

Girls in the Age of Industrialization: Female Education and the Lancasterian System of Instruction

Shutaro Suzuki

Introduction

Joseph Lancaster, an innovator in early 19th century public education, wrote *Improvements in Education* in 1805, in which he asserted the importance of female education. For him, educating women in England was part of a wider mission to develop the state of public education, as he saw the disadvantages of poor and uneducated women in London:

Let public, if not national benevolence, alleviate the consequence of this dreadful profligacy; and, let the national eye be directed to the education and employment of females, as a means to obviate the evil in future.¹

His philosophy was that youth suffering the confines of poverty would benefit from being educated in a highly industrialized society like London around 1800. Therefore, he needed to establish efficient systems in which one schoolmaster could control nearly a hundred or several hundred pupils. To a certain extent, he achieved this end. The system he established had an impact beyond his country. Many people in the

United States were eager to introduce it into the larger cities where the population of the lower class was increasing. This paper investigates women's education in the context of the school educational system in the United States and England during the early 19th century.

The author has primarily focused on research regarding women's education during the foundational period of the United States. In particular, my research has shown that, while educators at the Young Ladies' Academy of Philadelphia (founded in the city of the same name in 1789) promoted women's education with the objective of developing the skills necessary to become a "good mother," the students themselves did not necessarily share these values of "republican motherhood," and instead viewed education as a means to contribute to public life.² There has been more focus in recent years on the large influence that English educational theory has had on women's educational theory in the United States during its foundational period, and it has been argued that the influx of English theory, encapsulated by Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), has had a dual impact on the concepts of both republican motherhood and its opposing "women's thirst for knowledge." Finally, it notes that women's education in the United States became increasingly tied to the concept of domesticity after the 1800s.³

Two important elements were recognized in the course of this research. First, neither gender studies nor education history studies need be restricted solely to the United States, and a perspective that goes beyond only a national framework is necessary. Since I recognized them, I have focused on the concept of Atlantic Studies. Both revolutionary concept of women's rights (which came in vogue during the foundational period of the United States) and the concept of ideal femininity (which became established during the industrialization

period that followed) co-existed as influences in the context of women's education. Furthermore, it is important to note that the co-existence of these various dual female perspectives were formed in the context of human-based and intellectually-based exchange with Europe.

Introducing the perspective of a cross-Atlantic exchange of intellectual thought into debates regarding women's education would have a large impact on research in gender studies and education history studies research that goes beyond only an American framework. The purpose of the current research is to clarify the role of the influx of European intellectual thought (i.e., gender studies, education history studies), incorporate the trans-Atlantic perspective, and place the product under a larger Atlantic framework of intellect and philosophy in the context of public education theory and women's education theory, which have been fiercely debated in the United States since the late 18th century. This process is done by incorporating the novel perspective of trans-Atlantic studies represented by Bernard Bailyn's *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours* (2005), which explores the possibility of a historical perspective on the order of the Western hemisphere which goes beyond the history of one specific nation.⁴

The second point is the importance of understanding women's education in the context of the larger framework of a public education debate. Since the founding of the United States, leaders like Thomas Jefferson have argued for the necessity of public education.⁵ For example, with regards to the Pennsylvania state constitution drafted in 1790, the state committee tried to ratify a bill that would construct free-education schools throughout the state as rapidly as possible. And a bill that provided financial support to the children of the poor was passed in 1802 in accordance with this state committee.⁶ The Pennsylvania education system was not established until 1835; however, judging by

the history and controversies that arose prior to this time, the primary issue regarding public education was that of social class, which was not apparent during the U.S. foundational period. The homogenization of citizens within the Republic was a major objective of leaders like Jefferson and Benjamin Rush in achieving the advancement of public education during the U.S. foundational period.⁷ However, a major point of controversy by the 19th century was whether to provide financial aid to the lower socioeconomic classes.⁸ American society had changed dramatically by the 19th century: urban populations had increased and a working class began to form (albeit gradually).⁹ In this context there was an increased emphasis on public education. The evolution of the role of women's education in the development of public education starts to become clear when these shifts in the public education debate are considered.¹⁰ Another point of this research is to characterize the shift from women's education that focused on developing members of society who uphold the values of republican motherhood during the U.S. foundational period, to education that focused on the development of a working class (including poor women) within an emerging industrial society, not only within the United States but also in England.

