontario*, 52.

[52] History of OEA, Chapter 4; and Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten,* 43.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE INSTITUTION IN MOTION: DECLINE OF A PROFESSION

As seen in the prior chapter, the kindergarten became part of the graded public school system in Ontario in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. At the same time, changes in legislation encouraged the Normal School to introduce the Froebelian kindergarten system to its student-teachers, and later to open its doors to the education of kindergarten teachers in a separate course, as a speciality. This allowed kindergartners' training, examination and certification, to move from private institutions, often outside of Canada, to the official government-run school for teachers. They became a part of the Ontario public education system, and were positioned within the already existing teaching hierarchy. Although this move meant that the kindergarten system would reach more and more children, it came with a price, as it did not necessarily mean keeping with the quality of training many Froebelian kindergartners regarded as essential. The move into the male-run institution of education in Ontario meant a loss of control over the kindergarten system and the quality of training for the early kindergartners.

The Educational Institution of Ontario: Hierarchical Design

In the late nineteenth century the educational institution in Ontario was divided into Elementary Schools, High Schools, Colleges, Universities, and Training of Teachers Institutes. From the beginning, kindergarten was seen as a unit onto its own, as the elementary schools were subdivided into kindergartens and public schools (which included the Roman-Catholic separate

schools).[1] In order to situate kindergartners, or kindergarten teachers as they came to be known, within this system, it is necessary to be cognizant of the six different institutions created by the Education Department to prepare the young men and women in the province for the teaching profession. These included: (1) County Model Schools; (2) Provincial Normal and Model Schools; (3) Training Institutes; (4) County Teachers Institutes;[2] (5)Teachers' Reading Courses;[3] and (6) the Ontario Teachers Association. It is also beneficial to have a closer look at the hierarchy of certificates – there were three levels -- given to teachers and the conditions to receiving them. There were two types of examinations for receiving the certificates. First, a Non-Professional Examination, held at the High Schools, which tested the literary proficiency of the candidates; and second, a Professional Examination for each class respectively: at the County Model School for Third-class teachers, at a Provincial Normal School for Second-class teachers, and at a Training Institute for First-class teachers.[4] First and Second-class certificates were valid throughout the province, and were held during good behaviour, while the Third-class certificates

---

[1] For a detailed description of the educational system of the province see Ontario Education Department, *The School System of Ontario: Public Schools, High Schools, Colleges, Universities* (Education Department: Province of Ontario,1886). Located at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), Toronto. Amicus #9713814.

[2] This was formed in each county or inspectoral division. Every teacher attended meetings in these institutes where they read papers and discussed practical matters on the daily work of the school room. Ibid, 14.

[3] This extended over three years, and included subjects such as science, literature, and pedagogy. Ibid, 14.

[4] Ibid., 12. Note that I use the term 'professional' here as it is used in the document, but it holds a different meaning at each level of certification, as it is dependent on the level of proficiency/speciality.

were originally valid only within the county it was granted, and limited to a period of three years.[5] To receive any one of these, the candidates had to first pass the prescribed non-professional High School examination. On top of that, for a Third-class certificate they needed to show proof of good moral character, be 18 years old if male, or 17 years old if female, attend one term (three months) at a County Model School, and pass its examination.[6] For a Second-class certificate, candidates had to attend one session in a Provincial Normal School, to prepare for the professional examination; and they had to teach successfully for at least one year in one of the Public Schools in the province. Finally, for a First-class certificate one had to pass the professional examination for a Second-class certificate, and attend a Training Institute for one session, passing its prescribed examination. Another option was to teach in Public or High-School for two years and then pass the examinations. While this was the more prestigious certificate, it was not an option for the kindergarten teacher.

Public School kindergarten teachers were trained in the Provincial Normal and Model Schools. There were two such schools at the time, one in Toronto, and one in Ottawa. They both ran two sessions each year, with an average attendance of 100 candidates in each of the sessions. As mentioned earlier, Model Schools were adjunct to the Normal Schools and were used as Practice Schools for the teachers-in-training. Since 1885, they each had a "kindergartner on the staff of teachers, who [had] supervision of the kindergarten attached to the Model Schools, and

[5] A teacher could renew this for an extended three years upon re-examination in the County Model School, or, "in an emergency the Minister of Education has Power to extend the duration of a certificate." Ibid., 16.

[6] Note that these requirements (in 1886) are lower than was requested by the OTA at 1881.

also [instructed] the teachers-in-training in that branch of their profession."[7] The work in these institutions was to a large degree 'professional,' and like other teachers-in-training, only those "who have passed the non-professional, or literary examination, at the different high schools of the province, [were] entitled to enter the Normal Schools." Given the hierarchical design of the education institution, kindergartners like primary teachers, were limited in their possibilities. Although they could attend the Normal School, they were excluded from the more prestigious, First-class certificate.

Inspectoral Control

From the onset of the state school system in Ontario, there was an emphasis on the importance of school supervision and inspection. This is seen in Ryerson's 1846 report on schooling, as quoted by Smaller: "There is no class of officers in the whole machinery of elementary instruction on whom so much depends for its efficient and successful working, as upon the local Superintendents or Inspectors. The proper selection of this class of persons is a matter of greatest importance."[8] By 1871, "structures and processes for the inspection of teachers were ... enhanced ...[and] local school inspectors were to be employed only full-time."[9] Smaller notes that Inspectors had to be chosen from an official province-wide list of candidates examined by the provincial Department of Education. The 1886 Department of Education document, *The*

---

[7] See Ontario Education Department, *School System of Ontario*, 18.

[8] See Smaller, "Regulating the Regulators," 108.

[9] Ontario Education Department, *School System of Ontario*, 109.

school system of Ontario: Public schools, high schools, colleges, universities, describes in detail what it took to become an Inspector in those days, and their duties thereafter. To become an Inspector in Ontario in the 1880s, one needed to be appointed by the county, city, or town council, who paid "half their salary," and provided "reasonable travelling expenses," while the rest was paid by provincial funds. At this point, individuals appointed as Inspectors had to have certificates of eligibility, granted by the Department of Education. They could have been (a) holders of First-class Provincial Certificates, Grade A, or (b) Graduates in Arts, with first class honours, from any of the Universities in the province, who had taught successfully for five years, three of which had to have been in a Public School. The need for a full-time position becomes very clear with the following list of duties one received upon being appointed.

