

Historical Studies in Education / Revue d'histoire de l'éducation
ARTICLES / ARTICLES

“Children who drill, seldom are ill.”
Drill, Movement and Sport: The Rise and Fall of a
‘Female Tradition’ in Ontario Elementary Physical
Education — 1850s to 2000

Nancy R. Francis and Anna H. Lathrop

Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada

ABSTRACT:

This paper presents an analysis of the Province of Ontario’s elementary school physical education curriculum with respect to the dominant discourses that framed policy documents from the 1850s to 2000. Through an examination of curriculum documents, archival materials, and interviews with former teachers and lecturers, the paper argues that a male-centered physical education agenda, dominated by fitness and competitive sport, eclipsed a female-centered tradition, characterized by more broadly conceived movement curriculum of dance, games and gymnastics. This paper examines these competing ideologies in the waves of curriculum reform that characterized Ontario elementary school physical education curriculum during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

RÉSUMÉ:

Cet article présente une analyse des programmes ontariens d’éducation physique au niveau élémentaire en regard de l’idéologie dominante qui oriente les politiques institutionnelles de 1850 à 2000. À l’aide des différents programmes, de documents d’archives et d’entretiens avec des enseignants de différentes époques, l’auteur soutient que des activités de conception virile tels les exercices physiques et les sports de compétition supplantent chez les filles une tradition d’exercices basés sur la danse, les jeux et la gymnastique. Cet article étudie ces idéologies concurrentes dans les différents programmes d’éducation physique qui prévalaient dans les écoles publiques de la province de l’Ontario aux XIX^e et XX^e siècles.

Notwithstanding two decades of philosophical support for “quality daily physical education” and five years of mandated but non-resourced “daily physical activity” in the Ontario school curricula, statistics indicate that 28 percent of Ontario’s children “are facing a dark future”¹ due to their overweight or obese physical conditions. Contributing to this issue is that 91 percent of Canadian children and youth fail to

meet the activity guidelines necessary for optimal growth and development as established in *Canada's Physical Activity Guidelines for Children and Youth*.² Exacerbating the challenge is the troubling situation of school physical education, which was graded by the *Active Healthy Kids Canada Report Card* in 2009 to be a C minus due to the paucity of physical education specialists and the small proportion of students taking physical education at the secondary school level.³

Despite efforts to broaden the scope of the physical education curriculum to encompass “active living, movement, personal and social responsibility, and leadership and community involvement”⁴ feminist curriculum theorists in Australia, Britain, Canada and the United States continue to raise concerns that young girls are particularly at risk due to the kind of physical activity programming that *is* offered in schools. These scholars argue that contemporary models of school physical education are still equated with sport education, and that sport-dominated physical education curricula produces and legitimizes patriarchal definitions of masculinity and femininity.⁵ Furthermore, scholars argue that highly competitive school sport programs do not interest young girls who emotionally and physically disengage from or drop out of these activities.⁶

With tremendous optimism, the Province of Ontario's Ministry of Education, Gerard Kennedy, announced in 2005 that a new “Healthy Schools Program” would require every elementary student to participate in a minimum of twenty minutes of daily physical activity. Kennedy's comment that “Ontario's elementary students will be dancing, jumping, walking and leaping their way to improved fitness and student achievement” is particularly striking in light of the decades long impact of conservative and patriarchal influences on this school subject.⁷

Gender and the Social Construction of the Subject

As Foucault and Goodson⁸ suggest, the evolution of school curriculum reflects shifting patterns of cultural contexts and competing power groups. School curriculum, they argue, is a contested terrain where one set of knowledge and beliefs are valued, and others are not. The history of curriculum development must therefore take into account both the social construction of the subject, as well as the social construction of other cultural factors. Gender is a cultural factor that has a profound impact upon school curriculum⁹ and as Vertinsky¹⁰ observes, of all the school subjects, physical education with its emphasis on the body, has been the most influenced by belief systems about gender and biological difference.

This article parallels the scholarship of Jan Wright who examined physical education curriculum in New South Wales, Australia, from 1880–1980, and David Kirk and Sheila Fletcher¹¹ who investigated the social construction of physical education in post-war Britain. In each case, these scholars examined physical education curricular history as it was influenced by a “female tradition” that emerged in the English primary schools and colleges of physical training during the 1940s and 1950s. Similarly, this paper will examine three major periods of physical education curricular history in Ontario, from the 1850s to 2000, with attention to educational

goals, pedagogy and gendered features. In order to reflect the educational philosophy of these three periods, we draw upon national policy documents, provincial curriculum guidelines, published discourse in professional and scholarly journals, and interviews with former teachers and lecturers.¹² The first period, from 1850 to 1950, documents the rise of formal schooling in Ontario, with a gender-specific curricular emphasis upon drill and physical training for health, moral development and national defense purposes. The paramilitary flavour of this approach dominated a century of curriculum history. In the 1950s, however, Ontario physical education felt the impact of a female tradition from England, with its emphasis on movement education for boys and girls, designed to enhance creativity, self-expression and the development of broadly-defined physical literacy skills. This period lasted approximately two decades (1950s–1970s), until elementary school physical education curriculum once again returned to a more narrowly defined notion of fitness and competitive sport, which privileges a male-centered model of physical activity choices. Thus offering a unique perspective, this paper traces the rise and fall of a female tradition in Ontario physical education.

Drill, Training and Discipline (1850s to 1950s)

By the mid nineteenth century, the system of physical training most widely adopted by the common and grammar schools of Upper Canada¹³ reflected the characteristics of “the Ryerson System,” a system of drill, gymnastics and calisthenics attributed to the influence of Upper Canada’s first superintendent of education, Egerton Ryerson.¹⁴ Initially appointed in 1844, Ryerson travelled extensively in Europe to examine educational curriculum, and was influenced by educators such as Johann Pestalozzi, Friedrich Jahn, Per Henrik Ling and Johann Guts Muths. He was impressed with systems of European gymnastics and English sports that advocated physical training for health and national defense purposes.¹⁵ As Prentice suggested, Ryerson was an early school promoter who viewed schools as agents of social change with the potential to bridge the gap between the poor and the elite. He placed great emphasis upon the principle of universal education, and, like other mid-century middle-class school promoters, believed education would mitigate the vices of “materialism, ignorance and crime.”¹⁶ Familiar with European systems of gymnastics and concerned about Civil War tensions from United States, Ryerson was also influenced by the English cult of athleticism—popularized by the English novel, *Tom Brown’s Schooldays*. Physical training was viewed as an important means for instilling in boys the “masculine” traits of courage, self-reliance, sportsmanship and school loyalty.¹⁷

In his *Report on a System of Public Elementary Instruction for Upper Canada*, in 1847, Ryerson identified the physical and social benefits of physical training—specifically gymnastics—for elementary school children:

