Locating Abnormal Childhood: Neil Sutherland and Teacher Education

JONATHAN ANUIK
University of Alberta

ABSTRACT: Neil Sutherland identifies the 20th-century English-Canadian consensus about childhood. He tracks the beginning of its norms to the turn of the century and studies its growth as an idea shaping teachers' practices. In pre-service teacher education, Sutherland's scholarly work helps students learn how teachers "norm" children. Pre-service teachers understand less why certain children fall out of the norm to become abnormal. In this paper, I share how Sutherland maps normal childhood as a timely ideal coinciding with growing social and cultural complexity in Canada. The legacy of childhood as a public policy issue means teacher candidates don't often question where these ideas began; students see them as timeless. I show how I address this knowledge gap about abnormality in my instruction of Concepts of Childhood in History. In this foundations course, pre-service teachers learn they cannot merely enforce norms but must be critical of them.

Keywords: History of Childhood, Neil Sutherland, and Teacher Education.

RESUMÉ: Neil Sutherland décrit le consensus canadien anglais du XXe siècle qui a été élaboré sur l'enfance. Il place le début des normes du consensus au tournant du siècle et analyse sa progression comme une idée qui façonne les pratiques des enseignants. Le travail académique de Sutherland utile aux enseignants en formation initiale, leur apprend la manière dont les enseignants en activité considèrent la norme des enfants. Les enseignants en formation initiale ont du mal à comprendre la raison pour laquelle certains enfants ne font pas partie de cette « norme ». Ici, je montre que Sutherland caractérise l'enfance normale comme une période idéale qui coïncide avec l'évolution sociale et la complexité culturelle du Canada. Les séquelles de l'enfance : sujet traité comme un problème de politique

Journal of Educational Thought
Vol. 49, No. 1, 2016, 33-53

publique, montre que les candidats à l'enseignement ne se posent pas souvent de questions ; à savoir où ces idées ont pris naissance. Les étudiants les voient intemporelles. Ici dans mon enseignement sur les Notions de l'enfance à travers l'histoire, je montre la façon d'aborder le manque de connaissances sur les différences observées chez les enfants. Dans ce cours élémentaire, les enseignants en formation initiale apprennent qu'il ne suffit pas d'imposer simplement des normes, mais qu'ils doivent faire preuve d'esprit critique à cet égard.

Mots-clés : histoire de l'enfance, Neil Sutherland et formation des enseignants.

In Concepts of Childhood in History, Neil Sutherland's scholarly work helps students understand the history of Canadian childhood as an idea. Sutherland constructs the norms of childhood, invoking the term "consensus" to describe its container. He links the consensus to the formation of networks of professionals concerned with the well-being of families (Sutherland, 1975). He illuminates these networks' effects on childhood as it became a life stage with signposts through which children passed.

The legacy of the 20th-century consensus documented by Sutherland (2000) is a mistaken belief that modern understandings of childhood have always existed. These understandings have no history because they are value free; "[w]e have not generally challenged the assumptions on which they are based" (Sutherland, 1979a, p. 5). Sutherland pays less attention to abnormal childhood. How children became abnormal and separate from the usual childhood rhythms remains unclear.

Sutherland's work illuminates schools' socialization of children into childhood's norms. He sheds light on the implementation of the consensus and its rituals at the turn of the 20th century. They were a "cluster of ideas, beliefs, and practices" that became "social policy" (Sutherland, 1979a, p. 4, 1980) forming in a whirlwind of campaigns initiated by professionals (Sutherland, 1969, 1975). It was a timely childhood with ideas developed as a result of growing social and cultural complexity. Schools contributed to "the formation" of what became "modern

social policy towards children" (Sutherland, 1979a, p. 57), and teachers implemented the consensus (Sutherland, 1990). Sutherland implies culpability of teachers in stabilizing the ideal.

Teachers helped develop the composite of children's lives executing the consensus' ideals, which existed according to a timeless image of how childhood and children should be. Teacher candidates saw and learned about the image when they attended normal schools (Sutherland, 1973) and later faculties of education and translated it into pedagogy and lesson plans to practice everywhere (Anuik, 2013). By the 1920s, in addition to instruction on vowels and fractions, society expected teachers "to take responsibility for the behavior of their students during lunch hours and school breaks such as recess" (Wilson & Stortz, 1995, p. 222).

Sutherland illuminates the development of images of normal childhood. "Most children starting school had been initiated into its ways long before they arrived for their first day" (Sutherland, 1995a, p. 102), and school attendance was a trend spreading across Canada. Work was replaced by "[t]he normal ritual of children's school attendance for [e]ight whole years of ten months attendance." This new rhythm affected "community, children, and many parents" during the century (p. 127). Schools evolved to emphasize children's "emotional value" (Sutherland, 1995b, p. 177); teachers expected parents to emulate this ideal.