> To inspect every school at least once in each term; to spend half a day in each school; to satisfy himself as to the progress made by the pupils from time to time; to examine into the methods of instruction pursued by the teacher; to teach a few model lessons himself; to ascertain the nature of the discipline exercised by the teacher; to examine the registers, also the apparatus, seats, and desks, and all the internal and external equipment of the school-house; ... to see that no unauthorised text-books are used in the school; ... to grant, on examination, temporary certificates; to suspend a certificate if necessary; to visit the County Model School at least twice in each term; ... to act as chairman of the Examining Board of his district;... [and] to suspend teachers' certificates, for cause.[10]

I return to point out these many responsibilities of the inspectors in my discussion of the supervision of kindergartens and their specific needs. By 1878, the authority over hiring and firing of Inspectors was transferred from the county boards to the Education Department, a move that was supported by the officials themselves.[11] Abbott describes late nineteenth- and early

---

[10] Ibid., 11.

[11] Smaller,"Regulating the Regulators," 109.

twentieth-century public school inspectors as 'men in the middle.' He points to both their top position in the local administration hierarchy, and their low position in the central administrative hierarchy. Whereas in the former, their responsibilities included overseeing the educational efficiency of teachers, principals, and trustees, in the latter they were accountable to the Chief Inspector, Deputy Minister, and Minister of Education. They acted as links between the policy-making and the policy-implementing bodies, and functioned as "conduits for a vast correspondence."[12]

A search through the Archives of Ontario brings forth samples of such correspondence, which shed light on the part Inspectors played in the route to becoming a kindergarten teacher. For example, in 1892 there was a large quantity of formal correspondence regarding the unusual circumstances of a number of teachers hired by the Toronto Board, while still in need of further training. It speaks of modifications to the regulations with regards to employing candidates who just passed the kindergarten Assistant's exams, but were still attending the Normal Kindergarten taking up the course for their Directors' certificates.[13] I infer from the correspondence that due to the demand for more Kindergarten Directors, modifications were made with regard to taking their Directors' exams. The Minister of Education, G. W. Ross showed flexibility and a willingness to bend the rules to an extent, in order to allow a number of teachers, hired by the Board prior to 30

---

[12] John Abbott, "Accomplishing "A Man's Task": Rural Women Teachers, Male Culture, and the School Inspectorate in Turn of the Century Ontario," in *Gender and Education in Ontario: an Historical Reader*, eds., Heap, Ruby and Alison Prentice (Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1991), 49.

[13] See Letters of correspondence among the Minister of Education, G. W. Ross, the Deputy Minister of Education, John Miller, the Acting Minister of Education (no name provided), and the Toronto Public School Inspector, J. L. Hughes, September to November1892, Archives of Ontario, MS 5633, RG 2-42-0-2127.

June 1892, to continue working as employees of the Board while at the same time continuing their education towards becoming certified Directors. This was supposed to be an exception.

A letter from Ross to the Toronto Public School Inspector, James Hughes, implies that the latter made a request on behalf of a number of teachers for some exemptions from regulations to becoming Certified Directors. While prior correspondence was not located, Ross clearly responds to an inquiry made on behalf of the teachers in Hughes' Toronto Board. Being fully aware of Hughes' role in promoting the kindergarten and showing his respect for the system, Ross opens his letter by pointing out that his decisions are based on consulting with the then director of the Provincial Kindergarten, Mary Macintyre. In response to Hughes' request, Ross concluded that

> 1. The value of the course of lectures in theory depends very much upon the practical work of the Kindergarten, the practice being to require each student to conduct lessons and manage classes under our Director on the lines indicated in the lectures.
>
> 2. If students are excused from this practical work their training will be necessarily weak and wanting in symmetry. In view of the peculiar circumstances of those teachers who are at present under an engagement with the board, the Education Department would agree to the following; (1) every teacher from the city of Toronto certified as being under contract with the Board will be allowed to take the Kindergarten examination for Directors providing such teacher (a) attends all the lectures in theory delivered at the Provincial Kindergarten and (b) providing such teacher takes the practical work of the Kindergarten each forenoon for at least two consecutive months. (2) As the school is likely to be pretty full, it would be better if only four or five teachers should attend in the forenoon at one time. This would enable you to provide substitutes in case of their absence as only that number would be absent at one time.[14]

He ends the letter stating that it is the best that he can offer, to still provide the necessary training. Hughes, who was not completely satisfied with Ross' reply, wrote an indirect response to John

---

[14] G. W. Ross to J. L. Hughes, September 2, 1892, Archives of Ontario, MS 5633, RG 2-42-0-2127.

Miller, who was then Deputy Minister of Education. After a brief summary of Ross' recommendations, he formally added that the Minister "may have overlooked the fact that the ladies are engaged in practical work, each in charge of a small class of her own, every day throughout the year." He continued, arguing that "to take these ladies away from their regular work would greatly inconvenience [the] Kindergartens ... [which] require a very large staff to manage," as there were already 32 of them at the Toronto Board.[15] The documents do not support a direct response to Hughes' letter, but it was clearly not the end of the issue, as two months later, on 9 November 1892, the Acting Minister of Education sent a letter to Hughes stating his awareness that "some of the candidates who passed the recent Kindergarten examinations and who were [still] in attendance at the Normal Kindergarten taking up the course for their Directors' certificates have been appointed to positions on [his] staff." He stressed that the ladies hired after June 1892, will not receive the modifications applied to the ladies that were hired prior to that date, and that "before they are permitted to attend the examinations for Directors' certificates they will be required to comply with the regulations, which require attendance at a Provincial Kindergarten for one year."[16]

It is indeed true that Hughes played a prominent role in bringing the Froebelian kindergarten into Ontario's public education, but he was also the Toronto Public School Inspector and the increasing demand for public-school kindergarten teachers sometimes was in conflict

---

[15] J. L. Hughes to John Miller, Setember 6, 1892, Archives of Ontario, MS 5633, RG 2-42-0-2127.

[16] Acting Minister of Education to J. L. Hughes, November 9, 1892, Archives of Ontario, MS 5633, RG 2-42-0-2127.

with the need to keep the kindergarten system in specialized hands (I do wonder what Ada Hughes thought of his requests to 'cut corners'). Hughes' admiration for the Froebelian kindergarten, and his enthusiasm to include as many of them in the public education system may have blinded him to an extent when the demand began to exceed the supply of teachers. Although the teachers he referred to did gain practical experience, they were Assistants, hired as Directors. They taught without practising under the guidance of an experienced Director first, where practice and theory were combined, in order to achieve this specialization. While Ross did consult Macintyre's expert opinion on the matter, the economic sense of the request, coupled with Ross' awareness of Hughes' knowledge of the kindergarten system, led to the accommodations he made. Although Ross did stress the need for training, by making these exceptions possible he opened the door to teaching without the specialized tools needed for doing the best job possible. I infer, from the Acting Minister's letter to Hughes, that the Toronto Board, yet again, tried to take advantage of this 'loop-hole' to fill up more vacant positions.