A system of instruction making no provision for those exercises which contribute to health and vigour of body, and to agreeable-ness of manners, must necessarily be imperfect. The active pursuits of most of those pupils who

attend the Public Schools, require the exercise necessary to bodily health; but the gymnastics, regularly taught as a recreation, and with a view to the future pursuits of the pupil, and to which so much importance is attached in the best British Schools and in the Schools of Germany and France, are advantageous in various respects, promote not only physical health and vigour, but social cheerfulness, active, easy and graceful movements. They strengthen and give the pupil a perfect command over all the members of his body. Like the art of writing, they proceed from the simplest movement, to the most complex and difficult exercises, imparting a bodily activity and skill scarcely credible to those who have not witnessed them.¹⁸

In order to educate teachers in this subject content, a series of Normal Schools was established throughout the province. The Toronto Normal School opened in 1847, followed by schools for teacher training in Ottawa (1875); Hamilton, Peterborough, and Stratford (1908); and North Bay (1909). These Normal schools offered courses that included physiology and hygiene; breathing exercises; exercises for the leg, arm, neck and trunk; tactics (military drill); recreative gymnastics; and indoor and outdoor games.¹⁹ Ryerson published articles in the *Journal of Education for Upper Canada* that described gymnastic exercises on the horse and horizontal bar, and he promoted military instruction in the schools.²⁰ Men received instruction in drill and women received instruction in calisthenics for at least two hours per week. The textbooks employed to teach these subjects included Charles Spencer's *Field Exercises and Evolutions of Infantry Drill* and *The Modern Gymnast*, both published in England.²¹

Ryerson's drill and physical training system was also designed to educate children about the importance of discipline and moral values. He believed, "physical weakness produces moral evil, and no moral treatment can be successful which overlooks physical causes."²² The boys' curriculum consisted of military drill (tactics and marching formations) with additional attention to gymnastics. Girls were taught light calisthenics and encouraged to improve posture and grace through the use of "back-boards" and light apparatus. Although inclusive of girls, Ryerson's system of training was gender specific:

Though girls neither require the same robust exercise nor rough sports, to develop their frames and fit them for the duties of life, as boys, yet the system of education which omits or slightly provides for their physical training, is most radically defective. In addition to such of the apparatus already enumerated, and others proper for both sexes, those more peculiarly adapted for their wants should be provided. In this point of view, light dumb bells are best calculated, if properly used, to strengthen the arms and expand the chest. The long back-board is also well calculated to expand the chest and give litheness and grace to all the movements of the arms and bust.²³

In 1879, the first formal guide for physical training instruction in the public schools of Ontario was published by James L. Hughes who had served as the Inspector of

Public Schools for Toronto since 1874. His training manual, entitled *Drill and Calisthenics Containing Squad Drill, Calisthenics, Free gymnastics, Vocal Exercises, German Calisthenics, Movement Songs, the Pocket Gymnasium and Kindergarten Games and Songs* was adopted by the Ontario Teachers' Association, and became the "official programme" of student training for Public Schools in Ontario.²⁴ Despite the expansive title, military drill remained the focus for boys with some attention devoted to calisthenics, games and songs for girls. By this time, drill and calisthenics were compulsory subjects in the public schools of Ontario. Consistent with the philosophy of the Ryerson system, Hughes' text reflected the belief that both boys and girls were to be educated in the "proper use" of drill and calisthenics for moral character and disciplinary purposes in order to convey habits of "order, regularity, silence, obedience, neatness, attention, steadiness and method."²⁵ As Hughes reported, "You should reckon the discipline of a school imperfect in which a certain amount of drill is not part of the school routine."²⁶

With the publication of E.B. Houghton's text in 1886, *Physical Culture: First Book of Exercises in Drill, Calisthenics and Gymnastics*, physical activities for girls and women were slightly extended to include dumb-bell exercises, postural positions and dance, in addition to Indian club work and calisthenics. Houghton argued; "The physical education of both sexes deserves the greatest attention, and it is unpardonable to neglect that of girls."²⁷ Houghton was a retired physical training instructor from Chatham, Ontario, and by 1887 his text was recommended for use in Toronto and Ottawa Normal Schools, and in the school systems they served. Divided equally into sections for boys and girls, the instructional content included drill, calisthenics, and gymnastics, with the recommendation that both sexes receive thirty minutes of daily physical activity, five days a week. Although *Physical Culture* was the first text in Canada to devote nearly half of its content to the issue of physical training for girls, once again, the curriculum was gender-specific, with calisthenics and Indian club work as the primary forms of activity encouraged for girls. Although Houghton included drill as a form of exercise suitable for both boys and girls, the option of drill for girls was indicative of concerns about the health and hygiene of young women. As a poetic insert entitled "Little People at Play" in Ryerson's *The Journal of Education for Upper Canada* attested, it was believed that drill also offered young children the health benefits of disease prevention:

Children who drill
Seldom are ill,
For sinking, tiptoeing, and right and left going,
And shouting and clapping, and measured out tapping,
Strengthen their limbs,
Drive away whims,
Make faces shine brightly, make spines grow uprightly;
So, I suppose,
Illness all goes.
Children who learn

Bodies to turn,
 And bodies to bend low, and noddles to send low,
 And elbows to fetch out, and fingers to stretch out,
 Seldom look pale,
 Delicate, frail,
 And seldom are sulky, and seldom too bulky,
 And seldom are spiteful but always delightful,
 So then we will
 Beg leave to drill.²⁸

Houghton's text, evident from the title, also marked a transition in the naming of systems of physical activities. While gymnastics and exercises of a functional nature had previously been referred to as systems of "physical training," with the addition of aesthetic and expressive components (exclusively for girls), the popular term shifted to "physical culture."²⁹ Both Hughes and Houghton's texts were extensively used in Ontario's schooling system, and by 1909, almost half of all Ontario elementary pupils were reported to have received some instruction in physical training.³⁰

By the turn of the century, the paramilitary flavour of physical training in the schools of Ontario (and Canada) was further reinforced by the Province's endorsement of the Strathcona Trust. This Trust, originally established in 1909 by Sir Frederick Borden, the Federal Minister of Militia, was a fund of \$500,000.00 donated by Lord Strathcona to encourage physical and military training in the public schools across Canada. The funds from this trust merely extended the connection (which had already been in effect since 1890) between the Federal Department of Militia and the Ontario Department of Education, through monetary grants to secondary schools for holding classes in drill.³¹ By 1911, funds from the Strathcona Trust were directed to pay for drill instruction, drill competitions, and the purchase of physical training syllabi—notably, the 1909 (and later 1911 and 1933) *Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools*—a British publication based on the Swedish system of exercises and widely adopted by the British navy and army. As Morton noted, the Strathcona Trust became the most widely taught physical training curriculum in Canadian educational history, and one that had "far-reaching influence."³² According to feminist historians Lenskyj and Keyes, it was also a program that deprived girls' physical education of material resources and represented a giant step backward for child-centred education. As Lenskyj argued, "a school system which equated sports with manly sports and physical training with military training was a system which perpetuated the values of patriarchy."³³

