

Mary J. Oates, "The Professional Preparation of Parochial School Teachers, 1870-1940"
Historical Journal of Massachusetts Volume 12, No 1 (January 1984).

Published by: Institute for Massachusetts Studies and Westfield State University

You may use content in this archive for your personal, non-commercial use. Please contact the *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* regarding any further use of this work:

masshistoryjournal@wsc.ma.edu

Funding for digitization of issues was provided through a generous grant from MassHumanities.



Some digitized versions of the articles have been reformatted from their original, published appearance. When citing, please give the original print source (volume/ number/ date) but add "retrieved from HJM's online archive at <http://www.wsc.ma.edu/mhj>.



The Professional Preparation of Parochial School Teachers 1870-1940

Mary J. Oates

Historical studies of the parochial school system in America have emphasized numbers of schools, classrooms, and students enrolled and graduated. The Catholic sisterhoods, whose members staffed most of these schools, have been largely ignored. Yet in order to properly assess Catholic efforts in education, it is important to give attention to these teachers, their views on curriculum and teaching methods, and especially their professional preparation. Just as the presence of large numbers of immigrants changed the texture of Massachusetts political and social life, so also did the local environment affect Catholic institutions, particularly parochial schools. The experience of sisters teaching in the state after 1870 reflects the response of large numbers of working-class women to a social need, as defined by the church and by the women themselves. Although some sisters worked in Massachusetts prior to 1850, their numbers and institutions were few. Between 1834 and 1849, several Sisters of Charity from Emmitsburg, Maryland, who maintained an orphanage, were the only sisters in Boston. In the latter year, Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur arrived from Cincinnati to staff a parish school. By 1870, 102 sisters were engaged in the instruction of children in such schools. While the establishment of Catholic hospitals, orphanages, and homes had been viewed positively as a supplement to state agencies, the development of a system of schools was controversial from the start. With some justification, the Boston School Committee saw these "free schools" as threats to local public schools. For example, when St. Joseph School in Amesbury opened in 1885, public school enrollment in the town fell by 60 percent.¹

Unwilling to exacerbate hostility between native and immigrant populations, John Williams, Bishop of Boston from 1866 until 1907, unlike his colleagues in other dioceses, was relatively inactive on the school issue. However, the 1884 edict of the Council of Baltimore (that each parish maintain a school) dictated a change in policy and created special problems for Massachusetts pastors. The pastor of the parish was individually responsible for constructing the school and

*This paper was originally presented at the Fifth Annual Conference on the History of Massachusetts, April 23, 1982. This study was undertaken with the support of a grant from the Charles and Margaret Cushwa Center for the Study of American Catholicism, University of Notre Dame.

finding teachers to staff it. Since the two teaching sisterhoods in the diocese, the Sisters of St. Joseph and the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, were unable to supply enough teachers to meet the sudden increase in demand after 1884, pastors appealed to groups with motherhouses in other dioceses. During the 1880s alone, eleven communities not previously represented in the state sent sisters, and by 1940, twenty-seven groups had sisters in Boston schools.

Efforts to stimulate interest among local women in joining teaching communities were also intense. Sermons and press described the desperate need for parochial school teachers and praised their work over that of social workers and nurses. Teaching "required greater self-sacrifice and higher consecration of purpose than devotion to a life of charity in the alleviation of bodily suffering."² The sisters themselves were each exhorted to "ask at least four or five girls, especially high school and normal school pupils to visit them during the year at the convent and urge them to join the community."³ The political climate at the time reinforced the need for such appeals in the view of many Catholics. For example, Judge Joseph Fallon, a leading member of the Boston School Committee, resigned in 1890 to protest the anti-Catholic prejudice he observed in public school management, stating that Catholics had no choice but to open parochial schools for their children.⁴