Rise and Fall of a Specialized Kindergarten Inspectorate

The many responsibilities of the Inspectors required the implementation, in 1871, of a full-time position for this profession; Hughes, as Inspector of the Toronto School Board, held such a position. In 1886, recognizing the need for an Ontario Kindergarten inspector, a part-time position was created and given to Caroline Hart, who at the same time, held the position of the Director of the Kindergarten at the Toronto Normal Model School. She held *both* positions from

1886 to 1892.[17] It is interesting to note that not only was she a part-time Inspector, she was in charge of all the kindergartens in the province, not only in one Board. Among her responsibilities was the supervision of the examination process for new Assistants. In June of 1891, after reviewing the papers prepared for the Assistants' examinations, she submitted a report to Ross, the Minister of Education, where she voiced her concerns and criticisms. She commented on the move towards testing primarily the theoretical work of first year Assistants, and argued that the practical side provides important grounding and a basis for their theoretical course in the second year, and therefor should be emphasized more. In this report, she included her observations from kindergartens in Hamilton and Brantford, where she had heard teaching exercises, and examined twenty-four books of practical work. She was not impressed and she stated that most of the work was average, or below, and that other than two exceptions, a "lack of system seemed to prevail."[18]

Mary E. Macintyre was a former student of Hart's who replaced her as Director of the Kindergarten at the Toronto Normal Model School and Inspector of Ontario. She too held both positions simultaneously. She was Director of the kindergarten at the Toronto Normal Model School, and Inspector of Ontario from 1892 until 1932.[19] As Inspector, Macintyre took it upon herself to do several tours of inspection, while holding on to her position as Director of Kindergarten. She had a positive view of the kindergartens she inspected, but she did stress that where teachers were not trained as kindergartners, the rooms were conducted more like primary

---

[17] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten,* 44. Caroline Hart studied with Susan E. Blow in St. Louis, and was regarded by her as one of the best trainers in North America.

[18] Caroline M. Hart to G. W. Ross, June 6, 1891, Archives of Ontario, MS 5634, RG 2-42-0-2184.

[19] See Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten,* 44-45.

classes, the only difference being that Froebelian kindergarten equipment and materials were used. Macintyre was passionate in her zeal both to improve the public kindergarten system, and to keep it from deteriorating and losing its unique Froebelian qualities, such as understanding and using Froebel's 'gifts' properly, as they combine games (not simply toys) with instruction which is purposely and thoughtfully designed to " stimulate and guide the natural activity of the child."[20] She argued that avoiding using the 'gifts' as simple tools involves an in-depth understanding of Froebel's system.

In her 1896 Report to the Minister of Education, Macintyre demonstrates clearly her belief in the need for kindergartners to follow the Froebelian method. She summed up her inspection of the kindergartens in London, Tilsonburg, Aylmer, Ingersoll, Chatham, and Stratford as follows:

> The kindergartners show originality and thoroughness in their work. There is no tendency towards that mechanical routine, which is the death-blow to all advancement. The originality of children is developed and their power of expression cultivated. Froebel did not intend that the material should be used to teach mechanical lessons in form or number. He emphasised the fact that form and number are to be learned incidentally, the aim of the material being to develop physical, mental and moral power. In Ingersoll and Tilsonburg, I was pleased to see that the directors carried out that part of Froebel's plan of work which he emphasized so strongly and which is neglected by so many kindergarteners, namely, the excursions, by which the children are enabled to enter into the life of nature in woods and fields, or into the life of industrial trade, by allowing them to see the processes of production by which their simplest wants are supplied. The kindergartner who does not do this is not carrying out Froebel's ideal.[21]

In general, Macintyre was pleased with the orderliness and the teaching, but spoke in terms that reinforced Froebel's ideals. She stressed two errors kindergartners need to guard against. On the one hand, bringing primary work into the kindergarten, and on the other hand mistaking

---

[20] Emily Shirreff, *Kindergarten*, 8.

[21] *ARME* 1896, 231.

continuous impulsive plays as "exercises in creative expression."[22] The fact that Macintyre held both the position of Inspector of the Ontario Kindergartens and of Kindergarten Director of the Toronto Normal Model School, provided her with experience and an in-depth understanding of both the kindergarten itself, and the public education system at large.

As well as writing official reports, as an Inspector she had regular correspondence with the Ministry. In her letters, there are several references to issues such as the importance of assistants, the length of the kindergarten session, and the number of children in the kindergarten. She emphasized the kindergartners' need for preparation time as follows: "In our best kindergartens the teachers spend a great deal of thought and time in the preparation of new work for the pupils. But this requires time and study that must be spent in the kindergarten. The results are seen in the keen interest and enthusiasm of the children. This is impossible where the teachers have to work [two] sessions."[23] This issue came up frequently. For example, while discussing two schools in Toronto Junction, which were taught by the same team of teachers: a director, an assistant, and one student volunteer, Macintyre noted that

> this necessitates a morning session in one school, and an afternoon in another, of two hours each. ... a poor plan for two reasons: first, the children have only two hours in the kindergarten each day, a time insufficient to accomplish what should be done in a good kindergarten; second, the Director cannot do the work that should be done because there is not time for the preparation of material.[24]

---

[22] Ibid., 232.

[23] The two sessions refer to one morning and one afternoon taught by the same kindergartner. Mary Macintyre to G. W. Ross, November 15, 1897, Archives of Ontario, MS 5633, RG 2-42-2088.

[24] Mary Macintyre to G. W. Ross, December 7, 1898, Archives of Ontario, MS 5633, RG 2-42-2088.

Macintyre, herself a professional kindergartner, stressed the importance of preparation time as part of the kindergartener's daily routine. She argued for it as a necessity for a high quality kindergarten system.