Sutherland's conceptualization of schools as spaces for "re-learning rather than initial learning" (Sutherland, 1995b, p. 179) opens a paradox. As schools' mandates expanded "[b]y the mid-1890s" to take in more children supposedly able "to take full advantage of childhood," teaching was on the verge of substantial transformation as "new ideas about child-rearing, and about the kind of schooling necessary to produce an efficient work force," penetrated schools' walls (Sutherland, 1990, p. 106; Sutherland, 1969). There was, in the new schooling model, never any attention paid to "how parents and children actually learned what they wanted or needed to know" (Sutherland, 1980, p. 80). The new education was benevolent and justified as an improvement in children's lives (Battiste, 1986, 2000; Sutherland, 1979b). Discourse framed around public health and the public good justified schools' purposes.

The term consensus suggests broad public support. "By the 1920s … the state had triumphed over most … families" because

"most children enrolled in school … attended … regularly, and stayed in school longer" (Sutherland, 1990, p. 106) while educational administrators and teachers practiced under rhetoric such as "equitable standards of schooling" (Barman & Sutherland, 1995, p. 417). To meet standards such "[a]s passing the high school entrance examinations became the goal for city … [and] many … rural" students (Sutherland, 1995c, p. 126). However, this new way of educating children spread unevenly (Sutherland, 1995b, 2000). Particularly when work obligations conflicted with the legal requirement that children attend school, "a certain amount of conflict persisted between some families' need for the full-time labour of their children and the state's demand that all children attend school" (Sutherland, 1990, p. 106).

A scope and sequence of development phases were the outcomes as the public grasped to these ideals and used them to measure competence. School replaced work as the place for children (Sutherland, 1990). Work was a learning space where children learned to contribute to families' and communities' economies. It influenced particular sources and domains of knowledge in children. Children learned to observe and to share. They could understand responsibility to family and community. They also learned important lessons about gender, race, and class (Sutherland, 1995a). Sutherland (1995a) understands that in this new normative childhood, children became individuals in a formalist space and not through work.

The consensus' promoters conflated school attendance with progress in society. Educational administrators and leaders dubbed schools part of progressive systems of education for children (Bryan, 1906). This "[p]rogressivism formed the basic theme" of education; teachers would now expect that "each student was capable of certain predictable achievements and should be taught appropriately" (Wilson & Stortz, 1995, p. 210). There were now a series of predictable stages to pass, and teachers enforced these patterns through scoped and sequenced curriculum designed to assure certain outcomes (Anuik, 2013; Sutherland, 1989).

Sutherland (1995c) develops signposts marking implementation of new educational policy. "[B]efore the First World War, state and community together had lengthened the school year, increased the number of years children spent there, and given a more urban cast to standardized curricula" (p. 126).

After World War I, legislation mandating school attendance, policy introducing family allowance, and the presence of truancy officers assured more students attended school regularly (Sutherland, 1990). "[B]y the 1940s and 1950s attending school for the required number of years had become so much a matter of social custom and of law, children themselves felt that attending school was a necessary part of their lives" (Sutherland, 1990, p. 137), and "the state incorporated nearly all school-aged children into the laddered school system" (Sutherland, 1995c, p. 125; Barman & Sutherland, 1995).[i]

Although Sutherland articulates the consensus, he never accepts it. He does not expect teachers to blindly teach it, and students to copy it. As coauthor of a Canadian history textbook, he asks teachers to get their students to consider if it is "possible that, with the help of all the experts they employ, a government may [not] know, better than the people do, what is best for a country" (Sutherland & Deyell, 1966, p. 63). Referring to a statement about the necessity of children's "'love for Canada'" made in BC's Confederation debates he asks students if they and their fellow Canadians have a "'love for Canada?'" (Helmcken, as cited in Sutherland & Deyell, 1967, p. 171). He suggests to students their role in improving this educational consensus, a fine-tuning Sutherland (1979a) would describe later. School transmitted "ideals that helped build … society," ensuring "its continuance," but teachers and students had to understand the school was a relatively new setting for children (Sutherland & Deyell, 1967, p. 233; Sutherland, 1970a, 1970b).

