

\*Barbara Finkelstein

## Literature Review: Incorporating Children into the History of Education

In 1962, when the translation of Phillipe Ariés, *Centuries of Childhood* appeared and again in 1974 as Lloyd deMause's essay exploring the evolution of childhood emerged, the history of childhood and the history of education constituted two distinct and unrelated fields of inquiry.<sup>1</sup> At that time, historians of education were in the process of reconstructing the very definition of their field. Some, like Lawrence A. Cremin, advanced a view that the history of education would best be understood if historians broadened their understanding of education to include the analysis of cultural transmission as it proceeded in families, churches, colleges, universities, mass media of communication, museums, libraries as well as schools.<sup>2</sup> Others — Michael B. Katz, Marvin Lazerson, Stanley Schultz among them — believed that educational history would be incompletely and inadequately revealed if historians were unwilling to probe the weaknesses as well as the triumphs, and the economic as well as the political purposes which the commitment to public education entailed.<sup>3</sup> Still others — Jill Conway, Maxine Seller, Vincent Franklin, James Anderson, Geraldine Clifford, Joan Burstyn — were exquisitely sensitive to the "Whiggish" qualities of much educational history and through the study of previously understudied groups — women, blacks, ethnic minorities, sought to recover an educational past that was sensitive to the aspirations of the whole of the American people.<sup>4</sup> Only a very few historians of education had evinced any interest in childhood, or attempted to explore the evolution of learning.<sup>5</sup>

As conceptualized by Phillipe Ariés and Lloyd deMause, the history of childhood and the history of education were inextricably connected — and, on several levels. First, they were connected conceptually and psychologically. Second, they were connected in time. Third, they were connected socially and institutionally. Both Ariés and deMause emphasized the simultaneity in time of the discovery or recognition of modern childhood and the emergence of protective institutions in which to nurture and rear the younger generation. Both have agreed that these two concurrent, if not causally related events, conferred a new quality and possibility in child-rearing, that of an "over-controlling," carefully planned regimen of protection and supervision. It was a regimen which was to tie the fate of children and their parents intimately together, and to define the school as a fundamental agent in the nurture of the younger generation. DeMause emphasized the emergence of modes of child-rearing which would involve parents in the regulation of their children's lives and require minute and constant attention to their off-spring. Ariés identified the discovery of childhood with the discovery of systematic, deliberate and sustained age-graded schooling outside the

---

\*Center for the Study of Education Policy and Human Values, University of Maryland.

household. As the two historians implicitly suggested, the discovery of childhood was to coincide with if not to set in motion a kind of educational revolution.

What the history of childhood seemed to suggest was that educational historians would do well to pay systematic attention to the evolution of children and youth, not only because the lives of the young were important in themselves, but because the systematic study of children and youth promised to add new dimensions to our understanding of educational history. In the view of at least three historians, there was even potential to illuminate whole aspects of our educational past that had been virtually unrecoverable to traditional historians of education.<sup>6</sup>

What follows is an analysis of the ways in which historians of education have incorporated children and youth into their histories during the last decade. A dynamic and complex field of study, the history of education is properly understood as encompassing multiple and as yet unsynthesized visions of the evolution and character of educational ideas, arrangements, and practices. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that historians of education seem to have incorporated an interest in children and youth variously and selectively — extending and deepening the content of what they have studied and how they have studied it — without necessarily transforming their interpretive schemes, or analytic modes in fundamental ways. Only a very few historians have been systematic in an attempt to connect the history of childhood and child-rearing to the history of education focusing on learners and learning as important aspects in the study of educational history.<sup>7</sup> A mere handful have placed the study of children and youth at the heart of their treatments of educational history.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Children As Objects of Regulation: Education As A Regulatory Activity*

One group of educational historians have focused their analyses of the ways in which education history reflects and reveals what Clifford Geertz calls “the hard surfaces of life,” — political, economic, stratificatory realities into which people are born and within which they lead their lives.<sup>9</sup> More interested in the evolution of educational structures than ideas, processes, or sensibilities, they have incorporated children and youth instrumentally, as a way of deepening their understanding of education as a form of social control and political regulation.

The more sophisticated historians exploring education as regulation, focus systematically on the evolution of education as the evolution of structures of authority enclosing the young. They emphasize the institutionalization of children and youth in their writings, viewing it as a significant aspect of modernization. Following in an interpretive mode articulated by Phillip Ariés, they define the expansion of education as the effect of an evolving disposition to exercise control over the lives of the young and to regulate their lives.

#### *Children As Workers: Education as Preparation for Labor*

Some historians — believing in the overwhelming force of economic circumstance and material condition — locate the motive to control in attempts by industrial, commercial, intellectual and professional elites to maintain and/or secure power, authority, and status. They interpret the massification and institutionalization of education in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as little more than an elaborate strategy to create, train, and prepare a

docile labor force for a newly emerging industrial order. Implicitly defining children's institutions as nothing more than structures of domination and control, they root the emergence of specialized institutions in the bedrock of economic structure, viewing ideas and institutions as weapons used by elites in an unending struggle for power. Historians of this school describe the emergence of tutorial complexes as driven by rational calculations of consciously or implicitly recognized economic and professional advantage.<sup>10</sup>

Less likely than other social historians — Jacques Donzelot, Christopher Lasch, and Elizabeth Badinter — to focus on the emergence of the family as an educational institution, materialist historians of education have typically focused on the emergence of schools.<sup>11</sup> Some — Michael Katz exploring nineteenth century educational reform, David Nasaw examining the emergence of public and parochial schools, high schools and colleges, Robert Carlson exploring Americanization, Steven Schlossman exploring the evolution of the juvenile court, Patricia Rooke analyzing institutionalized education, Clarence Karier, Joel Spring, studying progressive reforms have all documented the emergence of coalitions of business elites, public school advocates, and emerging education and welfare professionals seeking to control the character of the work force emerging in a newly urbanizing and industrializing America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>12</sup> For these historians, the emergence of public schools and parochial schools, industrial schools, and infant schools in the nineteenth century, and of high schools and colleges in the twentieth, represented the construction of socio-economic complexes through which business and professional elites could transform the socialization of working or laboring class children.

Other historians, less likely to define educational evolution as a product of class conflict but wedded as well to the notion that material conditions drive and define educational arrangements and possibilities, have defined education as economic role training and analyzed relationships between economic structure and educational arrangements and practice. For these historians, the ideas of moral reformers, public school advocates and education experts complemented the demand of factory owners and corporate industrialists and for particular kinds of workers. In the view of David Tyack and Harvey Kantor, Morris Stambler, and Eugene Provenzo, the interests of industrialists and reformers were linked in attempts to restrict child labor and compel school attendance.<sup>13</sup> They were at work as reformers discovered truancy and empowered truant officers to enforce school attendance statutes and, among other things, remove youth from the labor force.<sup>14</sup>

The hand of education reformers and business elites was evident in the popularization and expansion of high schools in the progressive era, when the "architects of adolescence," as Joseph Kett likes to call them, provided psychological justifications for extending and regularizing the period of dependency to include the teen age years.<sup>15</sup> And, as Marvin Lazerson and Norton Grubb, Joseph Kett, Christopher Lasch, Clarence Karier, and Joel Spring have argued, business-professional alliances were revealed when schools were vocationalized, tracked, and massified, becoming sorting machines through which children were fitted for labor.<sup>16</sup>