In 1901, after nine years of holding the part-time position of Kindergarten Inspector, Macintyre wrote to Harcourt, Minister of Education at the time, and recommended that a separate full-time position be made for Kindergarten Inspector. She felt that this would allow for kindergartens to be inspected properly twice yearly, as she believed they should be, and that it would create fresh interest in the kindergarten system.[25] Such a move would have given the profession higher standing. Harcourt did not adhere to her recommendation, and Macintyre repeated this request, on behalf of the Ontario kindergartners, four years later in a letter to the new Minister of Education, Dr. Pyne. On 6 November 1905, she wrote:

> Before the opening of another session, I beg permission to place before you the need of the appointment of a [full time] provincial Inspector of Kindergartens, in order that the schools now established, may be kept up to the highest standards and that new districts may be encouraged to open kindergartens. ... Leaving out the kindergartens in Toronto, where the necessity of inspection has been recognized by the appointment of a supervisor, there would be between seventy-five and eighty kindergartens to be visited, which have no inspection. [Furthermore,] it is impossible for the Public School Inspectors to supervise the kindergartens for they do not understand any of the details of the work. ... They have no means of knowing whether a kindergartner is behind the time or keeping up with the progress of the movement.[26]

In her letter, Macintyre showed knowledge of the system by arguing that the distance between the kindergartens -- "they are spread over a district extending from Ottawa to Chatham" -

---

[25] See Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten,* 45. (original document was not located).

[26] Mary Macintyre to Dr. Pyne, November 6, 1905, Archives of Ontario, MS2631, RG 2-29-1-95.

- would keep a full-time inspector busy visiting each kindergarten twice a year, as was "the requirement for towns and villages." She added, that in some towns there was only one kindergarten, leaving the Kindergartner/Director (in the majority of cases quite a young woman) dependent on her own resources- with no encouragement, guidance, help, or criticism to "keep her up to the mark." She continued to argue that trustees, not having an understanding of the kindergarten work, at times hired unqualified teachers and provided inadequate accommodations and materials. Macintyre argues for the need for a specialist to overlook, support, and challenge the existing kindergarten teachers, as well as recognize those who are properly qualified to teach at this system.

Another argument for the need of a Kindergarten Inspector was that the Education Department withdrew their supervision of the examination for Assistants in the kindergarten training, leaving "the responsibility for the training ... entirely to the young Directors, assisted by the Public School Inspectors, who [knew] nothing of the work." Macintyre argued that a specialized Inspector will help safe-guard the standards of training for the Assistants' Certificate. Again, she showed her knowledge of the education system, her respect for it, and her adamant search of equal recognition for the kindergarten system, by writing that

> there are more kindergartens in the Province then there are Manual Training or Domestic Science Departments, yet there has been an Inspector for each of these departments for several years. The standard of our training is very high and compares favourably with the best schools in America. Our graduates are successful in prominent positions outside of our province and at home, but we feel that the kindergarten system will not flourish, nor maintain the standard of the Normal Schools, if we do not have a government Inspector.[27]

[27] Ibid.

Macintyre repeated this request several times during her role as Inspector. She ends the letter to Pyne, by reminding him that the two former Ministers of Education, Ross (1883-1899), and Harcourt (1899-1905), "acknowledged the necessity and promised to appoint one as soon as they could."

This repeated request, as well as the length of time that Macintyre held her position, suggests her keen search for the recognition of the kindergarten system as a speciality, and its teachers as specialists. But knowing that no action was ever taken by the Education Department to accommodate this request,[28] suggests a development of hierarchy within the education system, where some departments were considered more worthy than others.

Not being accommodated in the request for a government appointed full-time kindergarten Inspector did not deter Macintyre, and in 1913, being a part of a special committee on kindergarten regulation and course of study it came up again, though in a different guise. The committee included the kindergarten directors of the Normal Schools in Ottawa and Toronto, Miss Eliza Bolton and Miss Mary E. Macintyre respectively; the Supervisor of kindergartens in the Toronto Public Schools, Miss L. N. Currie; the Principal of Hamilton Normal School, Dr. S. A. Morgan; the Inspector of Public Schools in Ottawa, Dr. J. H. Putman; and Dr. H. T. J. Coleman, chairman, and associate professor of education in the University of Toronto.[29] They unanimously recommended the creation of what they called, a Provincial Kindergarten Director, who would act as a consultant to Inspectors and kindergarten authorities. Their report stated that

---

[28] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 45.

[29] *ARME* 1913, 328.

the one serious weakness in the Kindergarten system is "its lack of correlation with the regular school." They argued that "to relieve the Public School Inspector of responsibility for the kindergarten would tend to widen still further the breach between it and the grade classes." Therefore, they recommended that

> there should be a Departmental Officer with a special knowledge of Kindergarten work, whose duties would be as follows:
>
> (a) To consult with local [Public School] inspectors and Kindergarten authorities and report to the Department on the Kindergartners who are serving their term of apprenticeship.
>
> (b) To visit Teachers' Institutes for the purpose of developing interest in Kindergarten work.
>
> (c) To assist local authorities in organizing new Kindergartens.[30]

Being aware that Public School Inspectors did not have enough understanding in the Kindergarten system, they suggested a way to provide them with a more "competent knowledge" of Kindergarten work, by recommending they have:

> (a) Bulletins issued by the Department on Kindergarten work.
>
> (b) Conferences between inspectors and the Provincial Kindergarten Director.
>
> (c) Additional emphasis upon Kindergarten work in the examination for Inspectors' licenses.
>
> (d) Conferences, arranged by the department, lasting two or three days at a time, for groups of inspectors at the Normal School or Schools where Kindergarten teachers are trained.[31]

Like the earlier requests, it seems these recommendations were not acted upon, as there was no response, nor acknowledgement of them in subsequent reports. The analysis of the above

---

[30] Ibid., 330.

[31] Ibid.

documents illustrates how by not adhering to the many requests, made by official committees and individuals such as Mary Macintyre, for a full-time appointed kindergarten Inspector or at least a provincial director with broader responsibilities, a space was made for non-specialized knowledge to take over the Froebelian Kindergarten system in Ontario.

A Shift in Focus: A Move from Quality to Quantity

The success of entering the Ontario education system, endorsed by the government, gave room for expanding the kindergarten to many children; an achievement not to be taken lightly. But considering Hughes' original argument for the need of a two year training program, which he based on the successful training he saw in the USA and his own understanding of Froebel's writings, this move seemed to tip the balance of the quality of the profession in favour for quantity in the profession, which resulted in shorter training and some loss of specialization, as will be seen next.[32]

By 1903, the Report of Minister of Education stated that

> the kindergartens have taken a firm hold in [the] Province. Kindergartens were in operation in 1902 in the cities of Brantford, Chatham, Guelph, Hamilton, Kingston, London, Ottawa, Stratford and Toronto, in the towns of Aylmer, Berlin Cobourg, Dundas, Galt, Hespeler, Ingersoll, Niagara Falls, Owen Sound, Peterborough, Preston, Simcoe, Tillsonburg, Toronto Junction and Waterloo, and in the village of Ashburnham. Wherever kindergartens have been properly[33] established, they have met with much favour. The Principles of Froebel are now recognized as sound by nearly all leading

---

[32] They were given Second-class certificates, which could translate into a status of 'second-class' professionals.