Adopting the theme of pioneering, Sutherland asks students and teachers which "ventures" they would "like to pioneer?... [W]ays of promoting peace…. [W]ays of promoting 'food for all.'… [W]ays of promoting education for all…. [D]iscovering a cure for the common cold…. [P]eaceful use of atomic energy" (Sutherland & Deyell, 1967, p. 86). Sutherland (1970a, 1970b) goes on to ask teachers and students to analyze their experiences. For example, he asks youngsters to "[m]ake a list of the differences between school sixty years ago and now" and to "[m]ake a list of the similarities between school sixty years ago and now" (p. 16). Sutherland's treatment of history would help children understand how ideas emerge and have the potential to change society. Children reading his textbooks "learned and practiced many skills

in collecting, arranging, and using historical knowledge…. [U]sed in … life as a citizen" (Sutherland & Deyell, 1967, p. 233). It is this style of questioning that is beneficial to giving a history behind the ideals of children reflected in the education system.

Sutherland assigns a period when talk of normal childhood coalesced into discourse, rhetoric, campaigns, policies, curriculum, and legislation. The understandings of what constitutes normal childhood "still govern" Canadians' "treatment of children" (Sutherland, 1980, p. 80), and teachers continue to practice these ideals. Discipline and control at school became paramount to assure predictable outcomes in all students (Wilson & Stortz, 1995). The importance of control and discipline remained important parts of children's upbringing in the 20th century (Sutherland, 1995c).

Yet the intellectual dynamics of children at the turn of the century remain unknown to current teacher candidates who tend to conflate modern childhood with a timeless ideal. They are right in that "the *nature* of childhood experiences has not changed very much." However, they are incorrect in their belief in a timeless childhood when they locate themselves as modern Canadian educators. Their profession contributed to changing "the *setting* of childhood experience" even if "the *content* has not varied very much" (Sutherland, 1970a, pp. 10, 12, emphases in original). Education students believe in these ideals but do not understand where they originated. Hence, for them, these ideals reflect a timeless childhood all Canadian children deserve; for most students childhood is an unquestioned "common experience that has reached across the Western world" (Barman, Sutherland, & Wilson, 1995, p. xi).

The objective of Concepts of Childhood in History is to awaken students to seeing how modern childhood originated and became a normal experience expected for all children. The course looks at the "new set of policies and programs for children" beginning at the turn of the 20th century "designed," among other things, "to transform the means and methods of their schooling and education" (Sutherland, 1979b, p. 58). I ask students to identify the effects of the consensus Sutherland enumerates on education.

Starting in 1880, Canadian intellectuals expected teachers to advance a "set of social policies and programs for children … to prevent them from becoming burdens on society, and to transform

the means and methods of their education" (Sutherland, 1979b, p. 58). The consensus is an unseen and impalpable force yet it influences teachers' work. Therefore, mapping the consensus and identifying its effects on educators' practices is one of the course's core purposes.

Sutherland's scholarly work justifies the course's purpose and objectives. Since it is for students who want to be teachers, in addition to learning about the consensus, they must also understand how they practice it. Although "[h]istorians have focussed their attention on the effects" of "debates over educational policies," pre-service teachers do not know "what these quarrels have done to the families, pupils, teachers, or schools involved in them" (Sutherland, 1975, p. xii). The course's objectives and content reflects Sutherland's (1973, 2000) understanding of how people's "interests and organizations" coalesced to advance "their ideas into a new public consensus" of childhood in theory (Sutherland, 1973, p. 64). They advised on how teachers were to operationalize the English-Canadian and 20th-century ideal (Gleason, 1999; Sutherland, 2000) in "the Canadian educational enterprise" (Sutherland, 1973, p. 64). In class, I "explain more clearly what was actually going on" in Canadian childhood looking "carefully at what was supposed to happen and what actually happened, both inside and outside the school, to the children involved" who were growing up (Sutherland, 1969, p. 306, 1973, 1980, 1988, 1997, 2000).

Students and I learn about how what started as accepted custom among professionals became public consensus on Canadian childhood in multiple contexts (Sutherland, 1980). Effective teacher education, according to Sutherland (1979b), requires replacement of "mythic pasts" and expected realities with "real ones" (p. 57), which informs students of the historical origins of contemporary educational problems and controversies. Therefore, students must not only understand the 20th-century English-Canadian consensus, they must identify how it falls short of benefitting all children the same. Sutherland (1992) suggests professors teach childhood history from memories in children's stories. These memories and stories can enable neophyte teachers to develop their own themes and patterns to comprehend Canadian childhood. Teachers must move away from a scope and sequence model in stilted, prepackaged, and discrete curricular units

(Patterson, 1983) that do not, "and had never done much to train the minds" schools have "served" (Sutherland, 1995a, p. 101). With a critical lens, teachers must instead "listen … to the winds of childhood" (Sutherland, 1988, 1992) as they practice.