Not all physical educators, however, were pleased with the military emphasis that physical education had come to represent by the early decades of the twentieth century. As early as 1933, with the initial founding of the Canadian Physical Education Association, Dr. Arthur Stanley Lamb critiqued what he called the "tin soldier" approach to physical education, arguing in favour of the value of play, games and sport in the curriculum. At the inaugural meeting, he referred to the "national crisis" in Canadian physical education:

Then, coming closer home, what are some of the traditional beliefs about physical education in Canada? First, perhaps, that it is not education but “training” or “culture” words in connection with physical education over which savor of the quack, the charlatan, the strong man. Training for what? Culture of what? For what? Then again, smartness, discipline, obedience, and strength are claimed as values and also “it keeps children out of mischief and makes them healthy.” It is often looked upon as an addendum, a frill, an extra, and all that is necessary is to have some ignoramus snap out a few commands, strut about like a powder [*sic*] pigeon, and treat the children like so many automatic tin soldiers. God forbid that this constructed, limited, narrow archaic point of view should be further perpetuated. The Department of Militia and Defence and the Strathcona Trust have done such irreparable harm to Canada in promulgating such false and imbecilic notions regarding the place that physical education should play in education.³⁴

Despite Lamb’s lament, the military-oriented philosophy of the Strathcona Trust dominated the Canadian physical education landscape in the years leading up to World War I, and it continued well into the 1930s and 1940s. In 1933, at the 72nd Annual meeting of the Ontario Educational Association, physical education instructors from Normal and private teacher training academies gathered to share the latest subject content. Variations of gymnastics (fundamental, Danish and German) were the primary content featured at the conference. Notably, students and staff from the Margaret Eaton School, a private women’s school that specialized in physical education teacher training, presented demonstrations of German gymnastics and “corrective work.”³⁵ Throughout the 1940s, most Canadian provinces adopted and used the 1933 British Board of Education’s *Syllabus for Physical Training* for primary school physical education, with its drill, calisthenics, and command-style lesson format. In Ontario, although the Department of Education’s *Programme of Studies For Grade I to VI of the Public and Separate Schools* argued that physical activities for physical training should be “joyous and disciplined, providing for vigorous and happy self-expression, not suppression,” this publication offered very little content in the area of games and dance, and ultimately deferred to the *Syllabus for Physical Training* as the model for curricular content.³⁶

In 1943, with the passage of the National Fitness Act (under the direction of Major Ian Eisenhardt), a national fund was established in order to promote the fitness of Canadian youth through the provision of facilities and the training of teachers in the principles of physical education and physical fitness. The Act, however, did little to revitalize physical education in the schools.³⁷ As late as the 1940s and early 1950s, the use of “squads, straight lines, and precision in physical-education classes” dominated physical education.³⁸ In 1954, the curriculum presented in *Physical Education in the Rural Schools* (a text published by the Ontario Department of Education in conjunction with the Strathcona Trust, designed for rural schools in Ontario), advocated the use of “class quickeners” in order to “stimulate alertness and speed.” As the text described, these quickening drills were believed to “arouse the pupils’ mentality and create a more lively class attitude.”³⁹

Movement, Education and Self-expression (1950s–1970s)

After a century of physical education curriculum characterized by drill, training and discipline, by the middle of the twentieth century, the emphasis of primary school physical education curriculum in Ontario was poised to change. In a pattern similar to Australian physical education curriculum development,⁴⁰ Canadian curricula was profoundly influenced by the development of physical education curriculum in England, and was subsequently impacted by significant changes that occurred in English primary schools and colleges of physical education training during the 1940s and 1950s. As numerous scholars have noted, this period in England witnessed the rise of two conflicting visions of physical education curriculum.⁴¹

According to Fletcher⁴² a female tradition of physical education evolved during the late 1800s in England, stimulated by the growth of a number of private women's colleges that adopted a physical activity curriculum designed for and by women. Madame Bergman-Osterberg, founder of Dartford College for women argued:

Let us once for all discard man as a physical trainer of woman. Let us send the drill sergeant [*sic*] right-about-face to his awkward squad. This work we women do better, as our very success in training depends upon our having felt like women.⁴³ The curriculum offered by the early women's colleges for physical training at Dartford, Bedford and Anstey included Swedish gymnastics (for educational, remedial and aesthetic purposes) and English games. During the 1920s, the curriculum in these women's colleges of physical education expanded to include educational gymnastics, dancing, teaching practice, clinic work and games.

By the 1940s, the influence of a female tradition of physical education curriculum in England was still evident, as subject content evolved away from Swedish (Ling) Gymnastics, rooted in a medical model of control toward a more gender-inclusive child-centred philosophy of education through movement. The therapeutic influence of the Ling system was eclipsed by the rise of a humanistic philosophy of education and by the arrival of Central European dance.⁴⁴ The impact of the work of Rudolf Laban, an Austro-Hungarian dancer who emigrated to England during World War II, contributed to the emergence of modern educational dance and educational gymnastics as content areas in the women's colleges for physical training during the 1940s and 1950s.⁴⁵ The debate in England with regard to the merits of the "Laban influence" in physical education curriculum was quite heated, because the subject content of dance and gymnastics were applied to co-educational primary and secondary school contexts. Observing that the application of Laban's movement themes to gymnastics aroused suspicion among male physical education specialists because of the system's affiliation with dance, McIntosh described the controversy as "sex-linked."⁴⁶ Although educational gymnastics was largely adopted by women's colleges of physical education in England, men's colleges of education—specializing in physical education—generally resisted. Ruth Morison, Deputy Principal of I.M.