[33] This choice of words leads me to believe that there were kindergartens which were not properly established; an idea that corresponds with some of the concerns raised by Macintyre.

> educationists. It is well known that instruction in the kindergarten is presumed to be given on sound pedagogic principles. The success of a school of this kind largely depend upon the zeal and training of the kindergartner.[34]

The report recognizes the principles of Froebel as the basis for kindergarten education, and portrays an awareness of the importance of the training a teacher receives; however, when it moves on to discuss the benefits of the system, it does not point to the 'wholeness' of the program, nor the educational and developmental benefits it has for the child. Rather than discussing the great value of kindergartens from a professional kindergartner's point of view, it then quotes from Dr. W. T. Harris who was the United States Commissioner of Education at the time, and was, according to this document, an avid advocate of the kindergarten idea. His quotes discuss the social need for having kindergartens, helping the poor, the immoral, and invalids. He argues that it is good for society at large. These again promote the kindergarten in general terms, but shift the focus of quality and specialization of the teaching in this 'grade' to society's need to accommodate the poor, the immoral, and invalids. Not that these are not important matters, but promoting that need distracts from the special way in which a kindergarten teacher teaches, a way that suits a certain developmental stage, no matter what background the child comes from. Having a public education system, to which any child can go helps address the issues discussed by Harris. It is a shame that an important document such as the Minister's report did not differentiate between supporting the kindergarten theoretically and actually understanding its unique qualities. It is precisely these types of decisions made primarily by men in the Ministry of Education that show how becoming institutionalized helped take away the kindergartners' voice

---

[34] *ARME* 1903, xv-xvi.

with regard to the kindergarten system in its purpose as well as in the training system to becoming a kindergartner.

This is seen again in the introduction in 1912 of a new policy to "revise the Courses of Study for the training of teachers." The Minister of Education decided that, in conformity with this policy, "the kindergarten course should, if necessary, be modified to meet changed conditions." This need was partly brought on by the fact that "the number of kindergarten teachers-in-training [was] rapidly falling off and ... the supply [was becoming] not equal to the demand."[35] The Minister appointed a special committee on the kindergarten regulations and courses of study. He included the following points to consider:

> 1. The practicability of reducing the preparatory course for [kindergarten] teachers to one year.
> 2. The qualifications for admission to the teachers' course.
> 3. A suitable course for teachers.
> 4. The length of each daily [kindergarten] session and the complete utilization of the teachers' services.
> 5. The desirability of a special Inspector.
> 6. The means of securing a competent knowledge of the course on the part of the Public School Inspector.[36]

Although by this point, the established Froebelian kindergarten was "gaining recognition as the foundation of the public school system," influences from sources such as the Kindergarten-Primary Movement which began to develop in Ontario, and Maria Montessori's work in Rome

---

[35] *ARME* 1913, 328.

[36] Ibid., 328-29.

began to make their mark.[37] The committee, as discussed earlier, was made up of a collection of individuals with a range of experiences and ideas regarding the theoretical and practical work of the kindergartner. Their recommendations appeared in the 1913 Report of the Minister of Education, where they recommended that

> The standard for admission to Kindergarten-Primary Course at the Normal Schools be Normal Entrance; that there be one year training; that graduates be given certificates qualifying the holders as assistants only; and that their certificates become permanent and qualify the holders to become kindergarten Directors and Primary teachers after two years [of] successful practical work as certified by a competent Departmental Officer.[38]

The idea of harmonizing kindergarten with the primary grades was not new. It was based on Froebel's thought of a continuous whole. Corbett found that Currie, the Principal of the Hamilton Normal School, discussed this as early as 1889, suggesting it would be of considerable benefits for primary teachers to study Froebel's theories.[39] Also in 1894, "transition work uniting the kindergarten with the primary grades began in London [Ontario]," and kindergarten directors who taught in the morning began to assist in primary classes in the afternoon, a move Putman, the Ottawa Public School inspector, encouraged.[40] This relationship between the kindergarten and the primary grades required a change in the training process, and was looked into by the OEA, in

---

[37] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten,* 71. The Kindergarten-Primary Movement was based on Froebel's thought that the child's development should be a continuous whole. Although the kindergarten was accepted as a foundation for the public school grades, the move was to bring it to closer harmony with the first two primary grades, so it becomes a part of an early education unit as Froebel intended. By 1912, Maria Montessori's book, *The Montessori Method,* had been translated into English, published in the USA, and attracted a great deal of attention. Ibid., 74.

[38] *ARME* 1913, 328-330.

[39] Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 71.

[40] Ibid., 71-72.

1897, but no formal recommendations were made. The Committee of 1913 recommended the introduction of a course in the Normal School which combined the two systems, stating that "the granting of a Kindergarten-Primary certificate will tend to bring about a closer correlation between kindergarten and primary classes and that a Kindergarten-Primary will qualify the holder to teach Form I classes in any Public School."[41]

The Ontario Department of Education acted upon these recommendations and by 1915 a Kindergarten-Primary class was open in the Toronto Normal School. This training was offered both in the summer and winter months. To obtain this certificate kindergartners had only to study for one summer, while Primary teachers were required to study over two summers. A point, which I argue, illustrates the specialization a kindergartner already acquired. This system, and the time it took to evolve is beyond the scope of this thesis, and therefore I will not delve into the details of the Kindergarten-Primary system, other than to illustrate that school boards throughout Ontario could choose which classes they wanted, kindergarten, kindergarten-primary, both or neither. The Kindergarten-Primary class differed from the Kindergarten class in that it was an all-day class, which combined the grade one program with kindergarten activities. Kindergarten materials were used, but the three R's were also taught.[42] According to Corbett, where kindergartens were already available, few kindergarten-primary classes were formed, but where there were none, kindergarten-primary were often the preference.[43]

---

[41] *ARME* 1913, 329.

[42] For more detail on the Kindergarten-Primary system, see Corbett, *Century of Kindergarten*, 71-73.

[43] Ibid, 73.

