A Common Countenance?
Part IV

At fin-de-siècle, "the choice of content for the school curriculum was determined by tradition, by the views people held, by the knowledge teachers possessed and by the possibility of testing what the pupil learned."[1] Tomkins' only comment is that the term "curriculum making" had at this time appeared, and that as a term "new concepts of curriculum organization were being advanced."[2] "The new ideal is the citizen,"[3] Tomkins tells us (quoting Cappon), that replacing the "old educational ideal" the "scholar,"[4] referencing the 1901 Queen's University conference that had launched an important debate over the high school curriculum. He reminds us that the philosopher John Watson had there, at that event, argued "against any concession to practicality in the curriculum," that every "student entering public (elementary) school must be presumed to be a scholar" until indicated otherwise.[5] Therefore, "with minor variations, all students should receive the same schooling up to the leaving age of thirteen or fourteen."[6] Watson thought the 3Rs were taught inefficiently but worse, Tomkins reports, he alleged that the public school curriculum left a student "with no feeling for the literature of his ancestors."[7] At the same 1901 Queen conference an "applied scientist" - N. F. Dupuis – "shared educators' concerns over the tendency of the curriculum of the higher institutions to dominate the lower levels."[8]

Perhaps the source of his earlier comment on the phrase "curriculum making," Tomkins quotes another conference speaker, W. S. Ellis, principal of Kingston Collegiate Institute and future education dean at Queen's, whose topic - "The Making of a Curriculum" – included the idea that curriculum revision was "a very different thing from the rearrangement of certain subjects of study."[9] Ellis thought there were three elements when making the curriculum: (1) balancing liberal and practical studies, (2) the proper relationship between the stage of mental development [of] the pupil … and the kind of exercise that the studies afford,"[10] and (3) "the matter of interest."[11] The concept of "interest" – sometimes specific but often shifting - would seem to undermine Ellis' insistence that "public and high school courses of study be continuous."[12] Whatever continuity he was urging was not evidently tied to university admission, as "in a later paper, Ellis, like Dupuis, was critical of university dominance of school offerings and of the lack of any sound curriculum design,"[13] the latter a seemingly separate issue, but on which he also had strong interest. Tomkins tells us that "he thought that the course of study should be a scientific whole made up of interrelated parts, rather than a mere fortuitous grouping of subjects."[14] If the curriculum is addressing what is underway in the world, there could be, I should think, a "fortuitous grouping of subjects," but then, evidently, curriculum thinkers imagined they could still make sense of it all, a panoramic perspective to be encoded in the curriculum.

In Western Canada, Tomkins continues, the concept of "spiral or concentric curriculum" had gained currency.[15] Calgary superintendent Melville Scott argued for the introduction of "sophisticated concepts early," then "building on them spirally through repetition and review," with the result (presumably) that students would no longer leave school "without a grasp of what more advanced subjects mean."[16] What Tomkins terms "systematic curriculum making" was also characteristic of organizing the course of study around projects, a concept associated with William Heard Kilpatrick of Columbia University's Teachers College, a concept ("systematic curriculum making") that, Tomkins continues, "became the basis for so-called enterprise teaching, whereby the curriculum was organized around units of study, or enterprises."[17] While the concept "took firmest hold in Alberta during the 1930s," evidently it spread across Canada.[18] More on that later.

Kilpatrick was concerned with the subjective and social formation of children through collaborative study projects, no "scientific" sense of sequence or interrelated parts, ideas advanced at the 1901 Queens University conference. Franklin Bobbitt – for U.S. scholars sometimes as the first modern curriculum theorist - was concerned with preparing children for participation in the adult world. "Through his most famous student, Ralph Tyler," Tomkins tells us, "Bobbitt influenced later curriculum making and anticipated modern behavioral objectives and competency-based approaches."[19] So-called "scientific" principles of curriculum development were applied, Tomkins continues, during the 1930s when British Columbia revised its curriculum; indeed, "no curriculum making efforts before and few since have equaled a program that totaled 2700 pages and covered all grade levels."[20] It turns out, Tomkins adds, that "Bobbitt's system of curriculum making was specifically recommended to the revision committees."[21] Given how very American – focused on social efficiency, often conformist and uncritically status quo - Bobbitt's conception was, it is odd to read that "patriotism and morality as the oldest goals of the Canadian curriculum remained central aims during the era of the New Education."[22] I don't see how.

An inadvertent explanation occurs on the next page after Tomkins suggests that Canadian nationalism was "Ontario regionalism writ large."[23] Then he adds Nova Scotia, noting that on "May 23, 1899, the day before the birthday of Queen Victoria, Nova Scotia and Ontario became the first provinces to observe Empire Day," an "idea [that] quickly spread to the other provinces, becoming an element of school programs that contributed to the growth of a national patriotic curriculum."[24] Tomkins continues: "With its overt political socialization by means of recitations, songs, readings, classroom displays, sports, and parades, Empire Day reflected an overwhelming imperialist orientation that was paradoxically American in form but British in content."[25] Bobbitt's social-efficiency curriculum orientation was certainly "American in form." Can one be "British in content" and "American in form"? Would not the two cancel each other out or – invoking dialectics – producing a third

"synthetic" curriculum – perhaps a "Canadian" curriculum, if one missing the Métis, the Indigenous, the French?