Drawing on stories from the children Sutherland and his graduate students interviewed as part of his Canadian Childhood History Project,[ii] he shares questions similar to the ones I ask my students. For example, did "youngsters share religious experiences," and did "girls and boys share in the farm work" in similar patterns across Canada (Sutherland, 1992, p. 249)? Such stories when shared alongside students' emerging awareness of their pre-service teacher identities help them undermine their expectations for a predictable childhood development cycle propagated by "the characteristically missionary zeal and sometimes almost millennial expectations" of teachers (Sutherland, 1972, p. 313). Students can examine contexts in schools and communities to investigate how the English-Canadian 20th-century consensus affected children and youth.

Sutherland (1969, 2002) implies awareness and concern for abnormal childhood but never gives a composite of what abnormal children look like. Abnormal children are leftovers and often left behind at school. Therefore, I get students to begin to understand abnormal childhood through stories. Sutherland's (2000) invocation of the consensus led him to ask "how they [children] experienced their childhoods, how they felt about themselves and their families, and how they came to see their place in the world" (1995d, p. 94). In class, I ask students to conceptualize their own understandings of abnormality in the stories of past childhoods. There is now greater recognition that far from being deviant because of so-called deficits, the discourse of the consensus actually produces negative labels that learners carry. Certain children fell out of the norm or the consensus, as professionals and the public identified problems and sorted children accordingly (Comacchio, 2006).

By the second half of Concepts of Childhood in History, I show students what happened to children and youth labelled abnormal. Sutherland (1980) teaches that "examination of deviancy … solely from the point of view-of-society, is incomplete because it leaves out those who made a rational choice to be 'deviant'" (p. 89). This next section of my paper shows how I

illuminate how normal childhood makes children abnormal. What circumstances create abnormal children? How do children experience the identifier in their lives? Do they choose deviance while living "their lives under new arrangements" (Sutherland, 1980, p. 89)? I turn to the topic of teen pregnancy, grounding it in the language of deviance emerging in post-World War II Canada. Looking at teen pregnancy in postwar Canada can help students see who deviant children are.

Understanding deviance through ideals articulated in the consensus can enable students to understand abnormality and how children achieve this rank. Society expects teachers to correct abnormal behaviours. "Much of the work of the so-called helping professions is done in a context that lays out the prevailing situation in a field as a crisis and organizes the response to it in the form of a crusade" (Sutherland, 1979b, p. 59). Sentiments of crisis and anxiety are a legacy of the consensus; such feelings plague teachers as they manage their classes (Fleming & Smyly, 1995). The manifestations of this anxiety led to new crusades (Sutherland, 1979b) to contain and correct children wearing abnormal robes. And I choose teen pregnancy as a topic to illuminate abnormality and demonstrate how crisis and anxiety inspire new initiatives to sort, confine (Comacchio, 2006), regulate, and restore children back to the norm.

We start class with my identification of the goals of Canada's postwar professionals. The end of the war returned a lot of young men to society, and professionals feared transmission of venereal diseases and sexual disorder as a result of their return.[iii] Professionals believed they had achieved mainstream society's approval of the consensus and now turned their attention to these men identifying other abnormal behaviours and their presence in youth. They wanted to assure society that its morals would not be undermined as a result of the war. Finally, there were "calls … for public protection of disadvantaged children" (Sangster, 2003, p. 180).

Professionals now identified abnormal children and youth and their families and watched them. Teachers were part of this helping professional network. In their now lengthened teacher education programs, conferences, seminars, and professional development sessions, they learned about the presence of so-called new deviant behaviours in children and youth. Through

professionals' diagnosis of problems afflicting families, children, and youth and their responses to such surveillance, students can understand how professionals identified and treated problems.

I continue class with a review of how Sutherland's scholarly work opened the door to investigations of specific social problems connected with Canadian children and youth in the postwar years. Juvenile delinquency and its consequences emerged as a problem for practitioners. Prior to 1880, community members saw delinquency and discipline of children and youth as a private matter between parents and their dependents. However, in the 20th century, like learning, control over children's behaviour shifted from the family to the state. An emerging scholarly discourse identified fears about families living in urban Canada. As in education, this scholarly work argued for new laws to enforce a behavioural standard in children and youth. Like teachers, social workers and nurses needed to form and correct children. New and revised legislation gave a mandate to these practices (Chunn, 2003). As with education, such actions were thought to be good steps and beneficial to all children, regardless of region or place.

The state enforced a middle-class childhood model premised on ideals of heterosexual and nuclear family structures. The model ignored intergenerational learning through extended families, disregarding such knowledge as anti-modern. The nuclear family model was considered benevolent; an ideal guaranteeing harmony and perpetuating goodness.