The combined interest of business and professional elites were well served, and made manifest according to Dominick Cavallo in attempts by progressive kindergarten theorists to re-socialize children by transforming the character of kindergarten pedagogy during the progressive era.<sup>17</sup> They were evident as well, according to Cavallo and David Glassberg in

the efforts of urban social workers and playground educators to organize, regulate, and transform children's play into structured educational activity.<sup>18</sup> And, as David Rothman, Michael Zuckerman, Steven Schlossman, and Christopher Lasch have suggested, they were evident in successive attempts of domestic reformers — ministers in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries, physicians throughout the nineteenth and twentieth — to rationalize and justify child-rearing modes that complemented and reflected economic requirements.<sup>19</sup>

Taken together, materialist histories of education define education narrowly as role training.<sup>20</sup> With rare exceptions, found in the work of Bowles and Gintis who are interested in the evolution of consciousness as well as structure, this group of historians render children effectively invisible in their histories — passive recipients of social and economic status, unformed and manipulated laborers-to-be.<sup>21</sup>

### *Children As Endangered: Education As Protection and Opportunity*

Another group of historians represent children as objects of benevolence and philanthropy, rather than objects of regulation and manipulation. They describe educational expansion as a reflection of new and more enlightened dispositions toward the young, not simply products of economic circumstance, status anxieties, and unalloyed greed. They root the emergence of schools and the extension of formal education in the history of child protection rather than oppressive regulation. Indeed, they celebrate successive attempts to regulate the conditions of childhood. Extending deMause's view that childhood was, in fact, a nightmare from which children only slowly emerged, they see motives beyond status anxiety, greed, cunning, and imperial disposition at work in the attempts of reformers to transform the character of childhood, and extend the reach of formal education. Emphasizing the deleterious effects of poverty, filth, factory labor, overcrowding, and over-work on the character and possibility of childhood, they are exquisitely sensitive to the alternatives which education might have provided for children of laboring families. For these historians, the diffusion of formal education meant a substitution of educational nurture for excessive labor, of knowledge of ignorance, or careful supervision for beatings and neglect.<sup>22</sup>

Whether their histories focus on education for very young children, on the emergence of public education in the nineteenth and twentieth century, on the education of slaves or high born children, historians of this school portray educational evolution as a chapter in the history of child protection. For this group of historians, the emergence of medical experts, domestic reformers, school reformers and child advocates working to promote public involvement in the lives of children, signaled and represented a triumph of humanitarian sentiment, benevolent dispositions, concern for the well-being of children, and the desire to protect and assure their rights.

In their choice and analysis of documents in their classic work: *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, Robert Bremner and his associates emphasize the humanitarian character of educational reform and the progressive nature of medical, psychological, and educational expertise, advice, and advocacy. Representing education as an important aspect of the history of children and youth, Bremner has organized documents in order to reflect the evolving range of services which governmental and quasi-governmental agencies have provided to children — either directly as in the case of

schools, hospitals, asylums, recreation facilities, or indirectly, as in evolving attempts to regulate child labor, to protect child health and welfare, and to control educational environments. They define public education as an alternative to child labor, not an attempt to de-tribalization. They describe houses of refuge as havens from pestilence, disease, neglect and abuse, rather than vehicles promoting a public intrusion into family life. They view the expansion of school functions during the progressive era as measures to protect child health rather than to expand state power. They present documents portraying twentieth century schools as vehicles of social progress, protecting the interest and growth of children in the schools, rather than instruments of social control, serving the interest of professional and corporate elites.<sup>23</sup>

In a similar manner, Robert Bremner has extended his treatment in two more recent articles exploring relationships between the child, the family, and the state.<sup>24</sup> Ellen Ryerson, Joseph Hawes, and Jack Holl exploring delinquency in the nineteenth century, Charles Strickland focusing on early childhood education, Walter Trattner exploring child labor and school attendance, Joseph Duffy examining the emergence of school health in the early twentieth century, Mark A. Kakzielski analyzing the work of playground editors, N. Ray Hiner exploring corporal punishment and child abuse, Nanette Whitbred tracking the fate of the nursery infant school through the course of the last two centuries, Denison Deasey exploring the evolution of education for children under six years of age in Great Britain, France, and the United States, have all praised rather than damned the emergence of public involvement in the regulation of schools and families.<sup>25</sup>

Taken together, the work of these historians, like the work of materialist historians, reflects a narrow definition of education, and a partial view of children. For them, regulation reflects a disposition to protect rather than to control. The massification of education represents the diffusion of opportunity rather than the elaboration of tracking. No more interested than materialist historians of education in educational processes and the formation of consciousness, these historians also incorporate children instrumentally into their histories, but as vulnerabilities rather than as laborers.

#### *Children as Disorderly: Education as Government for the Young*

There is yet another group of historians, who explore educational history as a form of social control and regulation, but who emphasize changes in the character and evolution of governing authorities rather than economic forms or reform sentiment in their analyses of educational history. Following a line of reasoning articulated as early as 1962 by Bernard Bailyn and David Rothman studying the colonial period, these historians study educational history as attempts by various actors to control the character of educational authority, the better to maintain social order and to transmit culture in an uncertain world.<sup>26</sup>

Harboring complex views of human motivation, and, in any case, more interested in exploring the exercise of authority than in assessing motive, these historians have emphasized two developments in their treatments of educational history: the emergence of schools as important agencies of education, and the evolution of government involvement in the construction of educational spaces for the younger generation.

Those studying the colonial period, Bernard Bailyn, David Rothman, Michael Zuckerman as examples, link the emergence of schools to transformations in the function of families as

educational institutions and keepers of social order.<sup>27</sup> Reacting to what they perceived as a growing incapacity of families to manage children effectively, colonial leaders turned to schools to complement if not to strengthen the educational hand of New English families. In an attempt to maintain order and stability, they vested schools with educational missions that were once a near exclusive preserve of family — teaching children to read and write, preparing them for labor, forming their manners and morals, securing their loyalty, compelling obedience. The emergence of schools represented the emergence of new structures of authority for the young, and, as these historians suggested, linked the fate of education and the fate of children inextricably together. More interested in analyzing the school as a structure of social regulation than as an environment for children, these historians also incorporate children instrumentally into their histories: as threats to social order and civic harmony.

In a similar mode, Carl F. Kaestle and Maris Vinovskis explain the rise of infant schools in the first half of the nineteenth century as the creation of humanitarian reformers and factory owners seeking to improve the quality of the moral environment for children of factory workers. Intended to convey literacy and provide moral direction and nurture, infant school directors hoped to supplement the work of families, the better to provide children with moral direction, and the community with a disciplined and orderly coming generation. And they explain the demise of infant schools as the work of school reformers who thought the causes of moral order were ill served by school directors who treated children as “prodigies in mere intellect.” Serving no one’s interest — not those of moral reformers, factory owners, factory laborers, or education advocates, the infant schools died — according to Kaestle and Vinovskis, because they were killed for failing to cultivate moral dispositions in the young, to provide an atmosphere of family nurture, to govern them in their own best interests or in the interests of social order.<sup>28</sup>

Similar interpretations accompany attempts to explore the emergence of public involvement in the lives of children and youth. Providing some of the most creative and sophisticated links between the history of childhood and the history of education, a remarkable array of historians studying a remarkable range of educational efforts, focus on the theme of family transformation as an explanation for the emerging public educational effort.

Whether historians treat the expansion of government involvement by studying the origins and development of publicly sponsored and maintained total institutions — industrial schools for boys and girls, foster care facilities, boarding schools for native American children — or by examining the evolution of public provision of educational services, they link the expansion of government involvement to declines in the capacity of traditional authorities to manage the education of children. They typically study the evolution of education policy as it reflects and reveals transformations in the structures of authority enclosing the young, and in the capacity of families to dominate the terms by which their children enter into adult life.