These three were evidently not (yet) in the picture. Among those who promoted the conflation of British Canada with "Canada" were the Daughters of the Empire (IODE), mostly middle-class women of British origin, united under the motto "One Flag, One Throne, One Empire."[26] Founded in 1900 during "the height of the imperial fervor engendered by the South African (Boer) War," by 1904, the IODE, supported by ministers of education, academics and military representatives, had undertaken "an extensive program of political socialization conducted largely through the schools."[27] There were "essay contests, school-to-school links and 'pen pal' programs among Empire countries and through donations of teaching aids (Union Jacks, photographs of royalty, library books and picture collections)," the IODE promoted an "imperial curriculum, particularly in the teaching of geography, history, and literature."[28] There was "national sentiment" in Québec too, there "promoted" by the Francophone Roman Catholic majority," so it was not King Edward VII who enlisted students' loyalty but France and Catholicism.[29] "Concern" over "Americanization continued."[30]

Also intensified by immigration, school curriculum emphasized "Canadianization" and "textbooks were openly racist."[31] Tomkins cites a 1910 Ontario Geography textbook wherein "Caucasians" were described as "the most active, enterprising and intelligent race in the world."[32] In contrast, the "Yellow race" was "backward," as was the "Red race" - "but little civilized" the textbook advised - and the "Black race" was, well, "somewhat indolent" and "often impulsive."[33] Not that all Caucasians were equally superior of course: students learned that the Irish "lacked energy, intelligence and high ideals" and the French "included excitable urban dwellers and backward rural dwellers."[34]Anglophones saw the school curriculum as the basis for an "Anglo-conformist English-speaking society." [35] Not unlike the Americans' metaphor of melting pot (it seems to me), Anglophone Canadians imagined that "racial fusion would occur naturally when the school had done its job well,"[36] that, as George Bryce put it in his 1911 presidential address to the Royal Society of Canada, the public school curriculum should serve as the "great national unifier."[37]

While there was a "trend towards a secular, state-based morality" during the first decades of the twentieth century, "the moral outlook of Canadian educators remained strongly religious."[38]Across the provinces the school day began "with prayers and scriptures readings; the latter was typically presented without comment."[39] In Protestant Québec, Scripture became a "didactic examination subject like any other," and in Catholic Québec the school curriculum included both "direct and indirect moral education, including regular and frequent religious observance, the formal teaching of religion, and the deliberate infusion of the curriculum and life of the school with a religious spirit."[40] That "deliberate infusion" meant testing to ensure it had occurred; Tomkins notes that examinations were also imagined as promoting morality, as students were required to write (for example) about the "moral tone" of *The Tempest*,

adding that "one examination struck a modern note in 1913 when reference to "value choices" was made, but it was (Tomkins points out) "moral indoctrination rather than reflective discussion that was typically prized."[41] In contrast to this explicit moral-religious curriculum, "manners and morals" were taught implicitly, in Tomkins' term "incidentally."[42] Replacing the church and Scripture, schools and the curriculum were increasingly expected by parents "to shield their adolescent children from new moral and social temptations,"[43] an expectation that re-emerged decades later during U.S. school reform.[44] Consequently, "the high school took on an expanding custodial role analogous to that which the elementary school had assumed earlier."[45]

"What has been called the discovery of adolescence, its recognition as a stage or way of life, had become apparent before 1920,"[46] Tomkins tells us, adding that it seems to have been "closely associated" with the establishment of compulsory attendance, the prolongation of schooling and the withdrawal of youth from the labor market."[47] Tomkins cites G. Stanley Hall whose research, Tomkins suggests, "crowned a generation of concern about an age group that was seen as especially vulnerable to the demoralizing forces of an urban-industrial society." Adolescents' responses to such "forces" included a "propensity for delinquency," now no longer exclusively associated with "working class youth."[48] Intensified, then, was the "new social and moral custodial role of the high school," stimulating the "growth of supervised extra-curricular activities."[49]

Notable during the 1920s, Tomkins reports, were continuing "fears of economic recession, political confusion, sectional conflict, French-English antagonism and fears of Americanization."[50] A very American problem – racism – was "rampant" during the inter-war decades in Canada as well. (It had been "rampant" earlier as well.) As in the United States, racism was not only anti-Black – although most infamously so – but also anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic; in Canada, Tomkins tells us, the "Ku Klux Klan, aimed most at Jews and Catholics, became well established, especially in Saskatchewan and Ontario. Deportation of immigrants considered subversive was common."[51]

The "1920s were an era of nationalism," and even "young English-Canadian intellectuals and artists such as Vincent Massey sought to promote unity through the creation of national symbols, myths and heroes."[52] Tomkins terms their nationalism as "ambivalent," as it was "imbued with a strong sense of Canadianism admixed with imperial patriotism," adding that "the cultural content of Anglophone school curricula remained basically imperial."[53] Nationalism may well have also been driven by population loss: Tomkins reports that "325,000 Canadians, many well educated and ambitious, left for the U.S. during the years 1920-23 alone."[54] A 1943 study found "that the remarkable intermingling of the two peoples through migration, tourism, business and other made the average Canadian as familiar with an American as with a Canadian of another province."[55]

The 1920s ended with the Great Depression, "arguably the most traumatic mass experience in Canadian history," an experience that "preoccupied most Canadians,"[56] provoking "rural based protest movements" that "led to the formation of new political parties, of which the most enduring, formed in the 1930s, would prove to be Social Credit and the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), the latter the predecessor of today's NDP."[57] I'm thinking of survival as a (for Atwood "the") Canadian thematic, in the 1930s economic survival as well as cultural and political survival – must have stared many in the face as 100,000 children enrolled in the Junior Red Cross, an organization that became "a fixture in Canadian schools," for Tomkins "an interesting example of how an external agency could supplement the formal curriculum."[58] Even that "formal curriculum" was felt to be at risk; in 1931 restrictions on American publications entering Canada were extended."[59]

As in the United States,[60] the technologization of the curriculum – in the form of "school broadcasts"[61] over the radio - accelerated despite economic hardship. These were specifically designed "to strengthen national unity and increase Canadian consciousness among students."[62] By 1943 approximately 4000 schools were using school broadcasts; by 1951 the number had doubled.[63] The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) had been established in 1932 with a "mandate to educate, to entertain and to foster Canadian nationalism."[64] In 1939 the National Film Board began producing films "directly related to school curricula."[65] The technologization of the Canadian school curriculum was well underway.