Students learn that teachers worked with policymakers, police officers, social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, judges, and many other professionals to pass laws mandating children and youth to attend school. "Compulsory attendance laws reduced parental powers" (Chunn, 2003, p. 193) but did not guarantee parental access to resources to support their children's education. Helping professionals such as teachers collaborated to monitor movements of children and youth outside school. Once again, they replaced families' role in this responsibility. They blamed mothers for their offences, measuring theirs and the labelled deviant behaviour of their children and youth against dominant norms of masculinity and femininity (Ladd-Taylor, 1998; Sangster, 2003). They devised procedures to isolate misbehaved children and youth from society upon identification as deviant. They controlled their reintegration into mainstream society, setting the consensus as the

bar for children and youth and their families to achieve. They reunited families if the patriarchal model could be restored with a male provider and female "as nurturer and caregiver, particularly where children are concerned" (Gossage, 2003, p. 155).

Using Sutherland's (1975) professional networks model, I inform students that these professionals not only discussed these newly identified problems in their transnational networks but also worked across professions to sustain their ideals. They developed a discourse known as the threshold model, a laddered series of indicators deciding when professionals would intervene and the depth of interventions necessary (Pringle, Cameron, Durocher, & Skelton, 2010). They identified children and youth in trouble as deficient in personality, intelligence, and development. Scholars in the 1950s and 1960s were anxious about the maintenance and perpetuation of dominant norms of middle-class respectability in Canada.

Teachers and their colleagues in cognate professionals learned in their training not only how to educate children to embrace dominant ideals in the modern Canadian state, but how to help deviant children and youth accept the norms. If not, children now faced more encounters with justice and social services systems whose staff labelled them victims who needed correction. Such a label became difficult to "shake off" for the rest of their lives.

For students, Sutherland is one of the critical scholars shared in Concepts of Childhood in History who depict the lives of children and youth. Sutherland (1997) is one of many scholars (Gordon, 1988; Sangster, 2003) who try to think and feel children and youth caught in the hold of these practitioners trying to serve them. However, I tell students that Sutherland's work has shortcomings. In addition to never providing a composite of abnormal childhood, Sutherland never deliberately discusses the effects of the 20th-century English-Canadian consensus on contemporary Canadian teachers' practices. This gap provides an opportunity for me to set contexts for children to see Sutherland's consensus take shape in Canadian childhoods. This paper moves to one context, among many shared in class, that enables students to see the effects of consensus on children identified as deviant. We locate abnormal in the newly identified problem of teenage pregnancy in 1960s Canada. It is in this context that we set out to

locate abnormal childhood in class, using Sutherland's 20th-century English-Canadian consensus as our lens. We look at the topic of teenage pregnancy, identified as a social problem of young girls and boys in 1960s Canada.

Professionals identified teen pregnancy as a deficit in young women in the 1960s. This identification occurred as part of a larger discourse about "[t]he damaged psyches of … young women" that prior to this decade found "little comprehension in … medical and psychiatric writing" (Sangster, 2003, p. 177). However, identification of the problem would not be liberating for these pregnant teens. Like their friends before the justice system, they faced judgment for behaving in an "unchild-like manner" (Chunn, 2003, p. 195). To correct this deficit, they needed removal to a "child-appropriate" environment with extra surveillance. In the case of pregnant teenagers, the environment was birthing homes established to help women pregnant out of wedlock. I suggest to students that cases of teenage pregnancy become, like many other forms of child deviance, "parables for anxieties about the nation" (Janovicek, 2003, p. 145).

We then view a clip from 1964, implying teenage pregnancy as a new Canadian social problem of public concern. Produced by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) on December 8, 1964 as an episode of the show *Take 30*, the hosts introduce Little Betty who is "pregnant, unmarried, and planning to give her child up for adoption." She is one of many girls living in birthing homes across Canada "away from public view" and waiting for her child's birth (CBC, 2014, para. 1). We watch the home's operator Sister St. Francis and Betty discuss how this system of care for youth works. I ask students to consider how the dominant society—represented by Sister St. Francis—view teenage pregnancy and how youth—represented by Betty—think about pregnancy out of wedlock. This episode of *Take 30* locates abnormal childhood and illuminates how it is understood by a helping professional—Sister St. Francis—and a teenager, the abnormal child Betty.

Lessons for students to consider revolve around the consensus, and the threshold accompanying it. The threshold or bar was the norm children and youth crossed over in their development into adulthood. Youth in the 1960s became abnormal when they tripped over it. Little Betty behaved abnormally because she was not dependent on her parents to guide her teenage development.

Like many girls, she formed a relationship that resulted in a child. Outside of marriage and work, there was no prospect to support the child. The hosts and Sister St. Francis implied that parents became anxious about their daughters' marriage prospects and sons' abilities to support a wife and children, their new responsibilities.