The response from women was gratifying throughout the period, with the two original communities opening new novitiates in 1921 "to meet the needs created by the large increase in the number of candidates aspiring to membership. . . ."⁵ But the supply of sisters never met the demand. One reason is that Massachusetts parish schools were "free" only in the sense that tuitions were not charged individual students. The schools were entirely financed from general parish revenues. In this they differed from schools in other states where tuition fees were levied to cover teachers' salaries, ranging in 1912 from 50¢ to \$1.00 per month.⁶ Massachusetts parishes were never able to follow this practice. According to one Cambridge pastor:

We had to have free schools, there was no option for us. The public schools had been established with all that money from direct taxation could give, and with such a handicap we entered the field. We had to give free textbooks and erect buildings equal with the others, because we had to build in accordance with the building laws which lay down the conditions under which schools and public buildings for instruction must be erected.⁷

While lay teachers and religious brothers were not well paid by public school standards, they received far more than sisters. Dependent for funds on poor parishioners, pastors singlemindedly pressed for full complements of sisters for their schools.⁸ In 1922 only three percent of teachers in Boston parochial schools were lay, while the figure for Brooklyn was twenty-eight percent and for New York, thirty-two percent.⁹ Over the 1870-1940 years, approximately ninety percent of teachers in elementary schools in the Boston diocese were sisters. By late nineteenth century Massachusetts public schools were respected throughout the country not only for their organization and curriculum, but especially for their high standards in the area of teacher education. Formal pre-service training

was increasingly seen as essential for teachers. Changing policies can be observed in the stricter requirements of the normal schools, with the hiring of teachers on the basis of qualifications and merit well underway by 1900.¹⁰ While state normal schools were available to provide better teacher training as standards rose, corresponding institutions for the preparation of parochial school teachers were not established. Directives on teacher training had been spelled out unequivocally at the 1884 Council of Baltimore, but in 1940 sisters continued to enter classrooms without college or normal school degrees. The urgent need for faculty for the burgeoning schools has been the traditional explanation for the neglect of teacher training regulations for so long a period. In contrast to prevailing educational theory, the contention remained in Catholic circles that the elementary school teacher could “learn by doing” and profit as much by observation of experienced teachers as by formal study. As a result, disparity between the average level of preparation of parochial and public school teaching forces widened rapidly after 1890. From their inception, a strong criticism of parochial schools in Massachusetts had been the weak preparation of their teachers. Rationalization on so basic an issue diminished the prestige of the schools, the professional standing of their teachers, and their capacity to welcome progressive educational ideas.

Pastors seeking teachers placed few demands on the sisterhoods with regard to pre-service education. For the most part, they concentrated their efforts on constructing and furnishing schools and convents. When they did turn to pedagogical matters, their interests lay more with the teaching of moral values than with curriculum and methods. Their attitude is reflected in the comments of Thomas Reynolds, pastor of St. Matthew’s Parish in Dorchester:

It is perfectly natural that our good Sisters be anxious that their children stand out most creditably in their studies. Of course we want the highest and the best standards. . . . However . . . moral standards are of far greater value than academic standards. . . . If the parish priest . . . seldom darkens the parish-school door, it can happen that his school may be more or less of a public school with nuns as teachers.¹¹

Before 1900, Catholic institutions of higher learning were restricted to men. A feasible means of providing some formal training for parochial school teachers might then have been for them to enroll in state schools, but “in New England as a rule only those students [were] admitted to the normal schools who intend[ed] to teach in the public schools.”¹² In any case, the idea of their attendance at these institutions even for summer or part-time programs was discouraged by church leaders since the purpose of the parochial school was to provide an alternative to the secular public school, a different sort of education in a Catholic environment. One priest declared:

We cannot afford to lessen by one jot or tittle the Catholic atmosphere of our schools, much less can we afford to place the professional training of religious teachers in an ambient that might mar their character as Catholic teachers in Catholic schools.¹³

Instead, by the 1890s each sisterhood opened its own “novitiate training school.”