Marsh College of Physical Education in Liverpool, lauded the educational gymnastics approach, and published two texts on the subject.⁴⁷ A.D. Munrow, Director of the Department of Physical Education at Birmingham University, criticized the approach, fearing that a movement curriculum would be particularly dangerous for young boys who would suffer from a lack of rigorous training and specific skill acquisition.⁴⁸ As Fletcher observed, the “Movement/Anti Movement” battle raged in England for over twenty years.⁴⁹

During the 1950s, the primary schools of England began to adopt Laban-based movement content in physical education curriculum. The Ministry of Education published *Moving and Growing: Physical Education in Primary School, Part 1* in 1952,⁵⁰ and *Planning the Programme: Physical Education in the Primary School, Part II* in 1953.⁵¹ These two seminal guidelines advocated movement-based content, and marked a dramatic departure from the former military emphasis on drill, posture and Swedish exercise. Describing “movement as an art,”⁵² and depicting boys and girls in co-educational class settings, these texts encouraged teachers to abandon the 1933 *Syllabus of Physical Training’s* list of suggested exercises and lessons. The new movement curriculum consisted of equal representation for activities such as dance and dramatic movement as well as games and educational gymnastics, and emphasized the pedagogy of child-centred exploration, self-expression, and open-ended tasks rather than formalized responses to commands. *Moving and Growing* described the “PT lesson” as “being concerned with the grammar of movement,” with an emphasis on the acquisition of a wide knowledge of physical activities.⁵³ *Planning the Programme*, the companion volume, described the implementation of these lessons, and employed the terminology, popularized by Rudolf Laban, used to describe the characteristics of movement based upon the descriptors of “strength,” “time,” “space” and “flow.”⁵⁴

After World War II, a number of English teachers familiar with the Laban-based work in physical education immigrated to Canada. These educators wished to promote the movement-based curriculum in the primary schools. The majority of these advocates were women. In Ontario, through the influence of English-trained educators such as Nora Chatwin, Rose Hill, and Mary Liddell, together with local administrators and teachers who supported this new approach, the next two decades of primary physical education curriculum were profoundly influenced by the Laban-influenced tradition of movement education.⁵⁵ In 1944, the Ontario Department of Education established a Physical Education Branch in order to promote physical education curriculum in the school system. Under this new administrative arm, physical education administrators developed new curriculum for the elementary and secondary school system, and initiated new in-service teacher training incentives across the province.

Early changes in the primary school curriculum of Ontario during the 1950s toward a gender inclusive movement-based curriculum were initiated by Gordon Wright, the Director of the newly established Physical Education Branch for Ontario from 1947 to 1962, and by Nora Chatwin, who was appointed the first elementary school consultant for the Province in 1952. Chatwin, a graduate of Edgehill Teacher

Training College in Liverpool, England, immigrated to Canada in 1946. She had previously taught in various primary schools in Manchester, England, and was first introduced to movement education through Elsie Palmer, the Physical Education Organizer for the County of Lancashire.⁵⁶ Given her early teaching experience in England, Wright believed that Chatwin's appointment as the Elementary School Consultant for the Province would allow her to promote the movement work in the primary schools of Ontario.⁵⁷

In 1957, the Ontario Ministry of Education launched a series of summer school courses designed to update teachers in the field and to allow specialist certification.⁵⁸ This certification was expanded to include an elementary school focus in physical education. The selection of training staff for these physical education summer courses fell to Chatwin, who ensured that its graduates possessed a knowledge of up-to-date teaching methods, and a familiarity with the new movement curriculum from England.⁵⁹ In addition to teacher training initiatives, provincial curriculum guidelines for the elementary grades written between the mid 1950s and the 1970s also began to reflect the influence of the movement-based curriculum. In 1956, the Ontario Department of Education published *Primary Division Physical Education: Outline of Courses for Experimental Use*. Written by Chatwin, this guideline acknowledged that teachers in the province were beginning to experiment with an indirect method of teaching movement. The goals of the physical education program were designed to foster healthy growth and development, build fundamental movement skills, and promote social, mental and emotional health. This curriculum presented an outline of appropriate primary school physical education content for grades 1 to 5, which included fundamental and dramatic movement, creative dance, and cooperative games. The guideline further stated that children needed the freedom to develop their own "vocabulary of movement."⁶⁰ For the first time in the province, the term "creative dance" appeared in the physical education curriculum. A year later, the impact of the new curriculum was becoming apparent at the school level. By 1957, Jack Davy, the Principal of Humber Valley Village Elementary School in Etobicoke, reported in the *Canadian School Journal* (the official journal for the Ontario Education Association) that the new primary school curriculum was being employed, and that the school's teachers were "enthusiastic," "asking for assistance" and "thankful for demonstration lessons."⁶¹ Similarly, Ross Waters, the Supervisor of Physical Education and Health for North York elementary schools, reported that the "new" curriculum of developmental team games, educational gymnastics work and dance was being successfully implemented in North York public schools. He wrote that the program "lets the kids think and act on their own. They learn confidence and strength of purpose when they are praised for individual achievement."⁶²

In 1959, the Ontario Department of Education published a second text, also written by Nora Chatwin. *Physical Education, Junior Division, Grades 4, 5, 6* replaced the former Ministry guideline, *Programme of Studies, Grades 1-6*. In the new guideline, Chatwin identified the educational philosophy as one that was designed to develop an "all-round picture of the individual," with the stated objectives of physical education as the development of strength, endurance, muscular control and

the need to cultivate a wide range of body movement.”⁶³ The curriculum consisted of the movement content areas of games, small apparatus activities, and rhythmic work (including folk and creative dance). In the creative dance section, Chatwin specifically acknowledged the movement theory of the “late Rudolf Laban”⁶⁴ and identified the categories of “effort,” “space,” “body awareness” and “relationships” as themes for creative dance lessons. This guideline was also the first to be illustrated with photographs of Ontario boys and girls depicted in co-educational contexts of creative dance, cooperative games and educational gymnastics, similar to the illustrations presented in the English curriculum guideline, *Moving and Growing*. A year later, the Minister of Education for Ontario, John Robarts, reported that the efforts of the Physical and Health Education Branch personnel, through their initiatives, including in-service training workshops for teachers at schools and universities, were beginning to have an impact on schools in the province. Robarts commented: “A forty-percent increase in the enrolment of the Physical Education and Health summer course for elementary school teachers has resulted in a much better programme and an increase in the use of playrooms of the schools.”⁶⁵ In the same year, in a speech on the topic of “physical fitness,” Robarts reported that his government had made great strides to raise the level of physical fitness for the youth of the province. He identified Chatwin’s 1956 and 1959 curriculum guidelines (with the new curricular content of team games, gymnastics and dance) and the expansion of the Department’s Summer Courses in Physical and Health Education as achievements that had improved the health and wellbeing of Ontario school children. He also promised that these curricular changes at the primary level would be followed by similar revisions for the intermediate and secondary divisions of the school curriculum by the mid 1960s. Robarts commented:

My concept of fitness is much more than being able to play hockey well or to excel in running and push-ups. I believe our Government’s concern is for fitness in its broadest sense and is a true expression of our goal to provide greater opportunities and positive incentives for all our people to develop more purposeful living and a zeal to serve.⁶⁶