I ask my pre-service teacher candidates to watch Sister St. Francis carefully to understand her culpability in setting up an isolated space for abnormal youth, helping to restore the norm of parental authority and perpetuating gendered and heterosexualized norms of behaviour. I ask them to consider where such norms originate. Are professionals like Sister St. Francis really focused on "doing good" in society or are they instead behaving according to their own anxieties as practitioners unable to enforce their standards for orderly development of children and their families? The pregnancy is out of the scope and sequence of appropriate childlike behaviour. After her child's birth, and her placement of her newborn with adoptive parents, Betty returns home dependent again on her parents. This context asks students to reflect on whose anxieties and deficits become priorities and get attention in the practices of the birthing home confining Betty.

Sutherland's identification of the 20th-century English-Canadian consensus and subsequent scholarly work showing the often negative effects of the consensus on children and their families helps students understand where philosophies and so-called promising practices begin. They can see how professionals integrate ideas into practice that become lived as ideals by Canadians. Sutherland's work helps us locate abnormal children such as Little Betty who finds herself pregnant in Toronto, Ontario, in 1964. She is outside the norm of childhood dependence. The adversity is the result of a consensus that made her abnormal in the eyes of the public, the Catholic Church, and her family. Teacher effectiveness requires candidates attentive to the historical contours of normal childhood. Students must be active in their identification of where norms begin. They must work with me to debunk the so-called timeless childhood that has not always existed.

My Concepts of Childhood in History course is an elective part of my university's teacher education program; my pre-service teacher candidates are able to identify where their practices and the structure of education originate as a result of taking my class. It

uses Sutherland's scholarly work about the emerging consensus of childhood and youth, framed as a norm developed in a timely era of social and cultural change in Canada that became a timeless ideal to be emulated by teachers and the families and communities they served. Theory and practice coalesced around the ideals but unfortunately, pre-service teachers do not know its history prior to taking my course. Earlier (Anuik, 2013), I asked teachers to revisit their identities, especially as nurturing guides who nurture learning. In that piece and this one, I ask teachers to connect the 20th-century English-Canadian consensus enumerated by Sutherland with their own understandings of being a mentor and nurturing guide. Although nurturing children and learning is the teacher's duty, effective teaching does more than just reinforce norms and animate the 20th-century consensus of English-Canadian childhood. Teachers must understand that their education has inadvertently enabled them to identify abnormality and abnormal children and youth.

Concepts of Childhood in History shows incidents when children and youth resisted the consensus; such acts are often labelled misbehaviour. Teachers must understand learners' sources and domains of knowledge, the experiences of communities with learning, and the memories of learners and their families' encounters with educational institutions.[iv] Sutherland's scholarly work proposes a new way forward for teacher education. Instead of just locating abnormal in a deficit frame, where learners are sorted and confined (Comacchio, 2006), teachers should research children's sources and domains of knowledge, the authorities in communities, and the presence of mentors and nurturing guides (First Nations Holistic Lifelong Learning Model, 2007; Métis Holistic Lifelong Learning Model, 2007). There are always structures in growing up; teachers and their allies in cognate professions, although currently responsible for enforcing the 20th-century English-Canadian consensus, are not solely responsibility for mapping this terrain.

Locating abnormal childhood affords teacher educators and pre-service teachers the chance to ask new questions. I close this paper with these questions because I think they are a shared responsibility for all educators to contemplate as they practice.

1. Do teachers animate a consensus about Canadian childhood in their practice?

2. Do teachers include everyone in this consensus?
3. Does everyone understand teachers' roles the same?
4. Do curriculum and other forms of educational media reflect Sutherland's 20th-century English-Canadian consensus?
5. Could curriculum and practices reflect different perspectives of normal childhood?
6. Does an abnormal childhood drop out of normal childhood when educators define achievement and benchmark standards?
7. Do teachers inadvertently cast the abnormal child as an "other" when they set up lesson plans?
8. Is there always going to be a requirement to locate abnormal childhood when revising and reshaping norms of childhood?

The questions I pose to close this paper behoove all teachers to work collaboratively to clarify how abnormal children get extracted from the norm. Finally, in locating abnormal childhood, Sutherland provides the best compass to get to that place where teachers can contemplate their roles as helpers and nurturers in the space of a consensus model of childhood.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. L. (2003). Sex at the board, or keeping children from sexual knowledge. In N. Janovicek & J. Parr (Eds.), *Histories of Canadian children and youth* (pp. 291-304). Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Anuik, J. (2013). Teachers and gender and sexuality: Lessons on place and citizenship from Concepts of Childhood in Canadian History. In T. Christou & S. Bullock (Eds.), *Foundations in teacher education: A Canadian perspective* (Canadian Research in Teacher Education: A Polygraph Series) (pp. 8-18). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/a/ualberta.ca/file/d/0B2i27L6z1IlUTHl5OTFZN2lFdkU/edit

Barman, J., & Sutherland, N. (1995). Royal Commission retrospective. In J. Barman, N. Sutherland, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Children, teachers and schools in the history of*

British Columbia (pp. 411-426). Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises.