Gradually, motherhouse summer schools for sisters who had been teaching during the year supplemented these, and by 1910 it was reported that "practically all the teaching orders have them."¹⁴ Major difficulties with these programs were their variety, the provision of adequate faculty for them and their dubious status as educational institutions. A perennial lack of funds guaranteed that courses of study would be sketchy. In practice, no diocesan supervision of texts, curriculum or faculties existed since the required diocesan examination of teachers was merely a formality.¹⁵

Before 1920 novices in most communities remained in the novitiate for only a year, with much of that time employed in introducing them to convent life.¹⁶ From the standpoint of teacher preparation, the situation was particularly unfortunate since most communities at that time were admitting young women who had not received a high school diploma.¹⁷ A graphic example was provided by the Sisters of St. Joseph who in 1901 provided novices with less than a year of training before their religious profession. This violated the 1884 directives on teacher preparation and requirements for the training of new members of religious congregations. Church leaders had long "condemned as an abuse the custom of sending novices, before the end of their novitiate, from one house of the community, to another, for the purpose of teaching boys and girls."¹⁸ Acknowledging it to be "a sad state of affairs," Archbishop Williams ordered the community to refuse all requests for staff for new schools until remedial steps were taken. Superiors of sisterhoods acknowledged that the formal training of sisters was inadequate when contrasted with public school requirements and they were sensitive to criticism on the issue.¹⁹ But before the 1920s private correspondence and perfunctory resistance to pastoral requests for more teachers indicate ambivalence. A description of the 1921 course of studies for novices in the same community indicates its minimal nature: "The novices have regular class work. I think the teachers start in by reviewing the Primary and Grammar school work. Those who have gone through the High School take advanced subjects. . . . There are three excellent teachers . . . who have many years of experience."²⁰ On leaving the novitiate for parochial classrooms, their educational opportunities were fewer still. They were reported as "doing extra work at home outside of their school work. They are taking correspondence courses in the various branches. . . . One Sister . . . goes around to the convents to give the Sisters a course in English so they are advancing all the time. . . . Many of the Sisters from the mission houses come on Saturday afternoons [to the motherhouse] for [music] lessons."²¹

Concerned Catholics welcomed stricter state rulings on teacher preparation since they meant that Catholic schools would soon have to meet higher standards. "Such regulation, so far from working a real hardship to our teaching communities, would be a great blessing."²² But central diocesan revenues were not provided for improved teacher preparation, although such funds were used to subsidize the education of men for the priesthood. While sisterhoods were often criticized for their isolation and independence, these defects were now praised to justify absence of diocesan support. As one Catholic commentator wrote, "The spirit of the individual communities is a priceless heirloom and will be preserved by having these communities grapple with and solve the task of

preparing their own members."²³ With state certification requirements a reality, during the 1920s and 1930s more sisters began to study for degrees, mainly on a part-time basis in local Catholic colleges. Two Catholic women's colleges opened in the Boston area. Emmanuel College and Regis College conferred their first degrees in 1923 and 1931 respectively, and provided extension and summer programs for large numbers of sisters. Boston College admitted sisters to summer courses in 1921. A minimum of ten years and usually much longer was required to complete work for a bachelor's degree.²⁴

One significant effect of the decision in the 1880s to develop the Massachusetts parochial system by multiplying schools rather than by providing teachers with better training was an increasingly defensive posture among Catholic educators about the quality of their schools. The opening of a parish school in the 1880s almost always evoked from the local school committee a requirement that its students, unlike public school students, pass an examination for admission to the public high school. The performance of the children was reported in the local press and followed with great interest. The examination of students in St. Paul's School in Cambridge in 1895 and 1896 was administered by the Superintendent of the Cambridge Public Schools himself, the first year in the City Hall. His favorable report resulted in the elimination of the examination.²⁵ Describing a parish school whose first graduates took the examination in 1895, the *Amesbury Daily News* reported: "The success of those who entered the public high school in 1895 closed the issue and obviated discrimination of this sort against the graduates of St. Joseph School."²⁶ While such special tests for high school admission were no longer mandatory in most towns after 1912, they had a lasting effect on parochial school teachers.²⁷ There can be little doubt that the imposition of test requirements reflected public censure of faculties as ill-prepared and unqualified to instruct children. To the sisters then, the success of their students on the tests became critically important since it would serve as vindication of the excellence of their work.²⁸ Therefore in affected towns, public school curricula and textbooks were adopted since examinations were based on their content. Calendars were synchronized and local grade arrangements followed to permit "easy transfer from one system to another."²⁹ A paradoxical result of opposition to Catholic schools was that over time they became similar to public schools. A diocesan school board was established in 1888 and the first supervisor of schools was appointed in 1897. Community supervisors, sisters who worked under his direction, were introduced in 1914.