During the 1960s and early 1970s, the impact of the movement-based curriculum, with its emphasis on dance, games and gymnastics depicting children in co-educational contexts of functional and expressive movement, continued to dominate the educational scene in Ontario—and that of other provinces in Canada. Writing in the *Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (CAHPER) Journal* in 1965, N. C. Cooper (a former inspector of physical education and recreation for the Department of Education in Nova Scotia), argued in favour of the new approach in educational gymnastics, believing that both boys and girls would learn to discover their movement potential.⁶⁷ J. D. Dennison, from British Columbia, writing in the *CAHPER Journal* also supported the new movement approach, emphasizing the value of a learner-centred pedagogy and an indirect method of skill acquisition. In 1967, the Ontario Ministry of Education published *Physical and Health*

Education, Movement and Growth, Curriculum PIJ1. This guideline devoted equal consideration to dance, games and gymnastics, emphasized student-centred learning, and employed terminology for lesson development that reflected Laban's movement vocabulary of "body awareness," "space," "quality" and "relationships." In keeping with the Ontario Ministry of Education's Hall-Dennis Report of 1968, the document reflected the educational goals of child-centred progressivism and discovery methods of learning.⁶⁸ By 1969, the front cover of the November-December issue of the *CAHPER Journal* depicted boys and girls together engaged in educational gymnastics work.⁶⁹ A decade later, the September-October edition of the *CAHPER Journal*, a special issue dedicated to the Laban Centenary Year and the International Year of the Child, was entirely devoted to various descriptions of the "movement education approach," showcasing its impact on physical education curriculum in the primary school across Canada.⁷⁰

By 1975, with the publication of *Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions* and *The Formative Years (PIJ1)*, the movement curriculum had reached its zenith. In *Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions*, physical education was listed under "the arts" curriculum, with an emphasis on creative self-expression and free play:

In the Primary and Junior Divisions, children need to develop versatility rather than concentrate on specific skills; this implies a wide range of activities such as gymnastics, games, swimming, dance and drama, with ample time provided for practice, repetition, modification, consolidation and application.⁷¹

Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions also presented body management skills based on the movement themes drawn from the 1967 curriculum, and described the educational objective of the program as one designed to achieve a "rich and satisfying vocabulary of movement" in functional and expressive movement contexts.⁷² *The Formative Years (PIJ1)* also emphasized the values of creativity, self-confidence and the acquisition of a broadly defined repertoire of movement skills. The educational goals identified in this guideline included the acquisition of gross and fine motor skills; the development of an understanding of movement; the ability to estimate space and distance; the participation in games, movement exploration activities, dance and gymnastic sequences; and the development of an appropriate degree of balance, strength, speed, precision and economy of effort.⁷³ In 1976, *Movement: A Support Document to the Formative Years* was published. As the title suggested, *Movement* was designed to support *Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions* and *The Formative Years* by assisting teachers with the application of the curriculum in the classroom. In this document, in order to help facilitate teachers in the "movement approach," the theme of "shape" was used to illustrate lesson plans in the subject areas of dance, games and gymnastics. In addition to an emphasis on creativity and self-expression, this document also stressed the integration of movement competencies (i.e. the concept of shape) as it related to other subject areas across the school curriculum, including application in Environmental Studies, Communication Studies and the Arts.⁷⁴

By the late 1970s, however, resistance to the movement curriculum in Ontario gained momentum, and paralleled the intense and gender-specific debate that had unfolded in England a decade earlier. Rose Hill, an English-trained specialist in physical education who immigrated to Ontario in 1957 and was subsequently involved with curriculum design and teacher training during the 1960s and 1970s, recalled that many male teachers and administrators were not supportive of the movement approach, because they felt the new curriculum compromised a sport-specific skills focus.⁷⁵ Mary Liddell, the Supervisor for Physical Education for the Leaside Board of Education and one of the authors of *Physical Education in the Junior School* for the Borough of Etobicoke (1973), also recalled that much of the resistance was expressed by male secondary school physical educators who believed that the elementary school curriculum should complement the secondary school curriculum, and therefore emphasize measurement, fitness and discrete sport skills. Liddell further recalled that many male specialists resisted the idea of “generalized movement competency” and also questioned the legitimacy of “fun and self-expression” as viable educational objectives.⁷⁶ Gordon Wright also acknowledged the resistance that was expressed toward the movement curriculum during the period, particularly as it was perceived by male secondary school teachers committed to a sport-based curriculum model. He recalled that the content, given its affiliation with dance and self-expression, was not conducive to adoption by male, secondary school teachers.⁷⁷ Echoing the argument that questioned the line between expressive and functional movement, many male educators perceived the approach as too affiliated with dance and challenged its relevance for boys.

Resistance to the movement-based curriculum also surfaced at the national level in the Canadian physical education professional discourse. W. M. Simons, Head of Physical and Health Education in a secondary school in Scarborough, writing in the *CAHPER Journal*, raised serious concerns that the skill level of young boys would be compromised. He also warned that teachers familiar with “English methods” will displace more experienced, skillful Canadian teachers in our Training Colleges and concluded, “unfortunately this field has now been invaded by some well-meaning egotists who wish to achieve a ‘short cut’ to an administrative post.”⁷⁸ Ches Anderson echoed these concerns, and warned that prolonged exposure to movement education was counterproductive to the development of young boys beyond the age of ten, and that they would not develop appropriate specialized skills and complex sport techniques. He further argued that the Laban-influenced curriculum was analogous to a cult following based upon “faith” rather than scientific and educational theory.⁷⁹ The tenor of the debate and the gender-division that it evoked paralleled the “movement/anti-movement” debates in England.

Fitness, Sport and Cardiovascular Health (1970s–2000)

During the final four decades of the twentieth century, significant and well-publicized concerns surfaced with regard to the fitness level of Canadians. In 1973, it was reported that the average physical fitness of a Canadian at the age of thirty was

equivalent to the average physical fitness of a sixty year old Swede. "The outcry was immediate and even sparked a debate in Parliament."⁸⁰ In 1978, the Ministry of Education in Ontario published a second support document to *Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions* and *The Formative Years*. This document, entitled *Fitness: A Curriculum Guide for Teachers*, was grounded in research that reported a rising concern about the fitness levels of Canadian school children. Citing research that noted "a decline in cardio-respiratory endurance and [an] increase in obesity [in] the school-age years" the *Fitness* support document stated that the educational objective of the physical education school program should be designed "to promote physical fitness among children through carefully planned, vigorous activities that will increase their endurance."⁸¹ Further research indicated that children needed an hour of activity a day to offset obesity and that optimal school-based physical education activities should be sufficiently vigorous in order "to maintain a pulse rate of between 140 and 180 beats per minute for a duration of at least six minutes."⁸² "Appropriate" endurance activities included running, skipping, and jumping, with special attention to sport-related relay races, tag games and sport drills in the areas of soccer, handball, basketball, volleyball, and field hockey. Notably, "rhythmic activities" were described in terms of running, skipping and hopping to musical accompaniment, and "gymnastics activities" were presented as discrete strength activities such as chin-ups, push-ups, and rope-pulls. The former theme-based emphasis of the movement approach, characterized by progressive tasks that culminated with small group games, and dance and gymnastic skills that were refined and presented as individual and group sequence work, were eclipsed by functionality and an increasing bio-medical view of a relevant curriculum.