Some historians — Harvey Graff and Michael B. Katz studying transformations in the character of dependency in the nineteenth centuries, Margaret Connel Szasz and Robert Trannert exploring federal involvement in the education of native American boys and girls, Robert Carlson studying Americanization through schools, and David Tyack studying the discovery of truancy and the enforcement of school attendance statutes — interpret

government involvement as unwarranted intervention.<sup>29</sup> Aiming to remove children from their parents and to substitute the authority of the State for the authority of families — the apparatus of regulation, including child-snatching, legal transfers of authority, compulsory school attendance — represented a form of cultural imperialism. In each of these histories, government involvement is understood to be a strategy of cultural genocide, an attempt to transfer authority over children from the families of ethnic minorities to the state by incarcerating children and then subjecting them to a kind of middle class cultural blitzkrieg. These historians represent children as regulatory objects, and the public agencies which serve them as instruments of re-socialization.<sup>30</sup>

Other historians explain the evolution of public involvement in education, not as an attempt to undermine the influence of families, but to provide substitute care when families were unable or unwilling to dispatch educational responsibilities. To these historians government involvement reflected the work of moral reformer, public officials, public school advocates, and desperate parents (even those of immigrant children), who, as they advanced the cause of public education or willingly committed their children to the state, were in fact reacting to the devastating effects of urbanization and industrialization on the educative capacities of families. Barbara Brenzel accounts for the emergence of the Lancaster Industrial School for Girls in two ways: as the creation of anxious middle class Protestant founders attempting to control socially indigent, neglected, or incorrigible lower class Catholic girls, on the one hand: as a service to impoverished, desperate mothers and fathers seeking to find suitable effective structures of government for their children.<sup>31</sup> Ruby Takanishi follows the same line of argument in a study of the historical roots of child advocacy.<sup>32</sup> So too do Patricia Clement, Rebecca Scott, and D'Ann Campbell as they explore educational arrangements for foster children in Philadelphia in the late nineteenth century, the work of the Freedman's Bureau in preventing child apprenticeship and the work of Ben Lindsay, founder of the juvenile court in the late nineteenth century.<sup>33</sup>

Still another group of historians explains the evolution of public education policy as part of an attempt to diffuse and institutionalize child-rearing norms. Implicitly defining education policy as the implementation of specialized expertise, they represent public involvement as a kind of channel for the diffusion of child-rearing prescriptions — of ministers, physicians, school reformers, nurture writers in the nineteenth century, and psychologists, social workers, psychiatrists, boy and girl workers in the twentieth. As they explore patterns of school leaving and school attendance in Massachusetts in the early nineteenth century, Carl A. Kaestle and Maris K. Vinovskis see the hand of child-rearing experts and education reformers at work in laws pushing young children out of schools — prohibiting them from attending until they were five years old.<sup>34</sup> A reflection of attempts to persuade parents, and particularly mothers to oversee the early nurture of their children, the laws emerged, thus engaging government in the work of institutionalizing new child-rearing norms. New norms of child-rearing were being institutionalized as women entered the ever expanding universe of public elementary schools, as the work of David Tyack and Morris Stambler suggests, as truancy was discovered and governments became involved in the work of pushing children between the ages of six and sixteen out of the workforce and into the schools.<sup>35</sup>

The institutionalization of child-rearing norms is also reflected negatively — in services withheld, support not forthcoming. Conceptualizing the family as a haven, a place apart, a protective circle for women and children in a dangerous world, cadres of experts throughout

the nineteenth and twentieth centuries discouraged the expansion of government services to serve children under six unless, of course, the best interest of the child were served by removal. The unwillingness of government to become involved in the lives of children under six is explored systematically by Amy Steinfeld in a study exploring the fate of day care policy.<sup>36</sup> It is an implicit theme in a recent work of Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazerson who, as they seek to interpret the character of public policy toward families and children, link the emergence of public involvement to the discovery of the private family.<sup>37</sup>

There is as yet only a small group of educational historians exploring multiple government efforts simultaneously, seeking systematically to explore the evolution of education policy as it develops over long stretches of time, or as it effects all groups in society, and as it links educational history with the history of family and children. To my knowledge, four studies comprise the lot: a monograph of Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazerson, a review article by Ronald Cohen, an essay by Michael Zuckerman, and an essay by Barbara Finkelstein.

Lazerson and Grubb have suggested that government policy toward the young has incorporated two potentially contradictory conceptions of responsibility for children. "One strand emphasized the private family including the responsibility of parents for children, the primary role of mothers, and the separation of the child centered family from the harsh world outside. The second stressed the responsibility of the state where families failed to meet their responsibilities, a role discharged through children's institutions like the common schools and juvenile reform."<sup>38</sup> Reflecting a fundamental ambivalence in the willingness of government to equalize the life chances of the young, a dual policy has effectively allied government in the cause of protecting inequality even while it has appeared to advance it. The failure constitutes the theme of the book and its title: *The Broken Promise*.

In an excellent review article exploring the work of historians studying child-saving in the progressive era, Ronald Cohen has attached the history of education firmly to the history of child-saving.<sup>39</sup> Like Lazerson and Grubb, he also identifies contradiction and irony, viewing the attitude of school reformers as ambiguous. In efforts to create day nurseries, kindergartens, to expand the purposes of the schools to include mental hygiene, health education, and civics, to provide mothers' aid, and support probation rather than incarceration for juvenile offenders, reformers created educational environments in order to keep the family intact. At the same time, they constructed the sort of institutions that undermined instead of supported the authority of families, effectively substituting the authority of the state for that of the family. Less convoluted, Michael Zuckerman follows a similar line of argument.

Barbara Finkelstein's article exploring the evolution of congressional legislation involving children under six years of age, also documents the existence of contradictory strategies.<sup>41</sup> She discovered the existence of at least three distinct dispositions involving three distinct strategies, organizing three distinct relationships between the authority of government and that of the family.

Taken together, the three works document the existence of certain kinds of regularity in the character of public involvement with children and youth. At least the authors appear to

agree that the expansion of public authority has not nor was it intended to be uniform. All document the emergence of a two-tiered policy — one for the children of middling and high born families, the other for the children of native Americans, immigrant and ethnic urban poor and black. All characterize government interventions in a similar manner. When government has intervened on behalf of the child, then it has substituted its own authority for that of the family. Typically directed at the children of native Americans and urban immigrants in the nineteenth century, and at the children of urban poor, blacks, and other ethnic minorities, it appears to be policy for the poor and different. Of another sort, policy aiming to make expert advice available has come in the form of services provided to families, in the form of teachers sent down to teach the children of slaves in the nineteenth century or to set up Head Start programs in the 1970's, in the form of nursery schools for mothers working in war related industry, the emergence of kindergartens, mothers' aids, social service centers in local communities.<sup>42</sup> Supplementing rather than usurping the authority of families, it has some of the qualities of public schooling but without the compulsion. Finally, there is public support for child-rearing without public involvement and control. Typically war-related, it has come in the form of compensation to women with dependent children whose husbands have been killed in war. Contradictory, discriminatory, and rich in complexity, the study of the history of education as a phase in the emergence of the patriarchal state is yet systematically to be told.

Whether they have incorporated children and youth into the history of education by linking educational evolution to the history of industrial development, child protection, family transformation, or social fear and trembling, all of these historians have viewed transformations in the character of childhood and education as a significant aspect of modernization, part and parcel of an effort to control the character and direction of social change by organizing and regulating the lives of children and youth.