Even while World War II was underway, educators began to consider post-war needs and planning.[66] Not only curriculum planning was in consideration, so was "general social reform … signaled by the establishment of the federal committee on Reconstruction (1941-1943) headed by F. Cyril James, the Principal of McGill University," the most notable outcome of which was the so-called "Marsh Report which proposed a comprehensive national program of social security including health insurance, family allowances and unemployment insurance."[67] Such sweeping proposals foreshadowed the formation of the post-war Canadian welfare state. In 1940, the Rowell Sirois Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations had concluded that the quality of education and welfare services was no longer a matter of purely provincial or local concern" thereby rationalizing "future federal intervention in education."[68]

Other institutional expressions of nationalization were non-governmental in nature. The Canadian National Federation of Home and School Associations, established in 1927, began in provincial and local groups organized during World War I.[69] Inspired by what Tomkins terms "maternal feminism," this home and school movement - the first large formal organization of non-professionals concerned with curriculum - institutionalized the influence of women in education, including efforts to "improve the physical environment of schools and the health of children and to promote progressive innovations such as play-oriented physical education."[70] By 1945, the Federation enjoyed 60,000 members in 1300 local associations.[71] Teachers too

continued to organize, indicated by the growth of provincial teachers' associations, building on the formation of the Canadian Teachers' Federation in 1919.[72]

The National Council of Education was, Tomkins continues, a "unique inter-war organization" that functioned as an "unofficial voice for many Canadian educators."[73] The Council followed a national conference on character education focused on Canadian citizenship held in Winnipeg in 1919, what Tomkins reports as one of the "first attempts to focus the attention of all Canadians on the problems facing Canadian education" but one, "despite its emphasis on Canadianism, promoted an "ideology [that] was imperial in tone."[74] Perhaps "Canadianism" was then, at least for many Anglophones, an expression of British imperialism.

The National Conference of Canadian Universities, later renamed the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada https://www.univcan.ca/about-us/: had been organized in 1911 but became increasingly active after 1920, "regularly" discussing curriculum problems, frequently as an aspect of university-school relations."[75] A number of members "deplored the democratization of education," something they associated with "increased enrollments and vocational emphasis at the high school level."[76] Perhaps these curriculum traditionalists had in mind members of the Canadian Education Association (CEA) who promoted "the expansion of vocational and agricultural education, school consolidation, and the standardization of teaching certificates."[77] Among other topics, the CEA studied the "training of teachers."[78] After 1930, the organization also undertook studies of high school graduation requirements and the curricular articulation between the schools and universities, after which the Association enjoyed "some success in urging more flexible university admission requirements, reflected in the decision by several institutions to recognize art and music as matriculation subjects."[79] Tomkins reports the formation of another organization, the Canadian Youth Commission, a private independent body established in 1943 "out of concerns regarding youth (defined as the fifteen to twenty-four age group) and its place in postwar society, provided the first comprehensive view of what Canadian youth thought about their schooling."[80] Those who responded to a questionnaire prepared by the Commission's education committee reported a "positive evaluation of their school experience," although "they urged more emphasis on teaching an understanding of modern society and of citizenship responsibilities through greater attention to politics and public affairs in the curriculum, but flatly rejected traditional modes of indoctrination."[81] Providing assistance in finding jobs while developing their abilities and interests students judged as "more important than preparation for university entrance."[82] Paradoxically (given their vocationalism), "respondents rated the traditional school subjects – English, French (among those of that first language), mathematics, science and history – as the most valuable."[83]

Despite earlier concerns over American influence, Tomkins reports that inter-war Canadian-American educational contacts increased, leading "to a degree of Americanization of Canadian leadership in education."[84] Canadian branches of

American organizations such as the Modern Language Association and the National Committee for Mental Health were established.[85] While a 1938 survey confirmed "longstanding concerns regarding the pervasive influence of foreign media," it also found that the representation of the U.S. in Canadian curricula was "extraordinary slight."[86] Perhaps American influence was not considered entirely "foreign"?

Next Tomkins turns his attention to rural education, returning to 1914 and the publication of *Rural Life in Canada*, written by John MacDougall, a member of the Presbyterian clergy, for whom "the old simple, pure and creative country life had been undermined by the character defects of the people."[87] MacDougall blamed the schools for funneling youth from the farm work into teaching or other professions or business," a blame game also played by French-Canadian Catholic farm leaders in Québec.[88] Among the efforts to "solve the [rural] problem" was the provision of "correspondence courses and the famous railway-car 'schools on wheels' instituted in the 1920s."[89] J. C. Miller, a Canadian educator who had studied at Teachers' College, Columbia University," wrote *Rural School in Canada*, what Tomkins terms "another fine example of curriculum criticism,"[90] a phrase – and concept – that would be taken up also in the United States.[91] "For Miller," Tomkins adds, "the only immediate solution to acute rural problems of transciency and attendance and uneducated teachers was uniformity imposed by a strong central authority."[92] Rural teachers were not only not as educated as urban teachers – fewer than university degrees compared with their urban colleagues – but were paid less, often much less.[93] Moreover, Tomkins suggests, "problems were exacerbated by teacher training programs that offered normal school students no opportunity to observe or practice in rural schools."[94]

Disparities prevailed not only between rural and urban areas but between provinces too, a fact evident in a national survey conducted in the 1940s by K. F. Argue on behalf of the Canadian Teachers' Federation.[95] One province spent $550 per year per classroom; another spent $1297; "equalization" was Argue's recommendation, a concept that, Argue argued, should become a principle of Canadian federal-provincial financial relationships.[96] Bloated bureaucracies were evident in the findings of another study Tomkins reports; in 1939 Canada had 22,659 school boards with almost 100,000 trustees to supervise 50,000 teachers.[97]