In 1998, the World Health Organization declared obesity a global epidemic, and stated that the prevention of obesity "should begin early in life, and should involve the development and maintenance of lifelong healthy eating and physical activity patterns."⁸³ In the same year, the Ministry of Education and Training for Ontario published *Health and Physical Education: Grades 1-8*. Notably, the term "health" returned to prominence, preceding "physical education" in the title of the Province's curriculum. This emphasis reflected the belief that healthy active living included a combination of physical education and appropriate lifestyle choices. The purpose of the health and physical education curriculum was stated as the intent to develop "an understanding of the importance of physical fitness, health and well-being and the factors that contribute to them." The three "strands" or major content areas in the curriculum designed to achieve this goal entailed "healthy living," "fundamental movement skills," and "active participation." The "healthy living" strand emphasized decisions related to healthy lifestyle choices such as healthy eating, healthy sexuality and personal safety. The "active participation" strand reinforced the importance of cardiovascular activity, with specific endorsement of activities such as aerobics, skipping and sports such as "Ultimate Frisbee," soccer and cricket. Finally, the "fundamental movement" strand identified skill expectations within the categories of locomotion, manipulation and stability. Although remnants of the movement curriculum were evident in this strand, references to dance, gymnastics and cooperative games

activities were limited, and generic skills such as jumping, bending and stretching were emphasized. Although the Laban movement framework was represented under the auspices of fundamental movement skills, it was not presented as an inclusive framework across the physical activity curriculum or prominently situated. Furthermore, citing recent research in the discipline of motor development, the directive to teach skill-specific activities was made explicit to teachers. The guideline stated, “movement skills must be taught; they are not acquired simply through activities of various sorts.”⁸⁴ By 1998, the former movement curriculum that had once dominated the educational landscape of elementary physical education in Ontario was significantly reduced in scope and importance. The “movement orientation” that had earlier defined physical education in terms of versatility and self-expression through a wide variety of functional and expressive movement activities was restricted to one “strand” of the new health, fitness and sport-based curriculum.

Conclusion

This article has reviewed the discourses that shaped three distinct waves of curriculum reform in Ontario. The first wave, from the 1850s to the 1950s, was characterized by a sex-specific physical education curriculum characterized by drill and calisthenics for the purpose of discipline, disease prevention and military preparedness. The second wave, from the 1950s to 1970s, reflected the influence of a Laban-influenced “female tradition” that emphasized the acquisition of a broadly defined movement repertoire of functional and expressive movement, characterized by an emphasis on gender-inclusive and diverse experiences in contexts of dance, games and gymnastics. During the third wave, from the 1970s to 2000, fitness and sport gained pre-eminence, privileging competitive sport and fitness activities for cardiovascular health and wellness, a model that some feminists have argued is less conducive to participation by girls and women.⁸⁵

By the turn of the twenty-first century, the physical education “activity” curriculum in the elementary schools of Ontario endorsed, as in the past, a fitness and sport model. At the same time, researchers in the field of childhood obesity raised the alarm about childhood inactivity in relation to school physical education.⁸⁶ The provincial political response, as noted in the introduction of this article, was to initiate a Healthy Schools Program designed to remedy the problem through the introduction of a mandatory twenty minutes of daily fitness activity in order to augment the “regular” physical education curriculum. The belief that “children who drill, seldom are ill” is a refrain that still appears to resonate with twenty-first century educators who believe that twenty minutes of daily fitness activities will address the problem of childhood obesity in a relevant and gender-inclusive way. The success of this strategy has yet to be demonstrated.

Notes

- 1 Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario, Spark: Together for Healthy Kids (poster) (Toronto: Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario, no date). <http://www.heartandstroke.ca/spark>.
- 2 Canada Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute, "News Release: The latest data on Children's physical activity level" (Ottawa: Canada Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute, May, 2008). http://cflri.ca/eng/story_details.php?id=70
- 3 Active Healthy Kids Canada, "Report Card on Physical Activity for Children and Youth" (Toronto: Active Healthy Kids Canada, 2009). www.activehealthykids.ca
- 4 Tim Hopper and Kathy Sanford, "Masculinity of Physical Education: Socialization of New Recruits," in Ellen Singleton and Aniko Varpalotai, eds., *Stones in the Sneaker: Active Theory for Secondary School Physical and Health Educators* (London, Ontario: The Althouse Press, 2006): 255.
- 5 Numerous authors address these issues. For a meta-analysis of the research, see Anne Flinton and Sheila Scraton, "Girls Physical Education" in David Kirk, Doune MacDonald and Mary O'Sullivan, eds., *The Handbook of Physical Education* (London, England: Sage London, 2006), 767-783.
- 6 Doune MacDonald, "The Feminisms of Gender Equity in Physical Education," *Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal*, 63, no. 1, (1997): 4-8.
- 7 Gerard Kennedy was cited as making this pronouncement in "Healthy Schools Condition Healthy Minds," Government of Ontario (2005, 1). <http://ogov.newswire.ca/ontario/GPOE/2005/10/06/c8547.html?lmat> (retrieved June 12, 2008). The exclusively male delegation at the Healthy School Program news release entailed three Ontario government officials (the Minister of Education, the Minister of Health Promotion, and the Minister of Economic Development and Trade) and two professional hockey players. The title of the release, "Toronto Maple Leafs join Education Minister to Launch Minimum of 20 Minutes of Daily Physical Activity for all Elementary Students" suggests that contemporary physical education curriculum is equated with male professional sport.
- 8 For a helpful analysis of power in curriculum see: Michel Foucault, "Body/Power" in Charles Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (New York: Pantheon, 1980): 55-62 and Ivor Goodson, "Subjects For Study: Towards a Social History of the Curriculum," in Ivor Goodson and Stephen Ball, (eds.) *Defining the Curriculum* (London: Falmer Press, 1984): 25-44; and Ivor Goodson, "Studying Curriculum: Towards a Social Constructionist Perspective," *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22, 4 (1990): 299-312.
- 9 David Kirk and Richard Tinning, "Introduction: Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture," in David Kirk and Richard Tinning (eds), *Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture: Critical Issues in the Contemporary Crisis* (London: Falmer, 1990): 1-22.
- 10 Patricia Vertinsky, "Reclaiming Space, Revisioning the Body: The Quest for a Gender-sensitive Physical Education," *Quest*, 44, 3 (1992): 373-396.
- 11 There is a substantial body of literature examining the female influence within a patriarchal educational tradition. These include: Jan Wright, "Mapping the Discourses of Physical Education: Articulating a Female Tradition," *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 28, 3 (1996): 331-351; David Kirk, *Defining Physical Education: The Social Construction of a Subject in Postwar Britain* (London: Falmer, 1992); Sheila Fletcher, *Women First: The Female Tradition in English Physical Education, 1880-1980* (London: Athlone Press, 1984) and Sheila Fletcher, "The Making and Breaking of a Female Tradition: Women's Physical Education in England, 1880-1980," *The British Journal of Sports History*, 2, 1 (1985): 28-52.