#### *Children As Taught: Education As the Transmission of Ideas*

There is a second major approach to the study of educational history — one which reflects and recovers a different aspect of our educational past. It involves the study of educational ideas and ideologies as they evolve in response to political interest, and/or economic circumstance, as they are elaborated and presented in learned treatises, transmitted in the popular press, and as they are deliberately funneled through a variety of institutions that educate. As they explore educational history, so-called intellectualist historians of education emphasize the power of the written and spoken work, rather than the force of material circumstances as they describe the evolution of education. Like historians focusing on education as regulation, intellectualist historians of education also incorporate children into their histories selectively, in a manner which has deepened and enhanced their study of educational history without necessarily altering its focus and direction. Less interested in exploring consciousness or educational processes than the diffusion of ideas, they regard churches, families, schools, as educational instrumentalities, filters for the transmission of ideas. And they treat children instrumentally — as a concern of social philosophers, political theorists, and educators, a focus for philosophical debate, ideological controversy, and educational speculation. As passive recipients of ideas, sensibilities and skills, children, in the hands of these historians, become mere reflections of the movement of ideas.

Limited as this approach to the study of educational history might be for people wishing to focus systematically on relationships between the history of childhood and history of

education, there are useful connections, implicitly made, to be found in histories focusing on education as the transmission of culture. One such connection has resulted in a rich plethora of studies incorporating, if not focusing specifically, on the evolution of the family as an educational institution.

### *Advice to Parents*

An interest in the literature of advice to parents is one of the more creative reflections of the emergent interest in the family. Traditionally, historians like Bernard Wishy and Anne Kuhn studied an abundant and fascinating literature of advice in an attempt to understand the evolution of cultural traditions as they were mirrored in manuals of advice.<sup>43</sup> More recently, Philip Greven, Lawrence A. Cremin, James Axtell studying the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Cremin studying the nineteenth century, and Sol Cohen and Steven Schlossman studying the twentieth have analyzed the evolution of child-rearing advice manuals as channels of diffusion for the child-rearing theories of evolving experts. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, advice to parents was rendered typically by Christian missionaries seeking to catechize native Americans or West African immigrants and their offspring. Or it was directed to fathers within the household when they seemed to fail in their responsibilities for the moral development of their offspring. In the nineteenth century, advice to parents was as likely to reflect the child-rearing theories of republican statesmen like Benjamin Rush and Noah Webster, of evangelical Christians like Horace Bushnell, of Sectarian divines like John Finney, moral reformers like Catharine Beecher, and educational reformers like Jacob Abbott and William Andrus Alcott. As they prescribed for and directed parents in the principles of domestic nurture, they aimed their prescriptions at women, hoping to encourage them to remain within the domestic orbit and to teach them to prepare industrious citizens for an emerging nation. In the twentieth century, the literature of domestic prescription provided a channel for the diffusion of the ideas of psychoanalysts, psychologists, pediatricians, social workers, who, in the service of science and child-rearing, entered the list of educational authorities advising parents how to bring up happy, healthy, high achieving youngsters.<sup>44</sup>

There is another group of historians who, over the past decade, have explored child-rearing advice literature as an ideological weapon, a powerful instrument of persuasion through which one group seeks to dominate another and fix their inferior status. Exploring nurture literature dynamically and functionally, they implicitly view it as a negative educational persuader — a source of myths and mystifications. A number of historians detect in the advice literature issuing forth from the theological and Republican establishment in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, and the medical, professional establishment in the twentieth, attempts to establish a myth of maternal instinct. To use Nancy Weiss's wonderful formulation, mothers were the "inventions of necessity."<sup>45</sup>

Studying American feminine ideals in post revolutionary America, both Ruth Block and Jacqueline Reinier identify an emerging commitment to the notion that the well-being of the republic rested on the emergence of the moral mother.<sup>46</sup> Both suggest that the emergence of a concept of mother as teacher represented a response to social and political transformation in the volatile years between 1785 and 1815, rather than a reflection of the natural condition of women.

Similarly, through studies of child-rearing advice in popular literature, historians have alluded to a cult of domesticity being elaborated and extended in the nineteenth century. The work of Katherine Sklar exploring the life and work of Catharine Beecher and of Barbara Welter discovering the cult of true womanhood in periodical literature, of Carol Mulligan exploring images of mothers and children in art, literature, and policy, of William G. McLoughlin exploring the child-rearing theories of Francis Wayland, and of Barbara Finkelstein's study of the reconstruction of childhood in the nineteenth century, all allude to a construction of an image of women designed to persuade.<sup>47</sup> Projecting women as the guardians of the household, keepers of an educative family, molders of the minds and imagination of young children, reformers articulated a norm of maternal perfection. By virtue of their inherent gentleness and moral superiority to men, women were held to be the only fit guardians for young children. The ideal household was projected as one that required the social isolation of mother and child and an intensification of their relationships. It was one in which mothers protected children from the contagions of unhealthful influence. It placed mothers in a position of strategic importance for the developing sensibility of children. And it encouraged women to desist from seeking power in the marketplace or polling place, or even as Barbara Welter has suggested, from cultivating their minds.

Studying a plethora of child-rearing advice issuing forth from the Children's Bureau in the 1920's, 30's, and 40's, from the pens of prominent medical/psychological advice givers John Watson and Benjamin Spock, Nancy Weiss has alluded to similarities in their visions of the role of mothers as educators of their young. No matter how different their child-care techniques might have been nor how they advised mothers, nurture experts as diverse in their thinking as John Watson and Benjamin Spock agreed " . . . that the life of the child can be harmed by improper mother love."<sup>48</sup> In the name of scientific progress rather than patriotic fervor, of enlightened parenthood rather than divine necessity, the advice of twentieth century parent educators like that of their nineteenth century counterparts, burdened women with almost sole responsibility for child-rearing. Sensitive as few other historians have been to the effect of this sort of medical and moral advice on female sensibility, she harbors a certain skepticism about the scientific authority of domestic advisors. But other historians, Sheila Rothman exploring concepts of womanhood as they are mirrored in advice literature (as well as in other places), Michael Zuckerman analyzing the advice of Benjamin Spock, and Christopher Lasch examining the formulations of psychoanalysts, pediatricians, psychologists, and others of the scientific establishment, interpret the advice as an elaborate fiction, justifying and rationalizing the material transformations occurring during the twentieth century. They interpret the advice of child counselors and providing a justification and mystification of the fact that families had been transformed from being relatively powerful institutions of economic production and cultural transmission to relatively important units of consumption. through advice enjoining women to be attentive to the desires of their children and to minister conscientiously to their needs in the name of healthy personality development, twentieth-century parent educators misrepresented mothers as omnipotent molders of personality, responsible for securing harmony and order with their household. In fact, what the reformers were doing was preparing mothers to prepare their children to be good consumers and tractable corporate team players.<sup>49</sup>

*Educational Fare for Children*

An interest in the work created for the education of children rather than parents has also inspired historians exploring the systematic and deliberate transmission of culture. As James Axtell and Lawrence Cremin study the educational fare created by colonial leaders to effect conversion in New English, Native America, or West African children, they explore it as they explore nurture literature, as a reflection of New English culture and educa-disposition.