The committee worked to promote the kindergarten teacher's status. It proposed that "as a considerable portion of the ... training for a Kindergarten-Primary teacher will be parallel and largely identical with the training given Normal School students ... any holder of a permanent Kindergarten-Primary certificate [should] be granted a permanent Second-class teacher's certificate on passing the final Normal School examinations." They also strongly emphasized the importance of having current "kindergarten teachers ... placed on an equality with other teachers [with] regards [to] salary." They believed this "can never be done unless the hours of service are the same." Therefore, they recommended afternoon work for kindergarten teachers, such as (a) assisting primary teachers with constructive work; (b) assisting other teachers with sewing and art work; (c) supervising school gardens; (d) visiting homes of parents, and (e) preparing kindergarten material for morning class.[44]

Although the committee members understood the importance of the practical experience as well as the theoretical understanding of the system, they allowed their interpretation of Froebel's continuous whole to promote the stretching of the kindergartner into becoming a Primary teacher as well. And though they were divided on the "advisability of admitting a kindergarten student to a Normal School without a year of preliminary observation and practice in a kindergarten,"[45] a practice which was considered essential by the Froebelian kindergartners, the department elected to eliminate that process and introduced, in 1914, new regulations stating that

> no one will hereafter study in a kindergarten before attending a Normal School. Under the [new] regulations ... two certificates will be granted: the first an Interim Kindergarten-

---

[44] *ARME* 1913, 329.

[45] Ibid., 329-30.

> Primary certificate, obtained after one year's attendance at the Normal School, and on passing the final examinations ...; the second, a Permanent Kindergarten-Primary certificate granted after two years experience ... the courses for Kindergarten-Primary certificates will hereafter be given at the Normal Schools at Toronto and Ottawa.[46]

It appears that economic convenience influenced the kindergartner's training process. In this manner, each graduate could immediately be employed as a main teacher, not needing to work with another, as an assistant first. This meant a direct increase in the supply of kindergarten teachers for the growing demand.

Because many school boards did have the half-day kindergarten, the Department recommended that holders of Kindergarten and Kindergarten-Primary certificates also obtain one or more elementary certificates in Art, Vocal Music, Manual Training, Household Science, and Physical Culture, by attending summer schools provided by the Education Department. These changes were based on the argument that it would enable school boards of the smaller urban centres to "obtain teachers more adequately trained ... for the peculiar needs of young children and at the same time [it] will improve the efficiency of the elementary schools."[47] This also meant that half-day kindergarten teachers will be better qualified to help with other grades in the afternoons.

The decline of the kindergarten profession within the Ontario education system becomes apparent in this chapter, as it describes the disconnect that was created between the theory and

---

[46] *ARME* 1914, 149-50.

[47] Ibid., 150.

the practice, which in-turn contributed to changing the quality of kindergartners, stripping them of their speciality, and with that, lowering their professional status.

CONCLUSION

Kindergartening was a specialised profession when it was first introduced to Ontario in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and the entry into the already existing teaching hierarchy, with its gendered social relations, began a process of de-professionalization, as control over the training of the new kindergarten teachers, as well as the support provided thereafter moved into the hands of government officials at the Ministry of Education.

The period discussed in this thesis coincides with the height of kindergarten organizations and kindergarten expansion efforts in Canada, the USA, and England. Women activists in these countries "drew on the public's belief in a traditionally female sphere in order to shape public policy regarding maternal and child welfare. ... Kindergartners ... were among the women seeking professional recognition for their expertise, both learned and intuitive, on subjects relating to the family and its place in society."[1]

Like other professions of the nineteenth century, the 'kindergarten' profession was controlled by the practitioners themselves who were highly educated upper-middle-class women. They pressed for the establishment of their profession and closely monitored the standards of its professional education. These women considered their profession a vocation and were adamant about keeping the high quality of its specialization intact, while bringing it to as many children as possible, as they strongly believed in its benefit for all children. One way for the kindergarteners to achieve the aim of making it available to all children was through the public education system,

[1] Dombkowski, "Kindergarten Teacher Training," 477.

which already existed in Ontario at the time, a route that was encouraged by government officials who helped to promote this idea.

Being from the same social elite as the men who held powerful positions within the government and the public education system, these women held similar values and beliefs with regard to the necessity of social reforms in order to create a 'moral' population, a concern that rose directly from the social disruptions and the wide-spread unrest in the turbulent economic time of 1880s Ontario.[2] Crucial to achieving these social reforms were the "new forms of curriculum and pedagogy" that were introduced in the Normal Schools."[3] The kindergarten system was one of these new programs, introduced by the government as a tool to support "a truly national system [that] is as much concerned in rearing up a moral as well as an intelligent population."[4] Indeed, the kindergartners quest for having their specialty available to all children was encouraged by government officials who promoted it as a tool for the re-socialization of the working lower-class into moral citizens that adhere to middle class values and norms. It is clear then that the public kindergarten system grew partly as part of the government mechanism for more regulation over morality control.[5] It was advocated as a good starting ground for change, by both the kindergartners themselves, and the officials who supported that system.

The kindergarten system was held in high regard by these officials and they recognized it

---

[2] Smaller, "Gender and Class," 137.

[3] Ibid.

[4] *ARME* 1881, 242.

[5] Dehli, "The Rule by Sympathy," 196.

as a specialty that required a specific way of training, different from the regular teaching courses. More so, individuals such as Hughes argued that the principles and practices of the kindergarten should be the ground for all teaching and learning, and he recommended that all teachers take a course about the kindergarten system so they would be familiar with those. By 1885 kindergartens were officially included as part of the Ontario public school system and the kindergartners' training, examination and certification also moved into the public sphere as training courses were now offered within the official teacher education system, which included local Model schools, as well as the more prestigious Normal schools in Toronto and Ottawa. Kindergarten teaching was included as a speciality, as a separate branch from the elementary teacher training course, but with time the emphasis on the first year of practice, which according to the kindergartners provided a strong grounding and basis for their theoretical course in the second year of training, diminished as the need for more kindergarten teachers rose.

It was this move into the male-run provincial education system that encouraged the loss of control over the kindergarten system, and its teachers, for the specialized, professional kindergartners themselves. They joined a hierarchy that was based largely on gender and class, and although the early kindergartners came from the upper-middle-class, which was a part of their professional identity, it was their gender, and more so the gendered nature of their profession that situated them at the bottom of the teaching hierarchy they joined.

