

# **A Rural Schoolhouse in Jessamine County: Searching for the Materiality of Education in Central Kentucky**

*by*

Deborah L. Rotman, Ph.D., RPA  
Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc.  
Lexington KY 40517

*Script/paper prepared for the Fourth Annual South Central Historical Archaeological Conference, Historic Arkansas Museum, Little Rock, Arkansas, 19-21 October 2001.*

## *Preface/Disclaimer*

Between the time that I submitted the abstract for this conference and today's presentation, we have discovered that our site in Jessamine County may not be a schoolhouse at all. An analysis of historic maps seems to indicate that the structure was situated south of our site location.

I cannot present a data set of questionable integrity. However, the information my colleagues and I have gathered about rural education in America and the research questions that we had begun to ask of the now suspect data set are still of interest to me.

## *Introduction*

In this paper, I explore the materiality of rural education in America. I present a brief history of education in the nineteenth century and summarize some of the archaeological research that has been conducted to date on this matter. The

rest of the presentation focuses upon some of the ways we might use the archaeology of schoolhouse sites to understand the past.

*Rural Education in America: A Brief History*

Education in America was neither standardized nor well-organized prior to about 1830. In the rural Northeast and the new Midwest, the district school – like this ca. 1820 school in Gloucester, Massachusetts – was the norm. It was organized and controlled by a small locality and financed by some combination of property taxes, fuel contributions, tuition payments, and state aid. In the South, a different model prevailed. Itinerant schoolmasters selected a location on their own initiative and set tuition rates for parents who chose to send their children for an education. Similarly, a schoolmaster might be engaged *by* a group of parents to teach a term in a neighborhood school. (Kaestle 1983:15; *School* 2001).

The structures themselves were frequently made of logs or unpainted clapboard and the quality of their construction varied dramatically. Schools were often situated on plots of land that were not suitable for any other purpose – next to roadways or on swampy ground (Kaestle 1983:13-14). Sarah Hale, in 1829, commented upon the selection of the site for a district school:

The only requisite was, to fix precisely on the center of the district; and after measuring in every direction, the center had been discovered exactly in the center of a frog-pond. As near that pond as safety would permit, stood the school house (Hale 1829; Kastle 1983:14).

The Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Michigan remarked in 1848 that schoolhouses were “sometimes adjacent to a cooper’s shop or between a blacksmith’s shop and a sawmill” (Mayhew 1848:110; Kaestle 1983:14). The poor location of many schoolhouses was often cited as evidence of the public’s indifference toward education prior to the mid-nineteenth century. School was occasionally held in private homes or conversely, the school served as the private residence for the teacher (Gulliford 1996). These arrangements, however, were in the minority.

Children were often sent to school by their parents as much out of a desire to keep them out from under foot as from an eagerness to have them educated. Without a standard age for beginning school, it was not uncommon for teachers to supervise children as young as three years old. One teacher, however, found this less than desirable and referred to these pupils in her diary as “trundle bed trash” (Nelson 1902:305; Kaestle 1983:15). Similarly, without compulsory attendance, older children (that is, beginning at about age 10) would only attend school two or three months a year – often during the winter session when farm work slackened (Kaestle 1983:15). Furthermore, access to education was restricted on the basis of class, gender, and ethnicity, such that boys from affluent white families were the primary recipients of educational training until approximately the 1830s (*School* 2001).

The curriculum was also haphazard and lacked standardization. Materials were often limited, inadequate, and outdated; frequently they consisted of whatever

primers and books the teacher possessed (*School* 2001). “In some country schools, discipline was lax and learning incidental, but other schools were orderly, efficient, and staunchly supported by the community, offering children an opportunity for [an] education that few of their parents had enjoyed” (Gulliford 1996:35). The teachers themselves frequently doubled as farm laborers, tavern keepers, prospectors, and craftsmen. Often they were chosen for the position because they were one of the few members of the community who could read or they were unemployed (and sometimes unemployable) (*School* 2001).