With the above two points in mind, this paper addresses female students' and women's education in the context of the educational system proposed by Joseph Lancaster. The Lancasterian system was proposed in London at the start of the 19th century, and for a time was widespread in England, and Lancaster consistently sought to popularize his educational system internationally. The influence of the Lancasterian system in the United States during the early 19th century was profound, and his main work - *Improvements in Education* - was published in New York and numerous other regions, gaining popularity as a new system of education.¹¹ The expansion of the lower class had become an issue

of public concern in major urban areas such as New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore; and public education was seen by many as a potential solution to this problem.¹² Lancaster himself moved from England to the United States in the 1830s and sought to promote his educational system there.

Much research has been conducted on the early history of women's education in the United States since the publication of Thomas Woody's *History of Women's Education in the United States* during the early 20th century.¹³ New work has since been conducted on the analysis of women's participation and interest in political/economic activities and its role in women's education, exemplified by research from Linda Kerber, who explored the possible positive aspects of conducting women's education under the republican motherhood ideology during the U.S. foundational period; or from Susan Branson, who elucidated the large influence of political philosophy including diplomacy on the gender framework during the U.S. foundational period.¹⁴ This current study analyzes women's education in the context of the early 19th century Lancasterian system (which until now has not been significantly analyzed in gender studies or education history studies) and compares women's versus men's educations. The trans-Atlantic gender order at the same the time will also be clarified while reconsidering the historical significance of the Lancasterian system.

A mention of Testuo Yasukawa's work regarding Japanese research on the Lancasterian system is relevant here. Yasukawa identified the educational framework represented by the early-19th century Monitorial system espoused by Lancaster and Andrew Bell as part of the development of a modern educational system, and clarified its transitional role in this regard.¹⁵ Research regarding class establishment by Haruo Yanagi also highlights Lancaster's importance in serving as

a “prehistory” of the modern educational system. Mika Sugimura’s research has also shown the influence of the Lancasterian system on modern Japanese education.¹⁶ However, researchers of educational history such as Yasukawa do not often focus on gender differences in the Lancasterian system. Also relevant is American educational history researcher Aki Sakuma’s study of the reception of the Lancasterian system in the United States. Sakuma focused on Mary Lyon, who founded the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary, and her introduction of the Monitorial plan at the Sanderson Academy, where she was a teacher in 1826. Lyon had dedicated half of her class time to a monitorial system, where monitors were selected among upperclassmen by teachers and were responsible to direct student recitations. Apparently, Lyon implemented the monitorial plan with the expectation that the young female students would see the upperclassmen monitors as role models and improve their own conduct and personalities.¹⁷ However, Sakuma’s research focus was directed towards women as educators, and not on the gender order constructed by student gender differences or the educational system. Using the work by Sakuma as a starting point, this current research examines women’s education in the context of the Lancasterian system, focusing on Lancaster’s own works such as *Improvements in Education*.

1. The Lancasterian System

Only twenty years old at the time, Joseph Lancaster first started a school for local poor children in 1798. Due in part to its location in Southwark, where many poorer classes lived, Lancaster’s school had no shortage of students. In search of an effective educational method that did not require an increase in tuition and could effectively teach

numerous students with relatively few staff, Lancaster developed the Monitorial system.¹⁸

Lancaster's Monitorial system included two primary characteristics. The first was the establishment of student monitors within the classroom.¹⁹ Monitors were students who taught other students rather than the teacher directly engaging with the students. The teacher chose either the oldest or the highest-achieving students to serve as monitors. The teacher then taught the lesson material to the monitor, and the monitor taught other students. Subject matter to be taught was restricted to reading, writing, and arithmetic. One monitor, who led recitations on spelling and arithmetic equations, was assigned to approximately ten students. Within the rectangular classroom halls established by Lancaster, the teacher stood on a platform in the back center, and students learned while sitting on long desks that were parallel to one another in the classroom center or sitting in semi-circles around a monitor on the classroom sides.²⁰ Within the Lancasterian system, monitors were also responsible for the maintenance of the morality, discipline, and hygiene of the general class body.²¹

The second characteristic of the Lancasterian System was that students were divided into multiple classes based on their individual ability.²² A more efficient educational system was made possible by dividing the students by skill. Thus, the classes introduced here were different from those divided by age. As such, the classes were composed of students of variable age. In this system classes are re-organized each school term; for example, in the case of arithmetic, classes were divided based on how many figures with which a student could conduct arithmetic. Monitors were also utilized to assist with assessing students for class re-organization.