Despite these developments, throughout the period individual parochial schools remained more autonomous than public schools, the result of their ownership by individual parishes and especially of the independence of the many teaching sisterhoods. Cooperation among them had been urged, but with little result.³⁰ Such reluctance to collaborate professionally can be understood only in terms of the perception by sisters of means to ensure the long-term security of their groups. The size of a community and the number of schools controlled by it in the diocese indicated success to the sisterhoods and to the public at large. Prospective members were more likely to be referred by clergy to large, thriving communities. Pastors preferred larger groups for new schools since numbers promised stability and the guarantee of a steady supply of teachers.

As a result, each community tried to distinguish itself from others, jealously guarding its own traditions, textbooks, and grading systems and resisting efforts to develop uniform policies for all parochial schools. Each maintained that its distinctive teaching methods were intrinsically superior to those of other sisterhoods as well as to those followed in the public schools. The music program in 1921 provides a good example of the degree of community autonomy which existed:

Each religious community is left free in the selection of the method used in teaching music, but a graded course with definite results is required. [A uniform method could not be adopted because] the Sisters of St. Joseph were developing a method of teaching music, uniform for all their schools, and they were not disposed to change in favor of the Ward Method.³¹

Social as well as professional interchange among communities was discouraged, reinforcing the numerous distinctive perspectives on educational policy. Rev. E. F. Gibbons wrote in 1905 that "they scarcely ever see the inside of a school of another religious community, or exchange a thought with a Sister of a different habit on subjects in which both are so intimately interested."³² The isolated motherhouse training programs made segregation more pronounced. Separation of sisters not only from "the world" but also from fellow-teachers in other communities could not have continued for so long a period of time without support from the women themselves. In their eagerness to carve out spheres of influence in the diocese, sisterhoods subscribed to rules that minimized contact with other teaching groups.³³ Efforts by diocesan officials to coordinate the schools into a cohesive system were more successful after 1920 when more of the schools were directed by fewer sisterhoods. Although twelve communities staffed the English-speaking parochial schools by 1940, the Sisters of St. Joseph controlled fifty percent of them. But organizational changes did not compensate in the eyes of the public for deficiencies in professional training still common in the teaching communities. The indictments of the "testing era," while more muted, persisted. The "learning-by-doing" philosophy was in increasing disrepute and the work of teaching sisters was seriously affected by this fact.

A second charge persisted well into the twentieth century, namely, that parochial schools were divisive in that they "injure[d] . . . the cause of patriotism."³⁴ In order to assimilate immigrant groups quickly, it was held that children should attend common schools and follow a common course of study. It was said that students segregated in parochial schools "lose the strong sentiment which is necessary to make boys and girls thoroughly identified with the national spirit. . . . On the other hand, the public schools put patriotism and the development of American thought and life first and foremost. . . ."³⁵ The appearance of parochial schools in French parishes in the late 1880s was particularly worrisome in this regard since they were staffed by Canadian sisters, many of whom did not speak English and who continued foreign customs.³⁶ Arguments against these schools were brought out clearly in a Haverhill debate in 1887. A school was introduced in an Irish parish in the city in that year and it was not opposed by the local school board. But when a second school, staffed by the Grey Nuns of Ottawa, opened a short time later in a French parish, it was condemned

because "half the instruction was given in French . . . [and] various subjects required in the public schools were not taught."³⁷ The superintendent of schools argued that its establishment was an effort "to make New England a province of Quebec, its customs Canadian, and its language French."³⁸ Although an unpopular court decision kept this school open, challenges to similar schools continued in 1888 and 1889 in bills proposed for the inspection of private schools. Prominent citizens, alarmed at growing antagonism, opposed such bills as discriminatory. President Eliot of Harvard College testified: "Of course, we all understand that though the term 'private' schools is used in this bill, the bill is really directed solely to those private schools which receive large numbers of poor children, children belonging to the poorer classes."³⁹