Barman, J., Sutherland, N., & Wilson, J. D. (1995). Introduction. In J. Barman, N. Sutherland, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Children, teachers and schools in the history of British Columbia* (pp. xi-xiii). Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises.

Battiste, M. (2000). Maintaining Aboriginal identity, language and culture in modern society. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 192–208). Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.

Battiste, M. (1986). Mi'kmaq literacy and cognitive assimilation. In J. Barman, Y. Hébert, & D. McCaskill (Eds.), *Indian education in Canada: Volume 1: The legacy* (Nakoda Institute Occasional Papers) (pp. 23–44). Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.

Bryan, G. J. (1906). *I. Alberta Normal School: Principal's report*. In *Alberta Normal School Reports 1906-1920*. In R. S. Patterson, S. Jamieson, & University of Alberta. Faculty of Education. (199-?). *Teacher education: Topics in the history of education in western Canada: A skill centred approach*. Edmonton, Canada: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. (2014). Take 30: Talking teen pregnancy. *CBC Digital Archives—Take 30—Take 30: Talking Teen Pregnancy*. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/player/Digital+Archives/CBC+Programs/ID/1855205267/

Chunn, D. (2003). Boys will be men, girls will be mothers: The legal regulation of childhood in Toronto and Vancouver. In N. Janovicek & J. Parr (Eds.), *Histories of Canadian childhood and youth* (pp. 188-206). Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Comacchio, C. (2006). *The dominion of youth: Adolescence and the making of modern Canada, 1920-1950* (Studies in Childhood and Family in Canada, C. Comacchio, Series Ed.). Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

First Nations holistic lifelong learning model. (2007). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Council on Learning. Retrieved from http://ineducation.ca/ineducation/article/view/196/698

Fleming, T., & Smyly, C. (1995). The diary of Mary Williams: A cameo of rural schooling in British Columbia, 1922-1924. In J. Barman, N. Sutherland, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Children, teachers and schools in the history of British Columbia* (pp. 259-284). Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises.

Gleason, M. L. (1999). *Normalizing the ideal: Psychology, schooling, and the family in postwar Canada*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Gordon, L. (1988). *Heroes of their own lives: The politics and history of family violence: Boston, 1880-1960*. New York, NY: Viking.

Gossage, P. (2003). *La marâtre*: Maria-Anne Houde and the myth of the wicked stepmother in Quebec. In N. Janovicek & J. Parr (Eds.), *Histories of Canadian children and youth* (pp. 147-166). Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Janovicek, N. (2003). "Let's talk about sex": Learning about sexuality, 1950-1984. In N. Janovicek & J. Parr (Eds.), *Histories of Canadian children and youth* (pp. 289-290). Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Ladd-Taylor, M. (Ed.) (1998). *"Bad" mothers: The politics of blame in twentieth-century America*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Métis holistic lifelong learning model. (2007). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Council on Learning. Retrieved from http://firstnationspedagogy.ca/CCL_Learning_Model_MET.pdf

Patterson, R. S. (1983). *Go, grit and gumption: A normal school perspective on teacher education* (McCalla Lecture Series in Education). Edmonton, Canada: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Pringle, B., Cameron, H., Durocher, A., & Skelton, C. (2010). *Saskatchewan child welfare review panel report: For the good of our children and youth: A new vision, a new direction*.

Sangster, J. (2003). Incest, the sexual abuse of children, and the power of familialism. In N. Janovicek & J. Parr (Eds.), *Histories of Canadian children and youth* (pp. 167-184). Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Sutherland, N. (2004). Children. In G. Hallowell (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to Canadian history* (pp. 125-126). Toronto, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Sutherland, N. (2002). Popular media in the culture of English-Canadian children in the twentieth century. *Historical Studies in Education, 14*(1), 1-33.

Sutherland, N. (2000). *Children in English-Canadian society: Framing the twentieth-century consensus* (C. Comacchio, Foreword). Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Sutherland, N. (1997). *Growing up: Childhood in English-Canada from the Great War to the Age of Television*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Sutherland, N. (1995a). The triumph of "formalism": Elementary schooling in Vancouver from the 1920s to the 1960s. In J. Barman, N. Sutherland, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Children, teachers and schools in the history of British Columbia* (pp. 101-124). Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises.

Sutherland, N. (1995b). Reflections on a century of Canadian childhood. In J. Barman, N. Sutherland, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Children, teachers and schools in the history of British Columbia* (pp. 175-187). Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises.