- 12 Interviews were conducted with Gordon Wright, Rose Hill and Mary Liddell. Gordon Wright was the Director of Physical Education for Ontario from 1947–1962. Rose Hill, a faculty member at the University of Toronto and McMaster University, was involved with physical education teacher training during the period. Mary Liddell was a Supervisor for physical education for the Leaside Board of Education in Toronto. These interviews were originally conducted as part of a larger study investigating the impact of movement education in Canada. See Lathrop, A. “Movement Education: A Study in Cultural Diffusion,” (M.A. thesis, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada, 1989). Upper Canada united with Lower Canada in 1841. In 1867, Upper Canada entered Confederation and became the Province of Ontario. In 1871, by the terms of The School Act, free common schools in each municipality became mandatory and all Ontario children between seven and twelve years of age were compelled to attend school for at least four months of any given school year. According to Allison Prentice; “By 1871, the common school had become a public institution in the modern sense of the term,” *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada*, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 17.
- 13 Egerton Ryerson’s significant attention to the importance of military drill for boys in the grammar and common schools of Upper Canada may be attributed to Civil War tensions with the United States. Ryerson described these “troubles on the other side of the border” as the reason why defensive organization was considered absolutely essential as cited in “Military Instruction in Canadian Schools,” *The Journal of Education for Upper Canada* 18: 7 (1865): 98. In 1863, students in the Normal School in Toronto formed a drill association, and by 1876, military training for boys in the City of Toronto was mandatory. See also Frank Cosentino and M. L. Howell, *A History of Physical Education in Canada* (Toronto, ON: General Publishing, 1971); J. George Hodgins, *The Establishment of Schools and Colleges in Ontario, 1792–1910*, Vol.1 (Toronto: L. K. Cameron: 1910 and Don Morrow and K. B. Wamsley, *Sport in Canada: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- 15 Egerton Ryerson, *Report on a System of Public Elementary Instruction for Upper Canada* (Montreal: Lovell and Gibson, 1847).
- 16 Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters*, 52.
- 17 J.A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- 18 Ryerson, 1847, 58-59.
- 19 J. George Hodgins, *The Establishment of Schools and Colleges in Ontario, 1792–1910*, Vol. 111 (Toronto, ON: L.K. Cameron): 1910: 255-256.
- 20 Ryerson published four articles, all in *The Journal of Education for Upper Canada*. They include: “The Importance of Physical Education,” 1(1848): 336; “The Physiology and Hygiene of the School-room,” 10, 8 (1857): 113-117; “Military Instruction in Canadian Schools” 18, 7 (1865): 98-99 and “Little Folks at Play,” 6 (1892): 173.
- 21 A. Marling, *A Brief History of Public and High School Textbooks Authorized for the Province of Ontario, 1846–1889* (Toronto, ON: Warwick and Sons, 1890): 36.
- 22 Ryerson, 1848, 336.
- 23 Ryerson, 1857, 116.
- 24 J. L. Hughes, *Drill and Calisthenics Containing Drill, Calisthenics, Free Gymnastics, Vocal Exercises, German Calisthenics, Movement Songs, The Pocket Gymnasium and Kindergarten Games and Songs* (Toronto, Ontario: W. J. Gage, 1879).
- 25 *Ibid.*, All references to drill activities in Hughes’ text employed male descriptors and pronouns, although special attention was directed toward “How should girls salute” with the recommendation (via Royal Navy protocol) that a curtsy could be replaced

with a military salute as “it is perfectly becoming, and, especially in mixed classes, does not seem at all out of place,” 1, 4-5.

- 26 *Ibid.*, 71.
- 27 E. B. Houghton, *Physical Culture: First Book of Exercises in Drill, Calisthenics and Gymnastics*, 4th edition (Toronto: Warwick and Sons, 1891): 1.
- 28 Ryerson, 1892, 173.
- 29 Anna H. Lathrop “*From Elegance and Expression to Sweat and Strength: Physical Education at the Margaret Eaton School*” in S. Cook, L. R. Mclean and K. O’Rourke (eds.), *Framing Our Past: Canadian Women’s History in the Twentieth Century* (Montreal: McGill-Queens’s University Press): 194-198.
- 30 Mary Keyes, “Sport and Physical Education in Schools and Universities,” in Don Morrow, Wayne Simpson, Frank Cosentino and Ron Lappage, *A Concise History of Sport in Canada* (Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press, 1989): 81.
- 31 *Ibid.* See also Helen Lenskyj, “The Role of Physical Education in the Socialization of Girls in Ontario 1890–1930,” Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto Canada, 1983.
- 32 Desmond Morton, “The Cadet Movement in the Movement of Canadian Militarism,” *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 13, 2 (1978): 62.
- 33 Lenskyj, 197.
- 34 Arthur S. Lamb, “Physical Education in Canada,” *Bulletin of the Canadian Physical Education Association* 1, 1 (1933): 3-9.
- 35 See Lathrop, 1997, who writes about the Margaret Eaton School (1901–1941). Located in Toronto, Ontario, this unique school offered a two-year diploma in physical education for women, with a curricular emphasis on European gymnastics, organized games, and dance. Given its exclusively female administration and curricular design, the school represented a significant “female tradition” in the field of physical education in Canada. Although women who graduated from this school gained employment in private schools and YWCAs across Canada, the impact of this school was significantly limited as its graduates were not eligible, without further certification, to teach physical education at any level in the public school system. The school was subsumed by the University of Toronto in 1942.
- 36 Department of Education, *Programme of Studies For Grades I to VI of the Public and Separate Schools* (Toronto, Ontario: Department of Education, 1941): 34.
- 37 See Helen Gurney, *The CAHPER Story: A Review of the Growth and Development of the Canadian Association for Health, PE and Recreation 1933–1983* (Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 1983) and G. A. Patton, “The Historical Background and Present Status of Canadian Physical Education,” in Earle F. Zeigler (ed.), *A History of Physical Education and Sport in the United States and Canada* (Champaign, IL: Stipes, 1975): 432-449.
- 38 Keyes, 1989, 79.
- 39 Department of Education, *Physical Education in Rural Schools* (Toronto, ON: Department of Education and The Strathcona Trust Committee, 1954): 5.
- 40 Gordon Wright, interview by author, 27 October 1990.
- 41 Peter McIntosh, *Physical Education in England Since 1800* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1968). See also Sheila Fletcher (1984, 1985) and David Kirk (1992).
- 42 Fletcher, 1985.
- 43 Madame Bergman-Osterberg in Fletcher 1985: 33.
- 44 Central-European dance, promoted by Rudolf Laban, was a form of “free” dance that also became known as “modern dance” in England and “creative dance” in Canada. As Laban explained, educators in England encouraged him to publish his comprehensive movement theory and make application in relation to dance in the schools. See Rudolf von Laban, *Modern Educational Dance* (London: Macdonald & Evans, 1948): vi-vii.