Lacking post-secondary institutions such as American junior or community colleges, in 1942, at the request of the James Committee on Reconstruction, a survey was undertaken to identify Canada's post-war educational needs.[98] Major problems included provincial "disparities and differences in educational standards," as well as the absence of "practical curricula" – integrating "cultural and vocational courses" - for those high-school graduates who would never attend university.[99] "In modern curriculum jargon," Tomkins points out, "the report constituted a 'needs assessment,' focusing on the need for a greater of educational opportunity."[100] The post-World War II period found what Tomkins terms a "new curricular dispensation," one "which in

actuality was a restatement of the principles of the earlier New Education," and unlike south of the border – where "life adjustment" education[101] was being advocated - "aroused little immediate controversy."[102] Tomkins attributes the relative lack of controversy in Canada to the fact that
"progressivism itself remained more muted in a curriculum that continued to stress academic over vocational goals."[103]

Next Tomkins turns his attention to the "first and oldest Canadians," what he calls "a special case of a cultural minority," the "great diversity of Indians, Métis and Inuit peoples."[104] He provides what seems today too brief a history:

> Federal Indian educational policy, based on acknowledged goals of "civilizing and Christianizing savages" similar to that originally established in New France, was administered through the Department of Indian Affairs set up in 1880. In 1909, Duncan Campbell Scott, poet and man of letters, become the first Superintendent of Education, responsible for the schooling of Registered Indians through reserve-based residential schools, city-based industrial schools located far from reserves, and a few day schools, all operated as joint ventures with the major churches. Industrial schools, first established in Western Canada in the 1880s, proved expensive failures. They completely separated children from their environment and were ineffective in providing promised advanced training…. On balance, actualization and the transformation of the Indians into an unskilled and semi-skilled workforce remained cornerstones of policy.[105]

He adds that for thousands of Indigenous youth no education was provided, "[problems] that were exacerbated by the inability of government officials and educators to agree on a satisfactory curriculum for those who still led a nomadic life."[106] He notes that "since 1939, the Inuits had been legally classified with non-status Indians."[107]

Other "visible minorities" include Japanese Canadians, descendants of those who had come to British Columbia in the 1880s.[108] Arriving earlier had been the ancestors of Canadians of African descent, "some of whom had been in Canada as long as most Anglo-Canadians."[109] Tomkins references Robin Winks' documentation of racial segregation in Canadian schools: legislation allowing "colored schools" was not completed repealed in Nova Scotia and Ontario until the 1960s.[110] "Throughout the 1892-1945 period," Tomkins continues, "the curriculum continued to reflect an Anglo-conformist ethnocentrism, revealed in the literature in frequent references to national schools, that left no room for any positive treatment of ethnicity or cultural pluralism."[111] If the curriculum reflects reality, perhaps such "ethnocentrism" is not unsurprising; Tomkins reports that during this period "British newcomers outnumbered those of other origins even in the polyglot Prairie provinces." During

this period, he emphasizes, the "cultural content of the curriculum … remained essentially imperial and British."[112]

Tomkins' next topic is moral education, the emphasis of which, after 1920, "gradually shifted toward character and citizenship and away from pietistic indoctrination in textbooks."[113] He cites the 1936 British Columbia curriculum as "the most thorough statement of moral education through character development to be founded in the curriculum of any province."[114] Junior high school teachers were instructed "not [to] permit the demands of subject matter to crowd out attention to problems of character."[115] The British Columbia curriculum communicated "that individual development, while still prized, [must] be subservient to the ideals of state and society."[116] Tomkins discerns " some inconsistency in a character education that advocated the inculcation of right habits and attitudes while insisting that students be taught to make independent rational decisions."[117] Tomkins' irony is noted.

Despite continuing critiques of "mental discipline" theories,[118] the curriculum, it was alleged, implied that even "mathematics could contribute to character formation."[119] Providing "an opportunity for concentration and perseverance,"[120] mathematics presumably built character. Evidently "science" could too, as "the habit of looking for causal connections and basing one's actions upon them should [contribute] … to character."[121] (By such "logic" Latin too could build character, although that subject had fallen out of favor.) In British Columbia, even "guidance" and "counseling" became considered "a means of promoting the traditional moral function of the school."[122] During World War II, Tomkins adds, "Ontario reverted to a more traditional, explicit moral and religious instruction as part of a wartime 'back to the basics' thrust that combined with a new emphasis on imperial patriotism."[123]

Non-academic demands upon teachers intensified during the twentieth century, as "interrelated developments in mental hygiene, auxiliary or special education, mental testing, child study and guidance reinforced the growing socializing pressures on the school and expanded the non-instructional part of the teacher's role."[124] Conservatives complained over the "dilution of the academic function of the school and the overcrowding of the curriculum which they claimed were the consequences of the new trends."[125] They were unsuccessful in stemming the tide. Tomkins associates the concern over "mental hygiene"[126] with the eugenics movement that been focused on what was called "the threat of the feebleminded."[127] Key had been the establishment of the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene in 1918 and the publication of the *Canadian Journal of Mental Hygiene*.[128] He notes that "the movement was closely linked with that in the United States."[129]