Similarly, Ann Scott MacLeod, Gordon Kelly, and Gillian Avery studying children's fiction during the Jacksonian era, Gregory Nestiel studying the collected works of Jacob Abbott, Barbara Kaye Greenleaf exploring iconography, all connect the evolution of education to the emergence of ideas about rather than processes of child-rearing.<sup>51</sup>

*Schools as Instruments of Child-Rearing*

Finally, there are a very small number of works seeking systematically to explore the dissemination of child-rearing theories by studying the attempts to engage in school reform. These studies represent a small beginning in what might become an important focus of intellectualist history of education; the systematic diffusion of child-rearing theories into the work of public schools. Joseph Kett's essay on the decline of precocity as an educational ideal in the nineteenth century, Schlossman's explorations of attempts to spread the gospel of child development in the early decades of the twentieth century, Michael Imber's work on mental hygiene in the schools, Sol Cohen's corpus of work exploring the emergence, elaboration of dissemination of psychoanalytic ideals represent pioneering attempts to connect the history of childhood and the history of education.<sup>52</sup>

Whether they have explored the history of education by focusing on regulation or on cultural transmission, they have, as we have seen, typically incorporated children and youth into their histories unsystematically. As a corollary, the field as traditionally conceptualized, has advanced a remarkable bias: if historians of education study what people teach and write, they will somehow discover what is learned. Whether they have defined the history of education as the history of schooling, or more broadly as a wider range of efforts to transmit knowledge, attitudes, or sensibilities; whether they define the history of education as role training — a process of political economic, and sexual socialization, historians of education have typically visualized learners as essentially passive. They have treated them as though they were helpless assignees of social status, recipients of shared culture, unwitting creations of political and economic arrangement — as uncritically absorbent recipients of roles, responsibilities, duties, and skills. Their histories proceed as though children were cavernous holes into which are poured status, skills, books, and curricula, and out of which emerge formed human beings. Unwittingly asserting that human beings become only what others intend them to become, and in predictable sequence, they have treated learners and learning as mere reflections.

*Children as Learners: Education as Learning and Transformation*

A small number of historians have devoted themselves to the task of incorporating children systematically into the study of educational history. Proceeding on the assumption that the processes of cultural transmission will be incompletely understood and unnecessarily narrowed by a single-minded preoccupation with teaching, they seek, through the systematic

study of childhood and child-rearing, to focus attention on two of education history's most neglected aspects — learners and learning itself.

As historians approach the task, they have introduced an inter-generational dimension deeply into their studies of educational history. Indeed, the character of adult-child relationships is an important focus of studies combining an interest in childhood with one in education. An array of approaches is contained in a collection of essays entitled *Regulated Children/Liberated Children: Education in Psychohistorical Perspective*. Nine essays provide examples of educational history in which learning is explicitly emphasized, and in which an inter-generational focus is fundamental. Some of the essays — that of N. Ray Hiner focusing on Cotton Mather's development as a parent and parent educator, Ross Beales examining the poetry of Anne Bradstreet, Judith Plotz analyzing romantic poetry, Sterling Fishman presenting transformations in visual portrayal of teachers and students, and Sol Cohen exploring the fate of psychoanalytic pedagogy in Europe between 1908 and 1938, focus on the substance of adult-child relationships as they have been visually represented and philosophically and scientifically imagined. Others — Phyllis Vine exploring the uses of honor and shame as educational instruments in colonial colleges, Barbara Finkelstein comparing children's experiences as they learned to read and write among a cross-section of groups, Deborah Fitts examining the origins and effects of the movement to feminize school teaching, and Dominick Cavallo analyzing transformations in the substance of kindergarten pedagogy in the progressive era — focus on the educative character of relationships between teachers and students as they were institutionally enclosed and advanced.<sup>53</sup>

Implicit in a learning centered approach is a disposition not only to focus on relationships between adults and children, but to study education as a complete cycle, expanding an inter-generational approach to include the results as well as the possibilities of cultural transmission. Some historians reflect this tendency in studies examining how people have converted what they have learned in one generation into new social forms, cultural constructions, visions of educational, political, social, and economic possibility in the next. Studying the origins of Cotton Mather's interest in family nurture as a product of his experience as a son and then as a father, Ray Hiner offers a psychological explanation for the character of Puritan child-rearing prescriptions.<sup>54</sup> In a less relentlessly psychologically treatment, James Axtell provides what he calls a "waist-high view of education" of New English education during the colonial period. He examines the evolution of New English culture by paying close attention to educational processes as they were reflected in daily attempts to effect conversions, to provide the rudiments of literacy, to teach a trade and otherwise prepare the young for life as adults. He documents the emergence of small changes in the manner of education, which, he argues, represented attempts to adjust New English educational forms to combat the effect of economic and political pressures and transformations.<sup>55</sup> In fact, they contributed to their falling apart. And in process, young people were deserting the community — breaking apprenticeship contracts, seeking new and independent lives in cities and on the frontier and, as Axtell has emphasized, living among Native American families as well. Marginal in his awareness but consistent in his presentation, is the conclusion that New English educational forms and processes failed to excite the affiliative loyalties of generations to come and in so doing, prepared younger generations of New Englishmen to effect a revolution. Phillip Greven going further, explore the roots of American revolutionary consciousness in family educative styles or child-

rearing practices. Extending arguments advanced and articulated by psycho-historians Gerald Platt, Fred Weinstein, and Lloyd de Mause, Greven, in a monumental study entitled *The Protestant Temperament*, identified at least three characteristic modes of cultural transmission operating among New English Protestants, anticipating three distinct political styles and sensibilities among the founders of the American Revolution.<sup>56</sup> Similarly, Phyllis Vine suggests that Republican political style was importantly formed and directed in the educational processes of eighteenth century colleges.<sup>57</sup>

In a similar manner, other historians explore the roots of revolutionary consciousness in educational matters. In a study of child-rearing practices among Celtic Quakers living in the Delaware Valley in the eighteenth century, Barry Levy has suggested that the commitment to soft nurture, to gentle measures of rearing and schooling the young was not a post-industrial construction, nor necessarily an ideological weapon, but an intricate and unique expression of Quaker consciousness and sensibility. Not removed from the mainstream of American life, Quakers on the contrary, may have initiated some of its more characteristic educational ideals.<sup>58</sup> Judith Plotz, quoting Shelley, calls poets "the unacknowledged legislators of the world," the unrecognized architects of modern education arrangements and practices.<sup>59</sup> Among the most creative treatment of relationships between teaching, learning, and cultural expression, to date, is Daniel Calhoun's study of the nature of intelligence as it has been conceptualized, argued about, expressed in child-rearing theories and reflected in enterprises like bridge building. Suffering from inattention to real lives and situations, the book nonetheless suggests that the very quality and character of American culture is to be found in the way it has molded its educational processes.<sup>60</sup>

A disposition to conceptualize education as a complete cycle of teaching and learning has led some historians to re-define the meaning of institutionalization in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, attaching it to larger attempts to reconstruct the character of childhood. They have identified a dynamic element — the presence of children — in whom and through whom culture, if it is to persist, will have to be mediated. And they have implicitly redefined education, regarding families and schools as structures of persuasion — dynamic containers within which adults do battle for the minds and hearts of children. In an essay exploring the reconstruction of childhood from 1790-1890, Barbara Finkelstein has defined education as the attempt to persuade. Extending concepts used in the work of Jacques Donzelot, Lloyd deMause, Phillippe Aries, David Rothman, Clifford Geertz, Michael Zuckerman, Michel Foucault, and Burkart Holzner, she proceeds on the assumption that the contours of education and the contours of childhood are unvaryingly linked.<sup>61</sup> She pays close attention to the networks of association, the structures of authority, and the character of activities which informed the hearts and minds, compelled the behaviour and otherwise shaped the consciousness of children throughout the nineteenth century. It represented an attempt to control their experiences and after 1830, narrow the range of association for the young, creating tutorial environments with exemplary adults who would engage in attempts to predefine the terms by which the younger generation entered the world outside of their immediate families. It constituted an elaborate if only implicitly understood strategy to steward, shepherd, control, and otherwise organize the character of social change.<sup>62</sup>