The matter remained unresolved and in 1913, the Immigration Commission again objected to the French schools because of their "lack of proper training in English, the foreign atmosphere . . . where foreign teachers are employed and national traditions adhered to and insisted on. . . ."⁴⁰ At this time, Cardinal William O'Connell urged his school superintendent to press the French sisterhoods for compliance with the state law that elementary school classes be taught in English, at the same time directing him to continue to oppose "with all our forces" all inspection bills.⁴¹ But the Canadian sisters, like the French population at large, saw the schools not only as educational institutions but also as powerful forums for preserving their culture and language; their compliance with the Cardinal's request was slow. Until they were able to attract more American candidates, French communities could not readily supply teachers who could speak English well enough to teach it. Their difficulties adversely affected the curriculum of the schools. Of parochial schools which still had no music courses in 1921, all were foreign language schools. "There is a disposition to teach it," reported the supervisor of schools, "but the question of teaching two languages well absorbs all their time and attention."⁴² Nevertheless the sisterhoods continued to function autonomously, with no intercommunity assistance coming from the English-speaking groups in the solution of the language problem in the ethnic schools.

Only in the case of the French schools was there any real dissension before 1900 between parochial and public school faculties on the proper curriculum for American children. But progressive educators for some time had been proposing alternative ways to prepare children for their place in society. The public school, they maintained, "should prepare some students directly for subordinate roles in the economy while it screened out those fit for further training in higher education."⁴³ By 1904 industrial arts programs already mandated by Massachusetts law for high schools, were required in elementary schools as well and a three-year program in household arts was begun in the Framingham Normal School.⁴⁴

The reaction of teaching sisters to the new curriculum differed from their earlier drive to imitate public school practice. Arguing that later professional opportunities would be closed to children if such courses commenced at the elementary level, they remained unenthusiastic.⁴⁵ They had some justification for their concern, given the reasoning of some vocational education proponents. David Snedden, the Massachusetts Commissioner of Education, for example,

favored grouping children by economic status, with vocational education provided those most likely destined by financial background for work in factories or the trades. He described the aspirations of working-class parents for their children as unrealistic fantasies.⁴⁶ Since most children enrolled in parochial schools were children of immigrants, the opposition of their teachers to the new programs was understandable.

Public comments by parochial school spokesmen did not directly attack the vocational curriculum. Instead they stressed the importance of adhering to "the basics" in the elementary school.

There is a danger against which we must be vigilant and constantly on guard. For, as we become proficient in the essentials, there will always be a temptation to imitate those about us and reach out for the frills and fads and fancies, which characterize the secular education of the day to the detriment of the more important things and the disruption of the undeveloped mind.⁴⁷

Public school spokesmen replied that parochial schools focused on the basics because they were unable to finance such innovative programs as industrial courses and kindergartens. The grade work of St. Mary's and St. Stephen's Parochial Schools in Boston in 1903 was described as "very similar to that of the public schools, though from lack of funds it is necessarily limited to the bare essentials."⁴⁸ Mentioned specifically as missing were nature study and industrial work. Certainly, given the general shortage of sisters and the special training required for vocational courses, these charges have basis in fact. But the response was not as simple as this explanation suggests. There is evidence of a change in view among parochial school teachers between 1870 and 1900 on the appropriate curriculum for working-class children. An 1867 letter of a Sister of Mercy reflects well their earlier position. She identified "two points of difference between our schools and the public schools. . . . With us children of every class *learn to work* [trades or manual skills] devoting nearly two hours a day to it; drawing is also taught in connection with fancy work. . . . The public common schools never teach manual work of any kind—hence their pupils grow up with a sort of contempt for it. . . . They are willing to take professions, but dislike much to apply to trades."⁴⁹ While by the end of the century, sisters were opposing such industrial training in parochial schools, they did see value in it for children in orphanages and homes who had to be prepared to be financially independent. The 1895 course of study in St. Vincent's Home for Girls in Boston was "designed to supply a plain, useful education. Needlework and cooking are taught with a view to enable the children, when old enough, to earn a living."⁵⁰ Manual training for boys and domestic arts for girls were well developed at the Boston School for the Deaf in Randolph. In 1891, before the movement to "business courses" for high school girls was underway, the few Catholic high schools in the diocese were offering stenography and typing, leading a public school educator to warn: "The public schools must never be so conservative as to allow any other institution to do better work or to do it more promptly."⁵¹ The commercial course was not introduced at Boston's Girls' High School until 1898.⁵²