Efficiency, above all, was the primary reason for which Lancaster

developed this type of educational system.²³ The number of students that could simultaneously be taught increased dramatically as the number of monitors was increased. In countries such as England, where the working and poor classes greatly increased in number during modernization, the Monitorial system proposed by Lancaster met the demands of its time.²⁴ This division of labor in which monitors were assigned the actual teaching of subjects was highly compatible with the mechanization and optimization demanded by industries at the time.

In addition to the characteristics of these teaching methods, English historian Shunzo Matsuzaka addressed the corporal discipline aspect of the Lancasterian system. Matsuzaka's focus was specifically on the on-site punishment promoted by Lancaster. In this system, students who broke the rules were punished by being restrained in wooden shackles or a basket; this type of visible punishment was highly effective in maintaining order within the classroom.²⁵ Reasons for punishment included behaviors such as poor grooming habits or tardiness. Monitors participated in the strict management of student discipline and punishment. This practice of corporal punishment in the Lancasterian system was in line with the demands of state authority, which sought to develop constituent members of the modern state through education.²⁶ In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Michel Foucault also gives attention to the Lancasterian system as a method to rearrange constituents into a form more desirable to the state. This modern element of the Lancasterian system coincides with the characteristics observed in the modern French education system by Philippe Ariès, in his work, *Centuries of Childhood*. Ariès argued that the demands of public education changed as a result of the expansion and entrenchment of the working class in the 19th century.²⁷

The educational system advocated by Lancaster saw rapid and

wide dissemination. He began to receive donations from royalty in the 19th century, and he was able to conduct his educational program in larger-scale buildings. Even so, he regularly traveled across England, engaging in lectures and visiting classroom facilities. Not limited to England, his system eventually spread throughout Europe, the United States, and European colonies in Africa. The British and Foreign School Society, founded in 1814 and modeled after the Society for Promoting the Lancasterian System for the Education of the Poor, continued to engage in promoting the educational system espoused by Lancaster up to the middle of the 19th century.

The greatest problem associated with the Lancasterian system was difficulty teaching complex subjects due to the student-to-student pedagogy nature of the system. Lancaster himself spread his teaching methods throughout England and overseas with his own meticulously crafted teaching manual, but he was able to do so precisely because he had seen education as menial labor to be conducted by monitors. However, toward the latter half of the 19th century, history and science were added to reading, writing, and arithmetic as subjects to be taught in public education. Additionally, physical education was incorporated into the school system. With the increasing complexity of the school system, the Lancasterian system characterized by the monitor-based division of labor and simplification of work became obsolete.

2. Lancaster and Female Education

Lancaster devoted one chapter in *Improvements in Education* to the topic of women's education. He emphasized women's religious faith and their role in the domestic sphere. As he wrote, "a religious and guarded education" should "improve the female character," Lancaster

claimed that religious women have a higher potential for understanding Bible-based education.²⁸ He also argued that women in charge of the household can provide a better environment for both their husbands and their children through education:

I am fully persuaded that great numbers of the rising generation have had their morals vitiated by the depravity of their parents---sincerely sorry am I to have observed, that all their mothers have not acted as they ought to have done. A mother is a domestic character, and has a double influence on the father and on the children.²⁹

He emphasized the benefits of both faith and household to the state. Lancaster thought that higher numbers of educated women in England could result in the greater development of the state. For Lancaster, female education, like male education, had to be a national project.

In addition, Lancaster imagined the increased presence of women with “habits of virtue and industry” as a factory labor force in the context of industrialization and emphasized the significance of women’s education for this reason as well. He repeatedly mentioned the utility of female education. Education could facilitate girls earning money for their families:

One proper object for schools of industry is, to enable children to earn as much money as will remove the difficulty occasioned by the poverty of their parents. By this means they are enabled to keep their children at school till their education is finished--- until they have acquired habits of industry, which will follow them into future life; and, when they may be engaged in a variety of domestic or

lawful pursuits.³⁰

So, which subjects could female schools teach in the Lancasterian system? In his book written in 1805, Lancaster confessed he had “not been much in the habit of attending to female education” and had “not had much experience.” Nevertheless, he proposed that the “complete education of a female consists in a knowledge of reading, writing, and the elements of arithmetic,” which seemed the same as male education in his school. Additionally, he listed as female skills to be learned “the art of cutting out garments, both linen and woollen; various kinds of needle-work; a knowledge of the domestic duties of servants; and a familiar acquaintance with the principles of Christianity.”³¹