Since "New Canadians" – especially those from southern and eastern Europe - were considered to be "especially prone to feeble-mindedness, reformers demanded stricter efforts to exclude mentally defective children and adults from the ranks of immigrants."[130] Racists also demanded that the "feeble-minded" and "purportedly delinquency-prone youngsters [be] excluded from school."[131] What ensued was a still-

persisting debate over "nature versus nurture," a debate that Tomkins dates to the 1920s. So-called "environmental theories gained ascendance among medical people and scientists, although eugenics as a pseudo-science remained influential in practice," and even the IQ test - as a" direct and accurate measurement of inherited intelligence" - became "questioned."[132] "Delinquent behavior" was "sometimes ascribed to a rigid, bookish curriculum" – at least by Progressives - but by the 1940s "some attention was now [also] being paid to the gifted."[133] Tomkins associates the "testing movement" with "mental hygiene and special education."[134] Testing helped formalize the curriculum, "introducing an aura of efficiency that reinforced conservative, stabilizing influences," appealing to many "Canadians, with their longstanding devotion to examinations as a means of curricular control."[135]

Post-World War II progressive (in the U.S. social efficiency is associated with Progressivism) critiques re-emerged, fueled by the concern for children's mental well-being. In 1945, a National Committee for School Health Research was organized, focused in part on "the mental health of teachers and students."[136] During this period "the home was preponderantly blamed for mental health problems" – something not politically palatable today - but the school was also "criticized for its large classes, lock-step curriculum, and rigid examination systems."[137] Efforts to address these critiques included incorporating into the curriculum "compulsory high school courses dealing with marriage, parenthood and related topics."[138]

While U.S. psychologist G. Stanley Hall (1844–1924) had initiated the child-study movement in the United States in the 1880s, the Canadian "pioneer of scientific child study as a distinct endeavor was undoubtedly W. F. Blatz," whose work (that of his colleagues) was influenced first by Freud and then by the Americans and their behaviorism.[139] (How could one switch from psychoanalytic theory to behaviorism?) The guidance movement in Canada had its beginnings in earlier emphases on "manners and morals teaching."[140] It was an "American innovation closely related to mental hygiene and vocational education."[141] Tomkins points out that "educational guidance has strong curricular implications because it became the basis for directing students into various courses and options."[142] Nearly all the tests and textbooks used in the Canadian guidance profession were U.S. in origin.[143] Tomkins suggests that the entire "mental hygiene" movement may have been "spurred by the growing secularization of moral education," e.g. "traditional Christian moral values."[144] The demand for moral purity may have morphed into a preoccupation with mental hygiene, medicine replacing theology as absolute knowledge. "Its chief overall effect," Tomkins continues, "may have been to medicalize the professional language of educators as medical metaphors such as symptom, diagnosis, remedial, treatment and similar terms came into use."[145]

Other American terminology entered Canadian terminology during this period; Tomkins tells us that "after 1920, some policy-makers, especially in western Canada, began to use the American term 'progressive education' as a theoretical label for their reform efforts." In the East "educators continued to use the term 'New Education'

which had been popularized in Great Britain." By 1939, Tomkins continues, "concepts such as play, interest and correlation had become part of a uniform set of ideas and procedures that constituted a new intellectual orthodoxy,"[146] although that last term – orthodoxy" – implies a consistency empirically accurate but (I suggest: 2010) dissonant with the very concept of Progressivism. Tomkins acknowledges that "in North America, progressivism was a loosely applied label, a complex reality that had both liberal and conservative dimensions," and that "its defining characteristic was change, and the questioning of long-established policies and practices,"[147] including, presumably, its own. American "administrative progressives" – Tomkins associates these with those "who sought to centralize education under expert leadership in the interests of social efficiency and social control" - were "best exemplified in Canada by George M. Weir."[148] Administrative progressives were "closely allied" with the "educational scientists," of whom "Peter Sandiford was the best Canadian example."[149] The two groups shared a "conservative social philosophy."[150] In contrast, "pedagogical progressives" –"possibly best represented in Canada by Hubert Newland in Alberta" – were committed to John Dewey's ideas, including the "project method" and "activity curriculum."[151] Newland and other Canadian "pedagogical progressives" may have conjoined Kilpatrick with Dewey, but the "project method" was Kilpatrick's concept and (as we see momentarily) apparently troubled Dewey.

After these surveying issues spanning half a century, Tomkins focuses on the 1930-45 period, which Peter Sandiford depicted as the era of the first wholesale curriculum revision ever undertaken in Canada, initiated in western Canada and spreading east.[152] Tomkins characterizes it as "the reverse of that of the New Education," as "experimentation was accompanied by considerable theoretical ferment as educators attempted to sort out the many ideas and practices that continued to emanate from American and British sources."[153] Evidently "educators" in that sentence denotes non-public school personnel as Tomkins adds: "Much activity was devoted to proselytizing teachers and public and to formulating policy."[154] Of course teachers could proselytize teachers – if overscheduled professional lives allowed time to attempt to do so – but formulate policy too? Probably Tomkins means Ministry of Education of officials. And I'm unsure how welcomed such "curriculum revision" was in eastern Canada given that "a good deal of the effort in western Canada reflected a growing resentment over east Canadian domination."[155]

Nor am I sure what Tomkins intended when he characterized this period of curriculum revision the "reverse" of New Education, as he spends the next several pages chronicling – sometimes questionably – the influence of U.S. Progressives on provincial curriculum policy and practice. "By 1922," he starts (backing up, as is his practice), "Saskatchewan normal school students were receiving instruction in W. H. Kilpatrick's project method, the most publicized pedagogical innovation of American progressivism during the inter-war years."[156] Apparently anti-Americanism was still in play because, "in Canada it was later known as 'enterprise education,' forming, with