The response of sisters to vocational education, then, reflected an educational philosophy which evolved gradually after 1870 and which was specific to the needs of the children they taught. Nevertheless, the debate reinforced the persuasion that they were conservative on educational matters. While their success in providing a basic education at the elementary level had won substantial public acknowledgement by 1900, their inflexibility on vocational education was attributed to a lack of awareness of educational developments, the regrettable result of inadequate training.⁵³ A special feature of parochial schools helped to reinforce this perception. Teaching sisters tended to maintain stricter classroom discipline and to emphasize manners training more than did public school teachers, a difference applauded by the Catholic press:

There is an air of politeness, of refinement, of deference to age and to superiors, and a spirit of obedience in the pupils of the Catholic schools which is in marked contrast to that of the pupils of the public schools.⁵⁴

But by the turn of the century such training was increasingly seen as outmoded and stifling the children's natural exuberance. The military precision characteristic of nineteenth century classroom management in public schools had slowly given way to less rigid teaching styles.⁵⁵ The continuation of highly regimented classroom management in parochial schools furthered the assessment of their faculties as conservative.

Necessity rather than inflexibility in teaching methods and philosophy explains much of the delay in modifying disciplinary practice. Only the maintenance of strict discipline allowed sisters facing large classes to ensure order. Although average class size in Massachusetts public schools fell sharply after 1900, no corresponding movement occurred in parochial schools.⁵⁶ In 1912, the diocesan school supervisor reported an "overcrowding of the lower grades and the assignment of too many children to one teacher in the higher grades also."⁵⁷ In the city of Boston, "seventy, eighty and even ninety pupils are often assigned to one teacher in the lower grades."⁵⁸

Economizing on teachers by placing large numbers of children in a single classroom was risky enough with a well-educated and experienced staff. But young sisters with little or no preparation found themselves in an extremely difficult situation. When confronted with enormous classes, they resorted to regimented classroom management and rote learning, especially in the important subjects of arithmetic and grammar. From the start of the period, rote learning was acknowledged to be "unfortunately more frequent in the parochial than in the public schools."⁵⁹ The common practice of assigning the most inexperienced sisters to the lower grades "where their lack of knowledge and training would be least liable to be noticed or to work ill," was a mistake, given the high enrollments in primary classes in parochial schools.⁶⁰

Overcrowded classrooms and weak formal training combined to present severe handicaps for parochial school faculties. The defensive spirit engendered by the high school admission test requirements and inspection bills of earlier decades continued as criticisms of inflexibility in teaching style and narrow

curricular offerings replaced them, delaying needed improvements and the development of a cohesive system of schools. Instead of taking the initiative, individual communities continued to espouse conservative positions on educational matters. Since most parochial schools were located in working-class neighborhoods, neither parents nor the environment itself challenged them to innovation. Sisters gained significant teaching experience by remaining in the classroom throughout their working lives, but it is unlikely that early classroom practice in the areas of discipline and pedagogy changed much as they grew older. Their lack of sufficient formal education and their isolation from public school teachers and from members of other teaching communities who might have had different experiences, training, and approaches were strongly counterproductive to change. As a result, substantial efforts to modify traditional curriculum, methods of teaching, and discipline in Massachusetts parochial schools did not occur before 1940.