Yet another reflection of the tendency to explore educational history as a complete cycle can be seen in biographical studies exploring relationships between cultural transmission and the acquisition of identity. Charles Strickland, exploring the child-rearing practices of

Bronson Allcott, seeks to understand the sources and origins of Louisa May's literary output.<sup>63</sup> Ellen Lagerman, in a biographical study of educational processes in the lives of five female progressive reformers, links their professional commitments as adults to the character and quality of their relationships with older mentors as they grew up and developed.<sup>64</sup> And Louis Perry links the study of childhood, child-rearing, education, inextricably together through a study of the journals of Henry Clarke Wright — abolitionist, nurture writer, educator and all purpose nineteenth century social reformer.<sup>65</sup>

Historians focusing on learners and learning are in a unique position to explore the multiple ways in which human beings adapt, control, modify, or succumb to the force of economic, political, cultural, psychological, and social circumstance. There is an evolving corpus of historical literature suggesting that families might be resistant and resilient — able through their educational processes to transform, to resist imposition from without. This point of view has driven the interpretation of several historians examining the processes by which various groups have adapted, resisted, and/or transformed the intricate machinery of cultural imposition whether it came in the form of missionary efforts in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries, in attempts by public school architects to use schools as deliberate instruments of civic education and character development in the nineteenth century, or to Americanize immigrants by Americanizing schools in the twentieth.

In an extraordinary study entitled *Deep Like the Rivers*, Thomas Webber explores education among slave-quarter communities in the nineteenth century agricultural south. Focusing on the world as slaves themselves understood and made it, Webber has revealed the extraordinary power and vitality of African cultural forms and expressions. Like Anthony Wallace studying the Iriquois in 1970, Webber discovered that the consciousness of slaves, and especially of slave children was being formed, molded, and expressed within a community that maintained solidarity and integrity by creating what Levine has called a "sacred world." It was a world that enabled slaves to transcend the environment in which they were forced to live, simultaneously creating a meaningful and richly expressive psychological and moral reality. In the world that slaves made, culture was transmitted orally, reflected in song, dance, and religious ceremony. It was carried on through a series of informal relationships in household structures and configurations that were unique. So persuasive in its power to compel, it defeated an intricate missionary of cultural imposition advancing from doorsteps of plantation mainhouses.<sup>66</sup>

The persuasive power of distinct educational forms is also an important focus of the work of John Hostetler exploring the Old Order Amish Community as it evolved over the course of two centuries of relentless cultural, political, and economic harassment. As he explores relationships between adults and children as they are reflected in nurture processes, naming ceremonies, in disciplinary techniques, in formal catechetical exercise, and in hundreds of daily transactions, Hostetler has implicitly documented the existence of an exquisite educational sensibility and capacity. So sophisticated are Amish Educational forms, structures and their capacity to persuade, i.e., to inspire the affiliative loyalty of its younger generations that it provided generations of children with the cultural and psychological wherewithal and inclination to hold the Amish community together.<sup>67</sup>

The study of educational processes and child-rearing practices among a variety of other ethnic groups is just beginning. With the exception of John Bodnar's promising work on the

domestic education of the children of Slavic-American immigrant groups, community studies have focused on the family role as it mediated the labor of children.<sup>68</sup> They have barely begun to study ethnic educative styles, to explore daily educational processes as they proceeded among immigrant groups, or to explore the capacity of different ethnic groups to mute the force of economic and cultural imposition. A learning centered exploration of educational history would correct the tendency to ignore the dispositions, inclinations, capacities, and educative power of ethnic tradition.

Educational history has, I believe, been well served by the growing disposition of its creators to pay more attention to childhood and child-rearing. They have been less reductionistic, expanding educational history to focus on the whole of educational arrangements, including learners as well as teachers, learning as well as teaching. They have added new dimension to the understanding of education as a process of cultural transmission as well as a process of policing families and children. Due perhaps to the subject matter, educational historians might, though they have not yet really begun to do so, also define educational history as an important aspect of chapters in the history of transformations in the human capacity to think, to feel, and to love, as well as to work, survive, and pursue power.

Perhaps the major contribution which a learner centered history might make to historiography generally and to education historiography in particular, is to enhance our overall understanding of social change — and most particularly the processes which initiate or prevent it.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Phillippe Aries, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, trans. Robert Baldick (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962); deMause, Lloyd, "The Evolution of Childhood," *The History of Childhood*, ed. L. deMause (New York: Psychohistory Press, 1974).

<sup>2</sup> His historiographical position is described in two different monographs. Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley: An Essay on the Historiography of American Education* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965); *Traditions of American Education* (New York: Basic Books, 1977).

<sup>3</sup> As examples, see Stanley K. Schultz, *The Culture Factory: Boston Public Schools, 1789-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973); Michael B. Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968) and "Hardcore Educational Historiography," *Reviews in American History*, VIII (1980): 504-10.

<sup>4</sup> Jill Kerr Conway, "Perspectives on the History of Woman's Education in the United States," *History of Education Quarterly*, 14, (Spring 1974): 1-30; Joan N. Burstyn, "Catharine Beecher and the Education of American Women," *New England Quarterly*, XL (1974): 386-403; James D. Anderson, "Education as a Vehicle for the Manipulation of Black Workers," ed., W. Feinberg and H. Rosemont, Jr., *Work, Technology, and Education* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975); Vincent P. Franklin, "Historical Revisionism and Black Education," *School Review*, 82 (1973): 477-86; Geraldine Clifford, "Saints, Sinners and People: A Position Paper on the Historiography of American Education," *History of Education Quarterly*, 15, 1975, pp. 257-68.

<sup>5</sup> The following historiographical essays focus on the disposition of learners as an important need in the history of education as a field of study. N. Ray Hiner, "The Child in American Historiography: Accomplishments and Prospect," *The Psychohistory Review*, 7, 1 (1978): 13-23; "Domestic Cycles: History of Childhood and the Family," ed. J.H. Best, *Historical Inquiry in Education: A Research Agenda* (Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1983), pp. 265-82; Barbara Finkelstein, "Choose Your Own Bias: Non-Documentary Textbooks in the History of American Education," *Educational Studies*, 5 (Winter 1974-75): 10-16; "The Twain Shall Meet: The History of Childhood and the History of Education in Documents," *Journal of Psychohistory*, 4 (1977): 553-81; and R.L. Schnell, "Childhood as Ideology: A Reinterpretation of the Common School", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 27, 1 (1979), 7-28.

<sup>6</sup> N. Ray Hiner, *ibid.*, Barbara Finkelstein, *ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> See Sol Cohen, "In the Name of the Prevention of Neurosis . . ." pp. 159-184; Sterling Fishman, "The Double-Vision of Education in the Nineteenth Century . . ." pp. 96-113; Ross W. Beales, "Anne Bradstreet and Her Children", pp. 10-23, in *Regulated Children, Liberated Children*, Barbara Finkelstein (ed.) (New York: Psychohistory Press, 1979). Also see Alison L. Prentice and Susan E. Houston (eds.) *Family, School and Society in Nineteenth Century Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1975).

<sup>8</sup> Works of N. Ray Hiner, and Barbara Finkelstein will be cited below.

<sup>9</sup> Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

<sup>10</sup> Proceeding on the assumption that the study of education is fundamentally the study of power, they harbor an implicit theory of what motivates education reformers: what Clifford Geertz has aptly described as "a form of higher cunning," *ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> For an analysis of the work of Badinter, Lasch, and Donzelot, see Barbara Finkelstein and Remi Clignet, "The Family as Inferno: The Dour Visions of Four Family Historians," *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 9, (1981): 135-41. Or better, see Elizabeth Badinter, *L'Amour en Plus: Histoire de l'Amour Maternelle*, (Paris: Fammarrion, 1980); Jacques Donzelot, *The Policing of the Family* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1979); Christopher Lasch, *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1979) and *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged* (New York: Basic Books, 1979).