adaptations, the centerpiece of curriculum revision during the 1930s."[157] The "essence" of the project method, Tomkins explains, "was the reorganization of the curriculum into a succession of projects which, by emphasizing 'purposeful activity' consonant with the child's own goals, would enhance learning through using Thorndike's concept of positive reinforcement."[158] "At the same time," Tomkins continues, "it was intended to serve Dewey's social purpose by creating a school environment more nearly typical of life itself than that of the traditional curriculum."[159] The most questionable statement so far, however, is the following: "Although Kilpatrick's emphasis on educative intellectual and moral experiences, which was designed to develop character in the interests of group welfare, was fully consistent with Dewey's philosophy, his excessively child-centered stance and his denigration of extrinsic 'fixed in advance' subject matter put him at odds with the great philosopher."[160] Robert Westbrook judges that it was Kilpatrick's "privileging" of the children's "purposes" – the formulation and enactment of which emphasized agency not "positive reinforcement" - and the subsequent "subordination of subject matter to them" that "troubled Dewey."[161] Westbrook adds that Dewey "agreed" with Kilpatrick that learning begins with children's interests but he worried that any unmediated pursuit of those interests risked trivializing the curriculum. Dewey had no objection to the "project method," Westbrook clarifies, but he "insisted that projects must have as one of their goals the child's mastery of organized subjects."[162]

Tomkins cites "other progressive methods" - the Dalton, Winnetka and Unit Mastery Individualized Teaching Plans – noting that these "were introduced in Alberta following that province's curriculum revision of 1922," each of them "aimed at individualizing instruction."[163] Introduced that year but not, evidently, installed, as Tomkins tells us that the Dalton Plan - a "contract system under which the pupil worked individually in 'subject laboratories' somewhat akin to modern resource centres or working stations" - was granted a five-year trial in Edmonton starting in 1924.[164] Formulated by Henry C. Morrison, a "leading progressive" who taught at the University of Chicago, the Unit Mastery Plan "organized curriculum content and activities into correlated units of instruction aimed at developing skills, content mastery and unified learning experiences."[165] In the Winnetka Plan "curriculum was divided into two parts: the tool subjects or 'common essentials' which were individualized, and the 'self-expressive' subjects, pursued on a group basis."[166] While "all three plans were introduced into several other provinces," Tomkins judges that "their overall impact does not appear to have been significant."[167]

American-educated Canadians would appear to have taken the lead in these developments. Tomkins names G. Fred McNally – after which an Edmonton High School is named – and H. C. Newland – president (and a founder) of the Alberta Teachers Federation - as "two of the nation's leading progressives."[168] Both went west from eastern Canada; both completed their doctorates at Columbia and Chicago respectively.[169] Newland, along with "some socialist-minded educators in

Saskatchewan" was among the "very few Canadian school reformers who advocated this [social reconstructionist, associated with the American George Counts] view."[170]

An even longer delay between the introduction and implementation of progressive ideas occurred in Saskatchewan where, in 1931, occurred "the first formal acceptance by a Canadian provincial authority of the ideas and practices associated with the progressive education movement."[171] Even there, the "effort was more notable in expressing new purposes for schooling than in realizing them in practice."[172] What occurred, Tomkins concludes, was "tentative, a mixture of old and new, the eclecticism of which gave license to teachers to maintain a tradition of information accumulation and storage."[173] In Nova Scotia, Progressivism was promoted by Alexander MacKay's successor, Dr. Henry F. Munro, a graduate of Columbia University in political science.[174] During this time the *Journal of Education* was, Tomkins reports, filled with quotations from John Dewey and Kilpatrick's monograph on the project method.[175]

In British Columbia, with the appointment in 1933 of George Moir Weir as Minister of Education and H. B. King as chief inspector of schools, curriculum revision was "formally launched."[176] Both men affirmed "social efficiency" evidenced by the appearance, in 1936, of three bulletins of more than 200 pages each.[177] Almost half the curriculum was consumed by the three Rs, but added were "significant time allotments for health, games and exercises, elementary science and the 'fine and practical arts,' of manual training, domestic science, music and art."[178] Tomkins notes the "irony in promoting ostensible autonomy and self-direction for pupils, while imposing detailed prescription on teachers."[179] In Alberta, "major curriculum revisions between 1936 and 1940 have been called the high-water mark in the acceptance of progressive education in that province and, indeed, in all of Canada."[180] Tomkins quotes a 1936 curriculum guide wherein H. C. Newland explained the new enterprise emphasis:

> The name "enterprise" has been chosen to designate "doing or activity," rather than the familiar "project" because it has a somewhat stricter meaning. An enterprise is a definite undertaking; teachers and pupils agree upon it and tacitly promise to carry it through as agreed… each enterprise involves planning, the organization of ideas and of materials, and co-operation. Enterprises include both mental and manual work, the collection of information and the practice of skills.[181]

Tomkins explains that in Alberta, and across Canada, the British term "enterprise," derived from the famous Hadow Reports of 1926, 1931, and 1933 in Great Britain.[182] Tomkins tells us that in invoking "enterprise" rather than the concept of "project method" Canadian educators were showing "characteristic political sagacity in ascribing progressive ideas to British, rather than American, influences."[183]

The enterprise method – also known as "experience education" - was "most fully adumbrated by Dr. Donalda Dickie (1883-1972) of the Calgary Normal School,

one of the three experts who had planned the 1936 revision."[184] In 1940, Dickie published *The Enterprise in Theory and Practice*, what Tomkins terms "a comprehensive treatise of more than four hundred pages which was widely cited and quoted in the professional literature across Canada, and was used as a manual in normal school."[185] Dickie emphasized "language and art as integrating subjects," citing many American progressives, among them Hollis Caswell, W. H. Kilpatrick and Harold Rugg.[186] The book included many examples and assessments of American progressive curricular experiments.[187]