Gender played a large part in the de-professionalization of the kindergartners in both theoretical and practical terms. I could not claim that the early kindergartners were professionals if I based my understanding purely on how kindergartners were viewed in late nineteenth-century Ontario, because as mentioned in this thesis, this was a time when 'women' and 'profession' were

considered contradictory terms, and I found no official documented evidence, other than by the kindergartners themselves, to suggest that they were considered professionals in official circles. Although it is made clear in my investigation of the Provincial Kindergartner Inspector that Mary E. Macintyre, as well as Caroline Hart before her, who were professional kindergartners that held the part-time position of kindergarten inspectors, were recognized as specialists within the discussed male hierarchy. This hierarchy did acknowledge that the existing professional school inspectors were not qualified enough to supervise the kindergarten system – a system that required a specialist. My understanding of gender issues, based on twenty-first century academic literature, enabled me to take it into consideration in the analysis, and go beyond these women's gender to demonstrate clear parallels between being a kindergartner and the officially accepted professions of the mid to late nineteenth century. It is important to prove that they were professionals for the purpose of accepting their highly specialized knowledge -- a knowledge, both in theory and practice, that was gradually lost in the process of their de-professionalization in the public education system.

Looking at this process from a practical point of view, it is clear that from the beginning, and continually through to 1915, these specialists consistently tried to keep the high quality of their profession, they repeatedly brought issues such as examination processes, length of training, importance of assistantship, preparation time, and the need for a full-time specialized kindergarten inspector, to the Minister of Education in office. Their requests were often agreed with but not necessarily adhered to. With time, changes to the requirements were made to accommodate the need for more kindergartners and the distinction between assistants and directors became more and more vague, as assistants began to teach their own kindergarten

classes without first gaining practical experience under the watchful eye of a professional kindergartner.

By early 1900s the kindergarten system was already losing its unique Froebelian qualities, as room for non-specialized knowledge was made. Due to the need of a larger quantity of kindergarten teachers, not all went through the full route to becoming professional kindergarten directors, and as a consequence they conducted their kindergartens more like the primary classes they were familiar with, with the only difference being that they used Froebelian materials. This need for quantity seemed to tip the balance of the quality of the profession. The distinction between Assistant and Director became vague, as Assistants were given kindergartens of their own to run, and the idea to create one kindergarten-primary certificate was accepted. By 1915 the kindergarten and the primary systems were fully united and all that was left of the specialized Froebelian kindergarten was the technology – the material was there, but it was not necessarily used in the proper way. One did not need to be a professional kindergartner to teach in that system. The importance of specializing in kindergarten teaching took a back-seat in the process of becoming a part of the gendered teaching hierarchy. Even those trained in the Normal Schools of Ontario did not receive the fully professional training for the profession. The education of the kindergarten teacher already lacked the depth of a specialization.

In order to contribute further to the field of education with regard to the development of the teachers' education program in Ontario, it would be of interest to research the training curriculum up to date, and compare it to what happened in other provinces of the country. Also, by recalling the reasons for the loss of the 'kindergarten' profession, it is important to ask whether it should once again be recognized as a special time of development, and therefore requires a

more specific training program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Department of Education of Ontario, 1902. *Calendar: Provincial Normal School (Toronto, Ottawa and London).* (Toronto: L. K. Cameron). Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) Library. Toronto.

Department of Education Select Subject Files, 1885-1913. MS 5633. RG-2-42. Ontario Archives. Toronto.

Department of Education Select Subject Files, 1885-1913. MS 5634. RG-2-42. Ontario Archives. Toronto.

General Correspondence Files of the Minister of the Department of Education 1880-1914. MS2631, RG 2-29. Ontario Archives. Toronto.

History of Ontario Education Association (OEA), 1860-1937. MU8108 #1. Library & Archives Canada. Ottawa.

Minutes of the Twenty First Annual Convention of the Ontario Teachers' Association, Toronto, August 1881. Archives of Ontario Microfilm. Ottawa.

Ontario Education Department. *The School System of Ontario: Public Schools, High Schools, Colleges, Universities*. Education Department: Province of Ontario,1886. OISE Library, Toronto.

Ontario Ministry of Education. *Report of the Minister of Education.* Toronto: The Department of Education, 1880-1915.

Report of Mr. J. J. Tilley. In *Relative to the Training of Teachers and Other Matters*. 1914. (Toronto: L. K. Cameron). OISE Library, Toronto.

The Globe. Toronto. 1880-1900. In http://heritage.theglobeandmail.com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/PageView.asp Toronto.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abbott, John. Accomplishing "A Man's Task:" Rural Women Teachers, Male Culture, and the School Inspectorate in Turn of the Century Ontario. In *Gender and Education in Ontario: An Historical Reader*. Edited by Ruby Heap and Alison Prentice. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1991.

Acker, Sandra. Caring as Work for Women Educators. In *Challenging Professions: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Women's Professional Work*. Edited by Elizabeth Smyth, Sandra Acker, Paula Bourne, and Alison Prentice, 277-295. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Atkinson, Carroll, and Eugene T. Maleska. *The Story of Education*. Philadelphia and New York: Chilton Books, 1965.

Axelrod, Paul. *The Promise of Schooling: Education in Canada, 1800-1914*. Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Button, Warren H. *History of Education and Culture in America*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983.

Butts, Freeman R., and Lawrence A. Cremin. *A history of Education in American Culture*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Cleveland, Gordon, et Al. *A Review of the State of the Field of Early Childhood Learning and Development in Child Care, Kindergarten and Family Support Programs*. Canadian Council on Learning, 2006.

Corbett, Barbara E. *A Century of Kindergarten Education in Ontario, 1887 to 1987*. Mississauga, Ont.: Froebel Foundation, 1989.

Cummings, H. R., and W. T, MacSkimming. *The City of Ottawa Public Schools: a Brief History.* The Ottawa Board of Education, 1971.

Curtis, Bruce. *True Government by Choice Men?: Inspection, Education, and State Formation in Canada West.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press., c1992.

_____. *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871.* London, Ont: Althouse Press: Falmer, 1988.

Danylewycz, Marta, and Alison prentice. Teachers' Work: Changing Patterns and Perceptions in the Emerging School Systems of Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-century Central Canada. In *Women Who Taught: Perspectives on the History of Women and Teaching.* Edited by Alison Prentice and Marjorie R. Theobald, 136-159. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

_____. "Revising the History of Teachers: a Canadian Perspective." *Interchange* 17, no. 2 (1986):135-146.

Dehli, Kari. "The Rule by Sympathy: the Feminizations of Pedagogy." Canadian *Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 19, no. 2 (1994): 195-216.