<sup>12</sup> Michael B. Katz, *Class, Bureaucracy and the Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America*, expanded ed. (New York: Praeger, 1975); *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968); David Nasaw, *Schooled to Order: A Social History of Public Schooling in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); Steven Schlossman, *Love and the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of Progressive Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920* (University of Chicago Press, 1977); Patricia Rooke, "The Child Institutionalized in Canada, Britain, and the United States: A Transatlantic Perspective," *Journal of Educational Thought*, 2 (1977): 156-7; Clarence Karier, ed., *Shaping the American Educational State: 1900 to the Present* (New York: Free Press, 1975); Clarence J. Karier, Paul Violas, and Joel Spring, *Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973); Joel Spring, *the Sorting Machine: National Educational Policy Since 1945* (New York: David McKay, 1976); Paul C. Violas, *The Training of the Urban Working Class: A History of Twentieth Century American Education* (New York: Rand McNally, 1978).

<sup>13</sup> David Tyack, "Ways of Seeing: An Essay on the History of Compulsory Schooling," *Harvard Educational Review*, 46 (1976): 355-89; Morris Stambler, "The Effect of Compulsory Education and Child Labor Laws on High School Attendance in New York City, 1898-1917," *History of Education Quarterly*, 8 (Summer 1968): 189-214; Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., "The Photographer as Educator: The Child Labor Photo-stories of Lewis Hine," *Teachers College Record*, 83 (Summer 1982): 593-612.

<sup>14</sup> Harvey Kantor and David B. Tyack, eds., *Work, Youth, and Schooling: Historical Perspectives on Vocationalism in American Education* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982).

<sup>15</sup> Joseph F. Kett, *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1977).

<sup>16</sup> Marvin Lazerson and W. Norton Grubb, *Broken Promises: How Americans Fail Their Children* (New York: Basic Books, 1982); Kett, *ibid.*; Christopher Lasch, *Culture of Narcissism*, op. cit.; Clarence Karier, op. cit.; Joel Spring, op. cit.

<sup>17</sup> Dominick Cavallo, "The Discovery of Latency: Kindergarten Pedagogy, 1860-1930," *Regulated Children/Liberated Children*.

<sup>18</sup> Dominick Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and Urban Reform, 1880-1920*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981); David Glassberg, "Restoring a 'Forgotten Childhood': American Play and the Progressive Era's Elizabethan Past," *American Quarterly*, 32 (Fall 1980): 351.

<sup>19</sup> David Rothman, "The Child, the Family and the State: Past Realities and Future Prospects," Working Paper #1, Center for the Study of Education Policy and Human Values, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland; Michael Zuckerman, "Children's Rights: The Failure of Reform," *Policy Analysis*, 2 (Summer 1976): 371-85; and "Doctor Spock: The Confidence Man," Charles S. Rosenberg, ed., *The Family in History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975) pp. 179-209; Steven Schlossman, "The Parent Education Game: The Politics of Child Psychology in the 1970's," *Teachers College Record* 79 (May 1978); "Before Home Start: Notes Toward a History of Parent Education in America, 1897-1927," *Harvard Educational Review*, 46 (August 1976): 436-68; and Patricia T. Rooke and R.L. Schnell, "The Institutional Society: Childhood Family and Schooling": 113-130, 158-163 in *Approaches To Educational History* (David Jones et al., (eds.)) (Winnipeg: Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, 1981).

<sup>20</sup> They have derived their categories from sociological and economic theory.

<sup>21</sup> Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life* (New York: Basic Books, 1976).

<sup>22</sup> This point of view has consistently inspired the work of historians of education like R. Freeman Butts, Diane Ravitch who have not as yet incorporated a focus on families and children, except to assert that we need more studies to understand the uses to which they put public schools.

<sup>23</sup> Robert H. Bremner et al., *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970).

<sup>24</sup> Robert H. Bremner, "Families, Children, and the State," R. Bremner, ed., *Reshaping America: Society and Institutions, 1845-1960* (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1982); "Other People's Children," *Journal of Social History*, 16 (Spring 1983): 83-104.

<sup>25</sup> Charles Strickland, "Paths Not Taken: Seminal Models of Early Childhood Education in Jacksonian America," B. Spodek, ed., *Handbook of Research in Early Childhood Education*, (New York: Free Press, 1982) pp. 321-40; Joseph Hawes, *Children in Urban Society: Juvenile Delinquency in Nineteenth Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971); Jack M. Holl, *Juvenile Reform in the Progressive Era: William R. George and the Junior Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971); Walter Trattner, *Crusade for Children: A History of the National Child Labor Committee and Child Labor Reform in America* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970); John Duffy, "School Buildings and the Health of American School Children in the Nineteenth-Century," in Charles E. Rosenberg, ed., *Healing and History* (New York: Basic Books, 1979). Mark A. Kadzielski, "As a Flower Needs Sunshine: The Origins of Organized Children's Recreation in Philadelphia, 1886-1911," *Journal of Sport History*, 4 (Summer 1977): 169-88; N. Ray Hiner, "Children's Rights, Corporal Punishment, and Child Abuse: Changing American Attitudes, 1870-1920," *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 53 (May 1979): 233-48; Nanette Whitbred, *The Evolution of the Nursery-Infant School: A History of Infant and Nursery Education in Britain, 1800-1970* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972); Denison Deasey, *Education Under Six* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978).

<sup>26</sup> Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society: A Re-interpretation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962); David Rothman, "A Note on the Study of the Colonial Family," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 23 (1966): 627-34.

<sup>27</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> Carl F. Kaestle and Maris A. Vinovskis, "From Apron Strings to ABC's: Parents, Children, and Schooling in Nineteenth Century Massachusetts," J. Demos and S.S. Boocock, eds., *Turning Points: Sociological Essays on the Family* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978, pp. 39-80).

<sup>29</sup> Margaret Connell Szasz, "Federal Boarding Schools and the Indian Child," *South Dakota History* (Fall 1977): 371-83; Robert A. Trennert, "Educating Indian Girls at Non-Reservation Boarding Schools, 1878-1920," *Western Historical Quarterly*, 13 (July 1982): 271-90; Robert Carlson, *op. cit.*; David Tyack and Elisabeth B. Ansot, *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1982).

<sup>30</sup> Richard J. Altenbaugh, "Our Children are Being Trained Like Dogs and Ponies: Schooling, Social Control, and the Working Class," *History of Education Quarterly*, 21 (Spring 1981):

<sup>31</sup> Barbara Brenzel, "Domestication as Reform: A Study of the Socialization of Wayward Girls, 1856-1905," *Harvard Educational Review*, 50, 2 (May 1980): 196-213. See also Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society* (University of Toronto, 1976), especially Pt. III.

<sup>32</sup> Ruby Takanishi, "Childhood as a Social Issue: Historical Roots of Contemporary Child-Advocacy Movements," *Journal of Social Issues*, 35(1978): 8-28.