However, in the 1830s and 1840s, a push toward statewide education had begun. By this time, important educators such as Horace Mann in Massachusetts, Samuel Lewis in Ohio, and Henry Barnard in Connecticut had come to view education as a public enterprise – as did Emma Willard, Catherine Beecher, and Mary Lyon, who urged women to become teachers (Gulliford 1996:39-40). Education reformers of this era argued that only an educated electorate could make responsible choices with their votes. However, the idea of “taxing one man’s property to educate another man’s child” resulted in significant public opposition (Gulliford 1996:40). Horace Mann offered a rather ingenious solution to this problem by suggesting that the public have control over their local schools. In addition, reformers linked education to ideas of national progress by using slogans such as “every schoolhouse opened closes a jail” (Gulliford 1996:40).

By the 1860s, the struggle over a free public education had largely been resolved. However, the Civil War and associated aftermath significantly disrupted

efforts to improve and standardize education in America. Progressives began to turn their attention to educational issues in the 1890s, but these efforts did not reach rural areas until after the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. (Gulliford 1996:40-41; Kaestle 1983:203; *School* 2001).

Clearly, this brief summary does not do justice to the complex history of education in America. The point, however, that I wish to illustrate is that education in the nineteenth century – even after efforts of education reformers in the 1830s and 1840s – was not entirely standardized. There was tremendous variation in the construction of the school building, the quality of the curriculum, the length of the school year, the qualifications of the teachers, and so on. One thing, however, that most schools had in common was that they served as a focal point of the communities in which they were situated.

Here in lies the matter that is of primary interest to me . . .

### *Schoolhouses as Representative of Communities*

Schoolhouses during the nineteenth century were more than places of education. They were also the center of social, dramatic, political, and religious activities in their communities (Tyack 1974:15; Gulliford 1996:79): In one room schools all over the nation, ministers met their flocks,

politicians caucused with the faithful, families gathered at Christmas parties and hoe-downs, the Grange held its baked bean suppers, Lyceum lecturers spoke, itinerants introduced the wonders of the

lantern-slide and the crank-up phonograph, and neighbors gathered [for] spelling bees (Barber 1953:1; Tyack 1974:16).

Furthermore, “as one of the few social institutions which rural people encountered [almost] daily, the common school both reflected and shaped a sense of community” (Tyack 1974:17). Consequently, the material records of schoolhouses need to be examined with this scale of human interaction in mind.

James Gibb and April Beisaw (2001) published a very eloquent article on the materiality of schoolhouses in this month’s *Northeast Historical Archaeology*. Their work is significant for a number of reasons. First, they acknowledge that “as prominent as one-room schoolhouses have been in the North American experience, . . . these ubiquitous structures have not found a place in the archaeological literature” (Gibb and Biesaw (2001:1). Second, their article summarizes the few technical reports and published papers on schoolhouses in the Northeastern United States. Third, they begin to suggest theories, methods, and historical questions relevant to an anthropological inquiry of this site type. And finally, they recognize the importance of schoolhouses as community institutions.

The primary conclusion of their research is that architecturally-related debris is the best source of data for understanding and interpreting the use of a school lot. Architectural objects, they argue, provide evidence of lighting, heating, furnishings, sanitary facilities, modifications and repairs to the structure, and so on. More importantly, however, these details “represent community attitudes towards public education and larger social issues, the length and seasons of the school year, length

of the school day, separation of the sexes (Pena 1992), sanitation and public health, and abstract learning versus manual training” (Gibb and Beisaw 2001:14).

Gibb and Beisaw (2001) noted that analyses of non-architectural debris from schoolhouse sites has been disappointing. Often, there is little material evidence of students educational or recreational activities “beyond a few slate pencils and writing slate fragments, and the odd marble or two” (Gibb and Beisaw 2001:15).

Therefore, the authors suggested that:

Archaeological investigations should not abandon the search for domestic artifacts and the behavioral patterns that those objects represent, but greater attention must be drawn to the architecture of the schoolhouses and associated structures such as fuel storage sheds and coal bins, privies, fences, wells, and other special use buildings (e.g., dormitories, chapels, and gymnasias) (Gibb and Beisaw 2001:15).