- 45 See footnote 11.
- 46 Peter McIntosh, "The Recent History of Physical Education in England with Particular Reference to the Development of Movement Education," *Proceedings of the Big Ten Symposium on the History of Physical Education and Sport* (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1971): 268.
- 47 Ruth Morison published *Educational Gymnastics* (Liverpool: Speirs & Gledsdale Ltd., 1956), and *A Movement Approach to Educational Gymnastics* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1969).
- 48 D. Munrow, *Pure and Applied Gymnastics* (London: Edward Arnold Publisher, 1963).
- 49 Fletcher, 1985, 37.
- 50 Ministry of Education, *Moving and Growing: Physical Education in the Primary School, Part I* (London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1952).
- 51 Ministry of Education, *Planning the Programme: Physical Education in the Primary School, Part II* (London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1953).
- 52 Ministry of Education, *Moving and Growing: Physical Education in the Primary School, Part 1*, 59.
- 53 Ministry of Education, *Moving and Growing*, 73, 75.
- 54 Ministry of Education, *Planning the Programme, Part II*, 13. The effort elements of "weight," "time," "space," and "flow" were first described by Rudolf Laban and Frederick C. Lawrence, *Effort: Economy of Human Movement* (Plymouth, UK: Macdonald and Evans, 1947) in relation to the economy of human movement in functional movement contexts (i.e., the workplace), and expressive movement contexts (i.e., play, activity, and the arts). These terms were subsequently applied to an analysis of the movement within the educational context of teaching dance, games and gymnastics in the physical education curriculum.
- 55 See Anna H. Course, "Movement Education: A Study in Cultural Diffusion," (Master's Thesis, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada) and Anna H. Lathrop "Contested Terrain: Gender and 'Movement' in Ontario Elementary Physical Education, 1940-70," *Ontario History*, XCIV, 2 (2002): 165-182.
- 56 Nora Chatwin, letter to author, 6 June 1989. Cited with permission.
- 57 Gordon Wright, interview by author, 27 October 1990. Quoted with permission.
- 58 The Ontario Department of Education's summer course offerings served as academic credit toward upgrading teacher certification. Students who graduated from Ontario Teachers' Colleges received a Standard 1 certification. Teachers who took five summer courses received a Standard 2 certification. For further discussion see Nora Chatwin, "The Pioneers of 1968," *Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal*, 35, 1 (1969): 13-14.
- 59 Nora Chatwin, letter to author, 6 June 1989.
- 60 Department of Education, *Physical Education Outline of Courses for Experimental Use. Primary Division, Grades I, II, III* (Toronto: Department of Education, 1956): 2.
- 61 J. M. Davy, "What is Etobicoke Doing About Physical Education?" *Canadian School Journal*, XXXV, 4 (1957): 165-66.
- 62 Ross Waters, "Some Phases in North York Education: Physical Education Builds Plenty More Than Muscles," *Canadian School Journal*, XXXV, 5 (1957): 211-214.
- 63 Department of Education, *Physical Education, Junior Division, Grades 4, 5, 6* (Toronto, ON: Department of Education 1959): 1.
- 64 *Ibid.*, 253.
- 65 J. P. Robarts, "The Minister Reports." *Canadian School Journal*, XXXVIII, 3 (1960a): 140.
- 66 J. P. Robarts, "Physical Fitness." *Canadian School Journal*, XXXVIII, 7 (1960b): 349.
- 67 N. C. Cooper, "The Philosophy of Educational Gymnastics." *Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal* 32, 1(1965): 19-31.

- 68 In 1967, in England, a report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (the Plowden Committee) published *Children and their Primary Schools*—a report, which also identified the importance of “finding out” rather than “being told” as the pedagogy of choice in the primary school context (see Peter McIntosh, 1968: 279).
- 69 Hart Devenney (ed.) *Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal*, 36, 2 (1969).
- 70 David Staniford (ed.) *Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal* (special Issue for the 100th anniversary of Rudolf Laban and the Year of the Child) 46, 1: 1979.
- 71 Ministry of Education, *Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions* (Toronto, ON: Department of Education, 1975b): 88.
- 72 *Ibid.*, 89.
- 73 Ministry of Education, *The Formative Years. Circular P1, J1* (Toronto, ON: Department of Education, 1975): 19.
- 74 Ministry of Education, *Movement: A Support Document to The Formative Years* (Toronto, ON: Department of Education, 1976): 1.
- 75 Rose Hill, interview by author, 10 September 1988. Quoted with permission.
- 76 Mary Liddell, interview by author, 27 September 1988.
- 77 Gordon Wright, interview by author, 27 October 1990.
- 78 W. M. Simons, “Educational gymnastics—its meaning, uses and abuses.” *Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal* 32, 5 (1966): 6, 26.
- 79 Ches Anderson, “Movement educators—beware!” *Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal* 45, 1 (1978): 42.
- 80 Government of Canada, *ParticiPACTION: the early years (1973–1979)*. http://usask.ca/archives/participaction/English/motivate/the_earlyyears.html (retrieved June 12, 2008) 2003: 3.
- 81 R. C. Goode, “The Physical Fitness of Our School Children.” *Education Canada*, 16, 4 (1976): 26.
- 82 *Ibid.*, 2.
- 83 World Health Organization, *Obesity: Preventing and Managing the Global Epidemic: Technical Report 894* (Geneva: World Health Organization, 1998): 240.
- 84 Ministry of Education and Training, *Health and Physical Education: The Ontario Curriculum, Grades 1-8* (Toronto, ON: Department of Education, 1998): 2.
- 85 See Nancy Theberge, “Toward a Feminist Alternative to Sport as a Male Preserve,” *Quest*, 37, 2 (1985): 193-202 and Patricia Vertinsky, “Reclaiming Space, Revisioning the Body: The Quest for a Gender-sensitive Physical Education,” *Quest*, 44, 3 (1992): 373-396.
- 86 Cora Craig, Christine Cameron; S. J. Russell, and A. Beaulieu, *Increasing Physical Activity: Supporting Children's Participation* (Ottawa, ON: Canadian Fitness and Lifestyles Research Network, 2001).