While Alberta led the provinces in its acceptance of Progressivism, curriculum change was conducted "cautiously."[188] Implementation of the enterprise method was, we're told, "voluntary, and the three Rs were still taught as distinct subjects outside the new program."[189] Voluntary to a point it would seem, as teachers were "expected to experiment with the new pedagogy 'by attempting one or two enterprises during the year'."[190] Again Tomkins cites Dickie who had recommended that enterprises were to be used "only to the informational and cultural subjects" and then "only during a part of the day."[191] The so-called skill subjects (the three Rs) should be taught "by the formal or drill method during part of each day."[192] In 1938 Alberta school inspectors concluded that the "enterprise technique" was in use almost everywhere, and that some "60 percent of the province's teachers were successful with it."[193]

That enthusiasm translated into invitations to prominent American Progressives to speak at Alberta teacher association meetings, meetings attended also by educators from Saskatchewan. Evidently the speakers - Carleton Washburne, Boyd H. Bode, Harold Rugg, Hilda Taba and Ralph Tyler – not only drew educators to hear them speak, but they also drew teachers to study with them, as "many teachers, principals, inspectors and normal school instructors went to study across the border, especially at Columbia University, the mecca of progressive education."[194] Alberta educators – as well as teachers from other western provinces - joined the U.S-based Progressive Education Association (PEA: 1919-1955); H.C. Newland was a member of the PEA executive.[195] Not all enlisted in the cause, as "more than a few Alberta teachers resisted the new approach," on occasion producing such "showy" projects such as an Indian village or an Inuit igloo that it was clear that it was "the concrete items that became important, with the actual learning lost sight of."[196] Even for the faithful, "there was a lack of materials and facilities, with the result that they had to depend largely 'on what children could scrounge at home'."[197] Tomkins reports that one observer described a 1940 curriculum revision as a "rush job," prompting "public protest" that "forced the withdrawal of a new report card which discarded grades, examinations, marks, passion or promotion."[198] Defensively perhaps, the 1940 curriculum guide emphasized that the curriculum was "a home-grown product" of Alberta children and schools, and "not simply a borrowing from another system."[199]

Despite resistance and protest, Progressivism – specifically the enterprise method - was being promoted across Canada at this time. In Manitoba, for instance,

the 1937-1938 annual report of the Department of Education boasted about a geography unit in a Winnipeg school on "Transportation in Canada" which was much more than a matter of "simply reading about transportation and reproducing what has been said orally or in writing."[200] Rather than memorizing facts several students had "searched for historical information on the topic, drawing maps and models of boats and carts" while "others studied railway, water, road and air transportation."[201] Whatever their interest, all students were expected to produce "models, maps, pictures and written work of their own," rendering the whole study (the public was assured) "vital and real."[202] That same report registered a reservation, allowing that "life requirements still demand obedience at a time to externally imposed authority and require one to be able to face unpleasant tasks and conquer difficult situations." In Canada, Progressivism was juxtaposed with, not opposed to, curricular conservatism.

REFERENCES

Berk, Laura. 1992. The Extracurriculum. In the *Handbook of Research on Curriculum* edited by Philip W. Jackson (1002-1044). Macmillan.

Gutek, Gerald L. 2006. George S. Counts and the Origins of Social Reconstructionism. In *Social Reconstruction: People, Politics, Perspectives*, edited by Karen L. Riley (1-26). Information Age Publishing.

Lesko, Nancy. 2002. *Act Your Age! A Cultural Construction of Adolescence*. Routledge Falmer.

Mann, John Steven. 1975. Curriculum Criticism. In *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, edited by William F. Pinar (133-148). McCutchan.

Perlstein, Daniel. 2000. "There is no escape … from the ogre of indoctrination": George Counts and the Civic Dilemmas of Democratic Educators. In *Reconstructing the Common Good in Education: Coping with Intractable Dilemmas*, edited by Larry Cuban and Dorothy Shipps (51-67). Stanford University Press.

Pinar, William F. 2010. The Eight-Year Study. *Curriculum Inquiry* 40 (2), 295-316.

Pinar, William F. 2015. *Educational Experience as Lived*. Routledge.

Pinar, William. F. 2021. Curriculum and the Covid-19 Crisis. *Prospects*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-021-09560-y

Pinar, William F. 2023. *A Praxis of Presence in Curriculum Theory*: *Advancing Currere against Cultural Crises in Education*. Routledge.

Pinar, William F., Reynolds, William M., Slattery, Patrick, Taubman, Peter. 1995. *Understanding Curriculum*. Peter Lang.

Taba, Hilda. 1945a. The Contribution of Workshops to Intergroup Education. *Harvard Educational Review* 15, 122-128.

Taba, Hilda. 1945b. A workshop for teachers. *Journal of Educational Sociology* 18, 551-560.

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

Westbrook, Robert. 1991. *John Dewey and American Philosophy*. Cornell University Press.

Winfield, Annie. 2010. Eugenic Ideology and Historical Osmosis. In *Curriculum Studies Handbook: The Next Moment*, edited by Erik Malewski (142-157). Routledge.

Winks, Robin. 1917. *The Blacks in Canada*: *A History*. McGill-Queens University Press.

ENDNOTES

[1] Quoted in 1986, 140.

[2] 1986, 140. I'd like to know to what extent these – tradition, what teachers knew, etc. – coincided. Perhaps in certain settings at certain times one weighed more than others? And why testing?

[3] Quoted in 1986, 140.

[4] 1986, 140.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Quoted in 1986, 140-141.

[8] 1986, 141.

[9] Quoted in 1986, 141.

[10] Ibid.

[11] 1986, 141. It's not obvious from this phrase whether Ellis was referring to teachers' or students' interests, although Tomkins' choice of words – "the matter of interest" – would seem to acknowledge the ambiguity.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] 1986, 142.

[16] Quoted in 1986, 142.

[17] 1986, 142. Kilpatrick's concept had fallen into disrepute, unfairly I suggest in Pinar 2023.

[18] Ibid.

[19] 1986, 142-143. The through-line is a bit blurrier than Tomkins' summary statements suggest; see Jackson 1992.