NOTES

1. A Sister of St. Joseph, *Just Passing Through, 1873-1943* (Boston, 1943), p. 53. *Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Boston, 1875* (Boston, 1876), p. 10. Private, tuition-charging schools for children of wealthy families were never considered competitive with the common schools; see Marvin Lazerson, *Origins of the Urban School: Public Education in Massachusetts, 1870-1915* (Cambridge, 1971), p. 19.
2. Sermon of Bishop J. J. Glennon, St. Louis, January 1, 1910, cited by Anna C. Minogue, *Loretto: Annals of the Century* (New York, 1912), p. 177.
3. Thomas Magennis to Archbishop William O'Connell, January 10, 1908, in Institution Correspondence Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston.
4. Howard Ralph Weisz, *Irish-American and Italian-American Educational Views and Activities, 1870-1900: A Comparison* (New York, 1976), pp. 103-104.
5. *A Brief Historical Review of the Archdiocese of Boston, 1907-1923* (Boston, 1925), p. 37.
6. Weisz, p. 354; Rev. J. A. Burns, *The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States* (New York, 1912), pp. 275-276.
7. Rev. John J. Ryan, "Comment on 'The Parish Priest and the Parish School,'" *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, X (November, 1913), p. 280.
8. See Mary J. Oates, "Organized Voluntarism: The Catholic Sisters in Massachusetts, 1870-1940," in Janet Wilson James, editor, *Women in American Religion* (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 154-160, for discussion of salaries paid teaching sisters in this period.
9. Rev. Michael J. Larkin, "The Place of the Lay Teacher in Parish Schools," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, XIX (November, 1922), p. 234.
10. Thomas M. Balliet, "The Problem of the Elementary School," *Report of the Advisory Committee to the Joint Committee of the Collegiate Alumnae and the Federation of Women's Clubs of Massachusetts*, reprinted from the Publication of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Series III, No. 6, February 1903, in Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College, Manuscript Collection.

11. Rev. Thomas R. Reynolds, "The Pastor and His Parish School," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, XXXVI (August, 1939), pp. 444-445.
12. Eliphalet Oram Lyte, "The State Normal Schools of the United States," in Commissioner of Education, *Education Report, 1903* (Washington, D.C., 1905), p. 1114.
13. Rev. Ralph L. Hayes, "The Problem of Teacher Certification," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, XIX (November, 1922), pp. 368-369.
14. Burns, p. 215.
15. Rev. George Johnson, "A Plan of Teacher Certification," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, XVIII (November, 1921), p. 391.
16. Rev. J. Elliot Ross, "Leisure for Our Teaching Orders," *Catholic School Journal*, XX (October, 1920), p. 206.
17. Rt. Rev. Regis Canevin, "The Parish School and Its Teachers," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, IX (November, 1912), pp. 387-388.
18. Rev. S. B. Smith, "The Present Policy of the Holy See, Particularly Regarding Religious Communities Having But Simple Vows," *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, III (1878), p. 240.
19. See, for example, the criticisms of teaching sisterhoods by Caroline E. MacGill, "The Lost Freedom of Women," *Catholic World*, CXVIII (January, 1924), p. 454.
20. Diary of Sister M. Aloysius Curley, November 2, 1921, in Archives, Sisters of St. Joseph, Boston.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Ross, p. 206.
23. Hayes, p. 366.
24. Rt. Rev. John R. Hagan, "Catholic Education and the Elementary School," in Roy J. Deferrari, editor, *Vital Problems of Catholic Education in the United States* (Washington, D.C., 1939), pp. 68-69.
25. *Just Passing Through, 1873-1943*, p. 71.
26. *The Amesbury Daily News*, September 21, 1895.
27. *Supervisor of Schools, 1912*, in Department of Education Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston.
28. *The Sacred Heart Review*, April 6, 1889, pp. 1-2.
29. *Just Passing Through, 1873-1943*, p. 55. Grade examinations were instituted by the diocesan supervisor in 1912, again following public school practice.
30. Sister M. Catherine, R.S.M., "The Higher Education of Women Under Catholic Auspices," *Catholic Education Association Bulletin*, XVIII (November 1921), pp. 437-439; Rev. E. F. Gibbons, "School Supervision: Its Necessity, Aims and Methods," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, II (July, 1905), p. 170.
31. Augustine F. Hickey to William Cardinal O'Connell, February 1, 1921, in Department of Education Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston.
32. Gibbons, p. 168.