Sutherland, N. (1995c). "I can't recall when I didn't help": The working lives of the children of modern pioneers. In J. Barman, N. Sutherland, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Children, teachers and schools in the history of British Columbia* (pp. 125-146). Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises.

Sutherland, N. (1995d). "Everyone seemed happy in those days": The culture of childhood in Vancouver between the 1920s and the 1960s. In J. Barman, N. Sutherland, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Children, teachers and schools in the history of British Columbia* (pp. 81-100). Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises.

Sutherland, N. (1992). When you listen to the winds of childhood, how much can you believe? *Curriculum Inquiry, 22*(3), 235-256.

Sutherland, N. (1990). "We always had things to do": The paid and unpaid work of Anglophone children between the 1920s and the 1960s. *Labour/Le Travail, 25*, 105-141.

Sutherland, N. (1989). "One, two, three, alary": Vancouver school grounds between the 1920's and the 1960's. *British Columbia Historical News, 22*(2), 23-24.

Sutherland, N. (1988). Listening to the winds of childhood: The role of memory in the history of education. *Canadian History of Education Association Bulletin, 5*(1), 5-29.

Sutherland, N. (1980). Social policy, "deviant" children, and the public health apparatus in British Columbia between the wars. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 14*(2), 80-91.

Sutherland, N. (1979a). The history of Canadian children: Some notes for the International Year of the Child. *CSSE news/nouvelles CSSE, 6*(2), 3-8.

Sutherland, N. (1979b). The history of childhood: Some notes on the Canadian experience. *Canadian Home Economics Journal, 29*(1), 57-60.

Sutherland, N. (1975). Introduction: Towards a history of English-Canadian youngsters. In M. B. Katz & P. H. Mattingly (Eds.), *Education and social change: Themes from Ontario's past* (pp. xi-xxxi). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Sutherland, N. (1973). Albert School, Saint John, N.B.: A case study of urban schooling in the 1890's. *The Journal of Education at the Faculty of Education, Vancouver, 19*, 63-73.

Sutherland, N. (1972). "To create a strong and healthy race": School children in the public health movement, 1880-1914. *History of Education Quarterly, 12*(3), 304-333.

Sutherland, N. (1970a). *When grandma and grandpa were kids: Teachers' guide* (Gage World Community Studies, N. Sutherland, Gen. Ed.). Toronto, Canada: W.J. Gage.

Sutherland, N. (1970b). *When grandma and grandpa were kids* (A Gage World Community Study, N. Sutherland, Gen. Ed.). Toronto, Canada: W.J. Gage Limited.

Sutherland, N. (1969). The urban child. *History of Education Quarterly, 9*(3), 305-311.

Sutherland, N., & Deyell, E. (1967). *Making Canadian history: A source-guide book in Canadian history (book 2)*. Toronto, Canada: W.J. Gage Limited.

Sutherland, N., & Deyell, E. (1966). *Making Canadian history: A source-guide book in Canadian history (book 1)*. Toronto, Canada: W.J. Gage Limited.

Wilson, J. D., & Stortz, P. J. (1995). "May the Lord have mercy on you": The rural school problem in British Columbia in the 1920s. In J. Barman, N. Sutherland, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Children, teachers and schools in the history of British Columbia* (pp. 209-233). Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises.

---

[i] See also Sutherland (2004).

[ii] Sutherland (1988) describes the project and its significance in understanding the history of childhood.

[iii] See Adams (2003).

[iv] These ideas originate in the First Nations Holistic Lifelong Learning Model (2007).

This paper originated as my contribution to a tribute session to Neil Sutherland, titled "Ring around the Maple": Round Table on Neil Sutherland and the History of Children/Childhood in Canada, at the 2012 biennial meeting of the Canadian History of Education Association (CHEA) in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. I thank Cynthia Comacchio and Mona Gleason for putting the panel together and my co-panelists, Comacchio, Gleason, Jean Barman, and Alessandra Iozzo-Duval. They and participants in the session helped me refine my ideas about Sutherland and Canadian pre-service teacher education. I have also delivered portions of this paper at the 2014 CHEA meeting in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan and the 2015 meeting of the Canadian Peace Research Association in Ottawa, Ontario. I also thank participants at these conferences for their feedback. I owe my greatest gratitude to students who have taken Concepts of Childhood in History over the last five years.

About the Author:

Jonathan Anuik is an assistant professor in the Educational Policy Studies department at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. His research interests are First Nations, Métis, and Inuit education policy and history, nourishing the learning spirit, and the pedagogy of the history of education in Canadian teacher education.
Email: anuik@ualberta.ca