Though Lancaster did not provide a concrete curriculum for female education in *Improvements in Education*, he proposed several ideas for it. He thought that, for women, “[t]wo kinds of classes are needful: one for work, and one for learning.”³² In his view, both sides of female education are “totally different,” so that they should be divided clearly. His intent was to apply his distinguished monitorial system toward female learning, while female students were also given vocational training inside the school, such as getting accustomed to machinery. His reason for emphasizing vocational training in female education was concern about ill feelings by parents toward schooling their daughters. So, he emphasized the usefulness of vocational training in female education.

As an attempt to prepare women both for work and for learning, Lancaster introduced education provided by the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor, which was suggested to him by William Corston, an entrepreneur, an educator, and a faithful companion of Lancaster.³³ Corston boasted that this society

could produce “employment to 50,000 children, if properly regulated” by a certain educational system.³⁴ Corston emphasized that getting opportunities to work was the priority for the progress of children in England:

The want of this (meaning employment) is a great cause of dissolute habits in the lower ranks of society; where the greater number of children, particularly girls, are not only without occupation, during that period, but without even the prospect of being fit for service. The invention and improvement of machinery has now nearly put an end to spinning by hand: weeding and stone-picking afford employment for one part of the year; and, for other, pilfering and hedge-breaking.³⁵

For Corston, in the new age of machinery, education for poor girls was the main concern. An entrepreneur who owned straw hat factories, he believed that female education should partly help train girls to be diligent factory workers. Nevertheless, he also had a conviction that his and Lancaster’s way of education made their society prosper:

[T]he earlier the little fingers of children are taught industry, the more valuable they become to themselves and others; and, if the effect is viewed in its future consequences, it is great indeed: since an industrious mother cannot bring up her children idle. By these establishments we should be training our poor in habits of order, cleanliness, and industry, the fruits of which would support them, until fit for service; and lay the foundation for their proving useful and valuable members of society.³⁶

While he introduced Corston's attempts, Lancaster had not set about establishing his education for women at this point. In his later book published in 1810, Lancaster suggested some practices of female education. He wrote that, at the Royal Free School for Girls, he tried introducing monitors even in the classes for work but saw difficulty with it.³⁷ When his system of instruction was adopted in the United States, the Lancasterian system spread widely in United States schools for women.

As urban problems such as growing numbers of the poor, excessive drinking, and crime were becoming serious, particularly in metropolitan areas such as New York, public education began gaining attention as a solution to those problems. The problems required an efficient system. In 1805 the New York Free School Society was founded and DeWitt Clinton, then mayor of New York, became the society's first president. He incorporated the Lancasterian system for the efficient education of poor children.³⁸

After it was introduced in New York City, several schools for women on the east coast of the United States adopted the Lancasterian system, for example, The Society for the Free Instruction of Female Children in Philadelphia. According to the minutes of the Society in 1808, it had tried to introduce the educational ideas of Lancaster in two practices. First, it "made trial of pupil assistants." Pupil assistants or, in Lancaster's word, monitors, were the quintessence of the Lancasterian System. The Society engaged them for efficiency to educate as many female pupils as possible. Second, it distributed "premium cards" at the quarterly examinations.³⁹ (As Michel Foucault referred to the Lancasterian system in his book, *Discipline and Punish*, reward and punishment are effective ways to make human beings docile.⁴⁰) After a few years of trial, the Society extensively accepted the Lancasterian system in 1811. The following is part of the regulations the society

adopted.

The school consisted of eight classes arranged according to students' proficiency and a monitor served in each class. The first class was for girls who were learning letters. In the class, students made copies of both capital and small letters with the instruction of a monitor. If they could write the whole alphabet by rote, they were to pass into the second class. In the second class, a monitor spelled simple and meaningless words such as "ab" and students copied them. They also learned syllables of the words and the numerical letters. In the third class, a monitor gave out words from books, and students tried to spell them. In this way, through the eight classes, students became able to write and read sentences and paragraphs. From the third class, they were also taught arithmetic.⁴¹