33. Rev. Joseph M. O'Hara, "The Supervision of Catholic Schools by Community Supervisors," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, XVIII (November, 1921), p. 213.
34. Robert A. Woods, "Assimilation: A Two-Edged Sword," p. 378, in Robert A. Woods, ed., *Americans in Process: A Settlement Study* (Boston, 1903), pp. 356-383.
35. Cited in *The Sacred Heart Review*, November 26, 1892, p. 8.
36. Mason Wade, "The French Parish and *Survivance* in Nineteenth Century New England," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXVI (April, 1950), p. 178.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 183-184.
38. Katherine E. Conway and Mabel Ward Cameron, *Charles Francis Donnelly: A Memoir* (New York, 1909), p. 90.
39. Cited by Conway and Cameron, p. 36.
40. Augustine F. Hickey to William Cardinal O'Connell, November 28, 1913, in Department of Education Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston.
41. C. J. Sullivan to Augustine F. Hickey, December 31, 1913, and Augustine F. Hickey to William Cardinal O'Connell, April 16, 1914, in Department of Education Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston. The Massachusetts law referred to is *Acts, 1878, chap. 171*; see Sherman M. Smith, *The Relation of the State to Religious Education in Massachusetts* (Syracuse, 1926), p. 261.
42. Augustine F. Hickey to William Cardinal O'Connell, February 1, 1921, in Department of Education Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston.
43. David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, 1974), p. 189.
44. *Catalog and Circular, State Normal School of Framingham, 1905-1906*, p. 8.
45. Alice Woodward Karl, "Public School Politics in Boston, 1895-1920" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1969), pp. 396-397.
46. Peter Milo Shane, "The Origins of Educational Control: Class, Ethnicity and School Reform in Boston, 1875-1920" (B.A. Honors thesis, Harvard University, 1974), p. 217.
47. George A. Lyons to William Cardinal O'Connell, *Report of the Supervisor of Schools, 1912*, in Department of Education Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston.
48. Caroline S. Atherton and Elizabeth Y. Rutan, "The Child of the Stranger," p. 310, in Robert A. Woods, ed., *Americans in Process*.
49. Letter of a Sister of Mercy to a Friend, June 3, 1867, cited by John Francis Maguire, *The Irish in America* (London, 1868), p. 492.
50. James S. Sullivan, ed., *One Hundred Years of Progress: The Catholic Church of New England, Archdiocese of Boston* (Boston, 1895), p. 237.
51. He was referring to St. Mary's School, Salem, staffed by the Sisters of Charity; *The Sacred Heart Review*, September 19, 1891, p. 11; *Journal of Education*, XXXIV (1891), p. 345, cited by Lazerson, p. 22.
52. Olive B. White, *Centennial of the Girls' High School of Boston* (Boston, 1952).

53. See Chicago Superintendent Howland's remarks cited by John T. McManis, *Ella Flag Young and a Half Century of the Chicago Public Schools* (Chicago, 1916), pp. 69-70; Worcester School Superintendent Marble's views are summarized by Lazerson, pp. 125-131.
54. *The Sacred Heart Review*, September 6, 1890, p. 1.
55. See the description by Harris and Doty cited by Tyack, pp. 43, 50.
56. Oates, pp. 162-163, discusses average class size in parochial schools.
57. George A. Lyons to William Cardinal O'Connell, *Report of the Supervisor of Schools, 1912*, in Department of Education Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston.
58. Augustine F. Hickey to William Cardinal O'Connell, June 2, 1914, in Department of Education Files, Archives, Archdiocese of Boston.
59. Rev. H. A. Braun, "The Improvement of Parochial Schools," *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, IX (1884), p. 247.
60. Burns, p. 212.