Dombkowski, Kristen. "Kindergarten Teacher Training in England and the United States 1850-1918." *History of Education* 31, no. 5 (2002): 475-489.

Froebel, Friedrich. *Pedagogics of the Kindergarten.* Translated by Josephine Jarvis. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1900.

Gidney, Bob. "Madam How" and "Lady Why." In *Learning to Practise: Professional Education in Historical and Contemporary Perspective.* Edited by Ruby Heap, Wyn Millar and Elizabeth Smyth, 13-42. University of Ottawa Press, 2005.

Gidney, Robert D., and Winnifred P. J. Millar. "From Voluntarism to State Schooling: The Creation of the Public School System in Ontario." *Canadian Historical Review* LXVI, no. 4 (1995): 443-75.

_____. *Professional Gentlemen: the Professions in Nineteenth-Century Ontario.* Toronto: OHSS, 1994.

Glazer, Judith S. "Feminism and Professionalism in Teaching and Educational Administration." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (August 1991): 321-42.

Hallman, Dianne D. and Anna H. Lathrop. Sustaining the Fire of "Scholarly Passion:" Mary G. Hanilton (1883-1972) and Irene Poelzer (1926-). In *Women Teaching Women Learning: Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Elizabeth M. Smyth and Paula Bourne, 45-64. Toronto: Inanna Publications & Education Inc., 2006.

Heap, Ruby, Wyn Millar and Elizabeth Smyth, eds. *Learning to Practise: Professional Education in Historical and Contemporary Perspective*. University of Ottawa Press, 2005.

Heap, Ruby and Alison Prentice, eds. *Gender and Education in Ontario: an Historical Reader*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1991.

Hodgins, George J. *The Establishment of Schools and Colleges in Ontario,1792-1910*. Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1910.

Houston, Susan E., and Alison Prentice. *Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth-century Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Hughes, James L. *Froebel's Educational Laws for All Teachers*. Vol. XLI of *International Education Series*, edited by William T. Harris. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1903.

Hughes, James L. *The Triumph of the Kindergarten Philosophy*. Toronto: Briggs, [n.d.].

Johnson, Henry F. *A Brief History of Canadian Education*. Toronto and New York: McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada, 1968.

Lawr, Douglas A., and Robert D. Gidney. *Educating Canadians: a Documentary History of Public Education*. Toronto, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1973.

Mann Trofimenkoff, Susan, and Alison Prentice, eds. *The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, c1977.

Mathien, Julie. "Children, Families, and Institutions in Late 19th and Early 20th Century Ontario." MA Thesis, University of Toronto, 2001. In

http://gateway.proquest.com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqdiss&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:MQ58891.

May, Tim. *Social Research: Issues, Methods, and Process*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 2001.

McLaughlin, Paul Vincent. "The Froebelian Movement in the United States of America." Thesis, University of Ottawa, 1952. In University of Ottawa, AMICUS No. 18685918.

Ontario Ministry of Education. Curriculum Documents. http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/subjects.html (accessed August 26, 2009).

Ontario Ministry of Education. *The Kindergarten Program*. Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2006. The publication is available on the Ministry of Education's website, at http://www.edu.gov.on.ca. (accessed April 22, 2009).

Pacini-Ketchabaw, Maria V. "Young Children as 'Others': Discourses Within the Ontario Child Care System, 1850-1940." PhD Thesis, University of Toronto, 2002. In National Library of Canada, AMICUS No. 28577721.

Patterson, Robert S., John W. Chalmers and John W. Friesen, eds. *Profiles of Canadian Educators*. D.C, Heath, Canada Ltd, 1974.

Phillips, Charles E. *The Development of Education in Canada*. Toronto: W.J. Gage & Co. Limited, 1957.

Prentice, Alison. *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-nineteenth Century Upper Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

_____. The Feminization of Teaching. In *the Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History*, edited by Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice, 49-65. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, c.1977.

Prentice, Alison, and Marjorie R. Theobald. *Women Who Taught: Perspectives on the History of Women and Teaching*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

Ross, Elizabeth D. *The Kindergarten Crusade: the Establishment of Preschool Education in the United States*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1976.

Sager, Eric W. "Women Teachers in Canada, 1881-1901: Revisiting the 'Feminization' of an Occupation." *The Canadian Historical Review* 88, no. 2 (June 2007): 201-236.

Sears, Alan. *Retooling the Mind Factory: Education in a Lean State*. Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press, 2003.

Shapiro, Michael S. *Child's Garden: The Kindergarten Movement from Froebel to Dewey*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983.

Shirreff, Emily. *Kindergarten: Principles of Froebel's System*. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Allen, 1880.

Smaller, Harry. Gender and Class: State formation and Schooling reform in 1880s Toronto. In *Women Teaching Women Learning: Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Elizabeth M. Smyth and Paula Bourne, 131-157. Toronto: Inanna Publications & Education Inc., 2006.

_____. Regulating the Regulators: the Disciplining of Teachers in Nineteenth-century Ontario. In *Discipline, Moral Regulation, and Schooling: a Social History*. Edited by Kate Rousmaniere, Kari Dehli, and Ning de Coninck-Smith, 97-116. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997.

Smyth, Elizabeth, Sandra Acker, Paula Bourne, and Alison Prentice, eds. *Challenging Professions: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Women's Professional Work*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Stamp, Robert M. *The Schools of Ontario, 1876-1976*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.

Sutherland, Neil. *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus*. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000.

The Centre for Dewey Studies, *Chronology of John Dewey's Life and work*, http://www.siu.edu/~deweyctr/resources.htm#chronology or go directly to the pdf file at

http://www.siu.edu/~deweyctr/CHRONO.pdf (accessed April 15, 2009).

Theobald, Marjorie. And Gladly Teach? The Making of a Woman's Profession. In *Women Teaching Women Learning: Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Elizabeth M. Smyth and Paula Bourne, 65-84. Toronto: Inanna Publications & Education Inc., 2006.

Tomkins, George S. *A Common Countenance: Stability and Change in the Canadian Curriculum*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc., 1986.

Turbian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. Rev. 7th ed. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Wilson, Donald J., Robert M. Stamp, and Louis-Philippe Audet. *Canadian Education: A History*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1970.

Weiss, Gillian. An Essential Year for the Child: The Kindergarten in British Columbia. In *Schooling and Society in Twentieth Century British Columbia*, edited by J. Donald Wilson and David C. Jones, 139-161. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1980.

Wollons, Roberta L. *Kindergartens and Cultures: the Global Diffusion of an Idea*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.