These practices in New York and Philadelphia had a huge impact on other cities in the United States. For instance, when Moses Stuart, a theologian, preached a sermon at the Female Charitable Society in Salem, Massachusetts, in 1815, he referred to the Lancasterian system. He said that "[i]f with a school, like that of Mr. Lancaster, communicating the common instruction from books, could be connected a school to teach labour and economy, it would accomplish the great object." He suggested that the Society adopt the Lancasterian system to teach "reading, writing, and all kinds of domestic business" to female orphan children three to ten years of age.⁴² As Stuart suggested, in addition to writing, reading, and arithmetic classes, most of the Lancasterian schools in the United States in the early 19th century had a needlework class.⁴³ For example, in a pamphlet published in Baltimore, he claimed that one teacher was teaching needlework to two hundred girls in his school.⁴⁴ In those schools, educators tried to train female students in domesticity. By comparison with the British Lancasterian schools

for women, where students were trained to be factory workers, in the schools in the United States, where the manufacturing industry had just started developing (especially after the War of 1812), domesticity was still important for female students.

Conclusion

According to Charles Ellis, who studied the acceptance of the Lancasterian system in the United States, the system “gradually fell into disuse,” even though the Free Instruction of Female Children in Philadelphia had kept making partial use of the system until 1859. Ellis argued that the efficiency declined by degrees since each school could afford to hire more teachers with lower expense.⁴⁵ In the middle of the 19th century, teaching jobs in the United States were increasingly being filled by women because, as Emma Willard and Catherine Beecher opined, women were regarded as more suitable teachers since “they could afford to do it cheaper.”⁴⁶ Actually, Willard and Beecher partially adopted the Lancasterian system due to of the possibility of training teachers quickly to reduce a part of the head teacher’s burden.⁴⁷ Ironically, the efficient system of instruction was replaced by professional, but much cheaper teachers created in bulk by the efficient system.

In this paper, I have provided an in-depth analysis of women’s education in the context of the Lancasterian system. The application of this system to female education varied from one society to another and evolved interdependently with the industrialization of Western culture, especially in England.

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Number 17K18197.

I would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.

Notes

1. Joseph Lancaster, *Improvements in Education, As It Respects the Industrious Classes of the Community* (London: Darton and Harvey, 1805), 116-117.
2. Shutaro Suzuki, “To Live in an Age of Light and Refinement: The Growth and Decline of the Young Ladies’ Academy of Philadelphia,” *The Bulletin of Tsurumi University, Part 2*, 54 (2017): 41-59.
3. Shutaro Suzuki, “For the Progress of Knowledge and Virtue: The Acceptance of Mary Wollstonecraft in America in the 1790s,” *The Bulletin of Tsurumi University, Part 2*, 53 (2016): 41-51.
4. Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005); Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
5. Thomas Jefferson, “Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge,” in *Thomas Jefferson: Writings*, ed. Merrill D. Peterson (New York: The Library of America, 1984), 365.
6. “Pennsylvania’s Constitutional Provisions for Schools for the Poor, 1802,” in *The American Legacy of Learning: Readings in the History of Education*, eds. John Hardin Best and Robert T. Sidwell (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1967), 155-156.
7. For example, Benjamin Rush wrote: “Our Schools of learning, by producing one general, and uniform system of education, will render the mass of the people more homogeneous, and thereby fit them more easily for uniform and peaceable government.” Benjamin Rush, *A Plan for the Establishment of Public Schools and the Diffusion of Knowledge in Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Thomas Dobson, 1786), 14.
8. Shutaro Suzuki, “America Kenkoku-ki no kō-kyōiku ronsō to zyoshi kyōiku [The Public Education Movement and Female Education in Early America],” *The Bulletin of Tsurumi University, Part 2*, 52 (2015): 1-23 (in Japanese).