<sup>33</sup> Patricia Ferguson Clement, "Families and Foster Care: Philadelphia in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Social Service Review* (March 1979): 406-20; Rebecca Scott, "The Battle Over the Child: Child Apprenticeship and the Freedman's Bureau in North Carolina," *Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives* (Summer 1978): 101-13; D'Ann Campbell, "Judge Ben Lindsey and the Juvenile Court Movement, 1901-1904," *Arizona and the West*, 18, (1976): 5. For a Canadian interpretation see Patricia T. Rooke and R.L. Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum: From Child Rescue to the Welfare State in English-Canada 1800-1950*. (Washington, D.C., University Press of America, 1983) and Neil Sutherland, *op. cit.*

<sup>34</sup> Carl F. Kaestle and Maris A. Vinovskis, "From Fireside to Factory: School Entry and School Leaving in Nineteenth Century Massachusetts," T. Hareven, ed., *Family and the Life Course in Historical Perspective* (New York: Academic Press, 1978), pp. 135-38.

<sup>35</sup> Morris Stambler, *loc. cit.*; David Tyack, *loc. cit.*

<sup>36</sup> Margaret O'Brien Steinfels, *Who's Minding the Children?: The History and Politics of Day Care in America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973).

<sup>37</sup> Grubb and Lazerson, *Broken Promises*.

<sup>38</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Ronald Cohen, "Child Saving and Progressivism, 1885-1915," N. Ray Hiner and Joseph Hawes, eds., *Growing Up in America: Children in Historical Perspective* (Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984, forthcoming).

<sup>40</sup> Michael Zuckerman, "Children's Rights: The Failure of Reform," *Policy Analysis*, 2 (Summer 1976): 371-85.

<sup>41</sup> Barbara Finkelstein, "Uncle Sam and the Children: Congressional Involvements in the Lives of Young Children," N. Ray Hiner and Joseph Hawes eds., *Child Rearing in America* (Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press, forthcoming).

- <sup>42</sup> David Rothman and Michael Grossberg of Case, Western Reserve have made good starts on it.
- <sup>43</sup> Anne L. Kuhn, *The Mother's Role in Childhood Education: New England Concepts, 1830-1860* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1947), and Bernard Wishy, *The Child and the Republic: The Dawn of Modern American Child Nurture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968).
- <sup>44</sup> Wilson Smith, *Theories of Education in Early America, 1655-1819* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973); Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970); Steven Schlossman, "Philanthropy and the Gospel of Child Development," *History of Education Quarterly*, 21 (1981): 275-87; Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The National Experience, 1783-1876* (New York: Harper and Row, 1980); and Katharine K. Sklar, *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1973); Sol Cohen, "The Mental Hygiene Movement, The Commonwealth Fund, and Public Education, 1921-1933," Gerald Benjamin, ed., *Private Philanthropy and Public Elementary and Secondary Education* (New York: Rockefeller Archive Center, 1980).
- <sup>45</sup> Nancy P. Weiss, "Mother, the Invention of Necessity: Dr. Benjamin Spock's *Baby and Child Care*," *American Quarterly*, 29 (1973): 519.
- <sup>46</sup> Ruth Block, "American Feminine Ideals in Transition: The Rise of the Moral Mother, 1785-1815," *Feminist Studies*, III (Fall 1975): 159-75; Jacqueline S. Reinier, "Rearing the Republican Child: Attitudes and Practices in Post-Revolutionary America," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 35 (July 1977): 426-55.
- <sup>47</sup> Katharine Sklar, *Catharine Beecher*; Carol Mulligan, "The Madonna and Child in American Culture" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1975); Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood, 1820-1860," *American Quarterly* (1966): 18, 151-74; Barbara Finkelstein, "Casting Networks of Good Influence: The Reconstruction of Childhood in the Nineteenth Century," Joseph Hawes and N. Ray Hiner (eds.), *History of American Childhood: A Reference and Handbook* (New Jersey: Greenwood Press, 1984, forthcoming); William G. McLoughlin, "Evangelical Childrearing in the Age of Jackson: Francis Wayland's Views on When and How to Subdue the Wilfulness of Children," *Journal of Social History*, 9:20 (Fall 1975).
- <sup>48</sup> Nancy P. Weiss, *Mother: The Invention of Necessity*.
- <sup>49</sup> Sheila Rothman, *Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1978); Michael Zuckerman, "Dr. Spock: The Confidence Man," ed., Charles S. Rosenberg, *The Family in History* (New York: Basic Books, 1971); Christopher Lasch, *Haven and The Culture of Narcissism*.
- <sup>0</sup> Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience*; James Axtell, *The School Upon the Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1974).
- <sup>51</sup> Anne S. MacLeod, *A Moral Tale: Children's Literature and American Culture, 1820-1860* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1975); R. Gordon Kelly, *Mother Was A Lady: Self and Society in Selected American Children's Periodicals, 1865-1890* (Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1974); Gillian Avery, *Nineteenth-Century Children: Heroes and Heroines in English Children's Stories, 1780-1900* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965); Gregory Nensiel, "Jacob Abbot: The Evolution of a Nineteenth Century Educator," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1979); Barbara Kaye Greenleaf, *Children Through the Ages: A History of Childhood* (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1978).
- <sup>52</sup> Joseph Kett, "Curing the Disease of Precocity," Demos and Boocock, eds., *Turning Points*, pp. 183-212; Steven Schlossman, *Philanthropy and the Gospel of Child Development*, Michael Imber, "The Genealogy of an Educational Campaign: The Social and Intellectual Origins of Sex Education;" Sol Cohen, "The Mental Hygiene Movement" and "Parent Blaming, Sex Repression, and the Schools: Reflections on the Mental Hygiene Movement," paper delivered at History of Education Society Annual Meeting, September 1981.
- <sup>53</sup> Finkelstein, *Regulated Children*.
- <sup>54</sup> Hiner, loc. cit.
- <sup>55</sup> Axtell, *The School Upon the Hill*.
- <sup>56</sup> Philip Greven, *The Protestant Temperament: Patterns of Child-Rearing, Religious Experience, and Self in Early America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977).
- <sup>57</sup> Phyllis Vine, "Honor and Shame and the Eighteenth-Century College," Finkelstein, ed., *Regulated Children/Liberated Children*.

<sup>58</sup> Barry Levy, "Tender Plants: Quaker Farmers and Children in the Delaware Valley, 1681-1735," *Journal of Family History*, 3 (June 1978): 116-133.

<sup>59</sup> Judith Plotz, "The Perpetual Messiah," Finkelstein, *Regulated Children*.

<sup>60</sup> Daniel Calhoun, *The Intelligence of a People* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973).

<sup>61</sup> Jacques Donzelot, *The Policing of Families* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1979); "The Evolution of Childhood;" Aries, *Centuries of Childhood*; David Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971); Clifford Geertz, "Ideology as a Cultural System" in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973); Michael Zuckerman, "William Byrd's Family," *Perspectives in American History*, 12 (1979): 253; Burkart Holzner, *Identity and Authority: Explorations in the Theory of Society* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979); Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (New York: Basic Books, 1980).

<sup>62</sup> Barbara Finkelstein, "Casting Networks."

<sup>63</sup> Charles A. Strickland, "A Transcendentalist Father: The Childrearing Practices of Amos Bronson Alcott," *History of Childhood Quarterly* (1973) 1:4-51.

<sup>64</sup> Ellen C. Lagerman, *A Generation of Women: Education in the Lives of Progressive Reformers* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979).

<sup>65</sup> Lewis Perry, *Childhood, Marriage and Reform: Henry Clarke Wright, 1797-1870* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

<sup>66</sup> Thomas J. Webber, *Deep Like the Rivers: Education in the Slave Quarter Community, 1831 to 1865* (New York: Norton, 1978); Anthony F.C. Wallace, *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970).

<sup>67</sup> John Hosteteler, *Amish Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980).

<sup>68</sup> John Bodnar, "Materialism and Morality: Slavic-American Immigrants and Education, 1890-1940," *Journal of Ethnic Studies* (1976) 3:1-16.