[20] 1986, 143.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] 1986, 144.

[25] 1986, 144-145.

[26] 1986, 145.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] 1986, 146.

[30] 1986, 145.

[31] 1986, 146.

[32] Quoted in 1986, 146.

[33] Ibid.

[34] 1986, 146.

[35] Ibid.

[36] 1986, 147.

[37] Quoted in 1986, 147.

[38] 1986, 148.

[39] 1986, 149.

[40] Ibid.

[41] 1986, 150-151.

[42] 1986, 150.

[43] 1986, 155.

[44] Pinar 2019, viii.

[45] 1986, 155.

[46] Ibid.

[47] 1986, 155-156.

[48] 1986, 156.

[49] Ibid. The extra-curriculum (see Berk 1992) was considered integral, then, to the overall school program, a conception splintered by increasing attention to separate subjects. One defining feature of curriculum studies as a field of study is its

recognition of and continuing attention to the overall curriculum, its situatedness nationally, politically, culturally, its gendered and racial import, and its meaning for the formation of the human subject.

[50] Ibid.

[51] 1986, 156-157. Racialized anti-immigration remains an issue, fueling the right-wing Presidential candidacy of Marine Le Pen in France; it was a conspicuous feature of the Trump Administration (2017-2021) in the USA.

[52] 1986, 157.

[53] Ibid.

[54] 1986, 158.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] 1986, 157.

[58] 1986, 160.

[59] 1986, 158.

[60] I summarize developments in the US in Pinar 2021.

[61] 1986, 157.

[62] Quoted in 1986, 158.

[63] 1986, 158.

[64] 1986, 157.

[65] Ibid.

[66] 1986, 158. Suggestive of similar efforts in the U.S., see Taba 1945a, b. The Estonian-born colleague of Ralph Tyler studied with William Heard Kilpatrick at Teachers College, Columbia University.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

[69] 1986, 160.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid.

[72] 1986, 161. The CTF remains: http://www.ctf-fce.ca/en/default.htm?main.htm

[73] 1986, 160.

[74] Ibid.

[75] 1986, 161.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

[79] 1986, 161-162.

[80] 1986, 162.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Quoted in 1986, 162.
[87] 1986, 163.
[88] Ibid.
[89] 1986, 164.
[90] Ibid.
[91] See Mann 1975.
[92] 1986, 165.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Ibid.
[95] 1986, 166.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Ibid.
[98] 1986, 167.
[99] 1986, 168.
[100] Ibid.
[101] See Pinar et al. 1995, 146-147.
[102] Ibid.
[103] 1986, 168-169.
[104] 1986, 169.
[105] 1986, 169-170.
[106] 1986, 170.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid.
[109] 1986, 171.
[110] Ibid. Winks 1971.
[111] Ibid.
[112] Ibid.
[113] 1986, 172.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Quoted in 1986, 1972.
[116] 1986, 172.
[117] 1986, 173.
[118] https://www.britannica.com/science/mental-discipline-theory
[119] 1986, 173.
[120] Quoted in 1986, 173.
[121] Ibid.
[122] 1986, 173.
[123] Ibid.
[124] 1986, 177.

[125] Ibid.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Quoted in 1986, 177.
[128] 1986, 177.
[129] 1986, 178. See Winfield 2010.
[130] 1986, 178.
[131] Ibid.
[132] 1986, 179.
[133] Ibid.
[134] 1986, 180.
[135] Ibid.
[136] 1986, 183.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid.
[139] 1986, 183-184.
[140] Quoted in 1986, 184.
[141] 1986, 184.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Ibid.
[144] 1986, 186.
[145] Ibid.
[146] 1986, 188.
[147] Ibid.
[148] Ibid.
[149] 1986, 189.
[150] 1986, 190.
[151] Ibid.
[152] Ibid.
[153] Ibid.
[154] Ibid.
[155] Ibid.
[156] Ibid. The project method may have been the best-known progressive reform in the U.S. too.
[157] Ibid.
[158] Ibid. I question how crucial "positive reinforcement" was in the method, as Kilpatrick was devoted to the cultivation of agency, not conNformity.
[159] 1986, 190-191. Certainly, both men wanted "life" to be a source of curriculum content ("content" expansively comprehended as including "activity"), but neither accepted social life "as is" in America. Their predecessor – Jane Addams – also wanted "life" to be a source of curriculum content; she, too, was critical of "life" in America. For Addams: see Pinar 2015. For Kilpatrick: see Pinar 2023.

[160] 1986, 191.
[161] 1991 504.
[162] 1991, 505.
[163] 1986, 191.
[164] Ibid.
[165] Ibid.
[166] Ibid.
[167] Ibid.
[168] Ibid.
[169] Ibid.
[170] Ibid. Regarding George Counts see Counts 1932; Perlstein 2000; Gutek 2006.
[171] 1986, 192.
[172] Ibid.
[173] Ibid.
[174] Ibid.
[175] Ibid.
[176] 1986, 194.
[177] Ibid.
[178] Ibid.
[179] Ibid.
[180] Ibid.
[181] Quoted in 1986, 194.
[182] 1986, 194.
[183] Ibid.
[184] 1986, 195. For more information on Dr. Dickie see: https://progressiveteacherblog.wordpress.com/2020/05/29/donalda-dickie-and-the-enterprise/
[185] Ibid.
[186] Ibid.
[187] Ibid.
[188] Ibid.
[189] Ibid.
[190] Ibid.
[191] Quoted in 1986, 195.
[192] Ibid.
[193] 1986, 195.
[194] 1986, 195-196.
[195] 1986, 196.
[196] Quoted in 1986, 196.
[197] Ibid.
[198] 1986,196.

---

[199] Ibid.

[200] Ibid.

[201] Ibid.

[202] Quoted in 1986, 196.