9. Billy G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort": Philadelphia's Laboring People, 1750-1800* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).
10. Margaret A. Nash, *Women's Education in the United States, 1780-1840* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 68-71.
11. Joseph Lancaster, *The Lancasterian System of Education, with Improvement* (Baltimore: Ogden Niles, 1821).
12. Shutaro Suzuki, "The Vestiges of British Education Systems in the United States and Japan in the 19th Century: With a Focus on the Lancasterian System," *The Bulletin of Tsurumi University, Part 2*, 56 (2019): 1-18.
13. Thomas Woody, *A History of Women's Education in the United States, Vol. I* (New York: Octagon Books, 1929).
14. Linda K. Kerber, *Toward an Intellectual History of Women* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Susan Branson, *These Fiery Frenchified Dames: Women and Political Culture in Early National Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).
15. Tetsuo Yasukawa, "Monitorial school ha kindai-gakkō no genkei ka? [Are Monitorial Schools the Model for Modern Schools?]," *Forum on Modern Education*, 9 (2000): 83-96 (in Japanese).
16. Haruo Yanagi, *Gakkyū no rekishi-gaku* [Historical Science of Classes] (Tokyo: Kodansha, 2005), 46-47 (in Japanese); Mika Sugimura, *Meiji shoki ni okeru issei kyōjuhō juyō katei no kenkyū* [A Study on the Process of Accepting the Simultaneous Teaching Method in the Early Meiji Era] (Tokyo: Kazamashobo, 2010), 129-130 (in Japanese).
17. Aki Sakuma, *America kyōshi kyōiku-shi* [The History of Teacher Education in the 19th Century] (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2017), 147-148 (in Japanese).
18. David Salmon, *Joseph Lancaster* (London: Longmans and Green, 1904), 4-6.
19. Lancaster, *Improvements in Education*, 37-38.
20. Lancaster, *Lancasterian System*, 30.
21. Lancaster, *Improvements in Education*, 40.
22. *Ibid.*, 41-49.
23. *Ibid.*, 12.
24. Joseph Lancaster, *Outline of a Plan for Educating Ten Thousand Poor Children, by Establishing Schools in Country Towns and Villages; and*

- for *Uniting works of Industry with Useful Knowledge* (London: The Free School, Borough Road, 1806).
25. Lancaster, *Improvements in Education*, 100-106.
 26. Shunzo Matsuzuka, *Rekishī no naka no kyōshi* [Dame Schools, Popular Culture and Liberal State in Modern Britain] (Tokyo: Yamakawa Publishers, 2001), 57-58 (in Japanese).
 27. Philippe Ariès, *Kodomo no tanzū* [L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'Ancien Régime], trans. Toshio Nakauchi and Morita Nobuko (Tokyo: Fujiwara Shoten, 1992), 204 (in Japanese).
 28. Lancaster, *Improvements in Education*, 116.
 29. *Ibid.*, 115.
 30. *Ibid.*, 120.
 31. Additionally, Lancaster proposed horticulture as a possible subject for female education because it could lead to “profitable employment to the peasant.” Lancaster, *Improvements in Education*, 118-121.
 32. Lancaster, *Improvements in Education*, 119.
 33. After he started to run his straw hat business, William Corston established a school of industry in Norfolk in 1802. Salmon, *Lancaster*; 17-18.
 34. Lancaster, *Improvements in Education*, 123.
 35. *Ibid.*, 125.
 36. *Ibid.*, 126-7.
 37. Joseph Lancaster, *The British System of Education: Being a Complete Epitome of the Improvements and Inventions Practised at the Royal Free Schools* (London: Longman, 1810), 53-54.
 38. Suzuki, “Vestiges of British Education Systems,” 7-8; “The New York Free School Society, 1805,” *The American Legacy of Learning*, 156-158; Michael B. Katz, “From Voluntarism to Bureaucracy in American Education,” in *Education in American History: Readings on the Social Issues*, ed. Michael B. Katz (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), 39.
 39. Charles Calvert Ellis, “Lancasterian Schools in Philadelphia” (Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1907), 10.
 40. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (London: Penguin Books, 1977), 136; Suzuki, “Vestiges of British Education Systems,” 1.
 41. Ellis, “Lancasterian Schools,” 11-12.

42. Moses Stuart, *A Sermon, Delivered by Request of the Female Charitable Society in Salem, at Their Anniversary the First Wednesday in August, A.D. 1815* (Andover, Massachusetts: Flagg and Gould, 1815), 17-18.
43. Ellis, "Lancasterian Schools," 65.
44. Lancaster, *Lancasterian System*, V.
45. Ellis, "Lancasterian Schools," 12; Carl F. Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 41.
46. Emma Willard, *An Address to the Public Particularly to the Members of the Legislature of New York, Proposing a Plan for Improving Female Education* (Albany: I. W. Clark, 1819), 15; Shutaro Suzuki, "'You Will Consider Home an Ample Theatre for the Exercise of Your Highest Possibilities': The Tradition of Domesticity in Female Education in the United States, from the 18th to 19th Century," *The Bulletin of Tsurumi University, Part 2*, 55 (2018): 70.
47. Woody, *History of Women's Education*, 427.