Although I don’t exactly disagree with the authors on this point, I see greater utility in the domestic artifacts from schoolhouses – despite their dearth – for telling ALL the stories of the site’s past use, not just its history as an educational institution.

### *Meaning in the Minimal*

Domestic artifacts are deposited in school yards in a manner that is different from that which is observed at residential homelots. Cultural materials result from its regular use for educational purposes as well as for special events – rather than

from the daily activities associated with the maintenance of a household. Therefore, the artifacts from schools seem to be particularly meaningful and deliberate.

For example, when examining the artifact assemblage from a schoolhouse site, it is easy to imagine that Mrs. Emily Johnson, brought her mince-meat cookies to a May Day celebration on a blue shell-edged whiteware plate. Or that a glass fruit jar once contained Miss Maura O'Reilly's first batch of strawberry preserves – a recipe, no doubt, that won her first prize in the community fair, but also the heart of young William Barnard. Or that Mrs. Madeline Wright spilled her sewing basket during the quilting bee and lost a number of her pins and needles in the grass. Mr. Josiah Allen may have experienced a similar loss when his jack-knife slipped from his pocket while he was repairing a hole in the building's roof. Mr. Moses Stevens and Mr. Francis Casey – two elderly farmers no longer able to work in the fields – may have met at the school for an afternoon of companionship, playing checkers and smoking tobacco (resulting in the loss of a gaming piece and the breaking of a pipe). Although these are fictional characters, they represent real events and illustrate that domestic artifacts recovered archaeologically from schoolhouses have a kind of *deliberateness* in their *accidental* loss or breakage. So, as we examine assemblages from these sites, we should be cognizant of the kinds of events and circumstances that brought the objects *to* the site as well as led to their deposition. Furthermore, there can be a tremendous amount of information in what at first glance appears to be a dearth of domestic artifacts.

We as historical archaeologists have a great many methodological and theoretical tools available to us. I would like to suggest some of the ways in which we might apply these tools to the data from schoolhouses.

Ceramics are one potentially useful data class about which a great deal of research has been conducted, particularly at domestic sites. Anne Yentsch (1991) has done some wonderful work with correlating vessel colors and functions. She observed that earth-toned vessels in the Virginia Tidewater region were used for private tasks such food preparation and storage, while white-toned vessels were used for public displays – as with the dishes of formal dining. Diana Wall (1991, 1994) determined that decorative motifs were associated with gender ideologies – specifically that Gothic-paneled ironstone was a symbol of sorts for the cult of domesticity. Similarly, we are familiar with George Miller’s (1980, 1991) ceramic price indexing – a method for determining the relative cost of ceramics in archaeological assemblages, which contributes to an understanding of socioeconomic status.

In the context of the schoolhouse and the activities that took place there, one might expect the material culture to reflect “one’s best foot forward,” so to speak. Mrs. Johnson may have chosen a whiteware plate for her mince-meat cookies rather than a redware platter, because the May Day celebration was a very public and formal event. Perhaps she did not choose her Gothic-paneled ironstone plate because she felt that its use was most appropriate for her family’s breakfast table or

entertaining close friends. Or perhaps she chose the shell-edge platter because it was her proudest possession – the most expensive serving piece that she owned.

I am not saying that we should do psychic archaeology and try to get into Mrs. Johnson's head to figure out why she brought those mince-meat cookies on a shell-edged plate. Rather, I am suggesting that we apply what we know from our investigations at domestic residences to levels beyond the homelot – notably that of the community.

Cultural expressions, political statements, reflections on worldviews, gender ideologies, social rituals, and so on occurred within individual homes during the nineteenth century, but did not do so in a vacuum (Rotman 2001). Therefore, we can expect that these human behaviors not only *have* material expressions, but in order to understand them we need to examine both arenas – the homelot and the community . . . and vice versa. Schoolhouses are ideal sites for this type of anthropological inquiry since they so effectively represent the communities in which they are situated.

### *Conclusions*

There are two points of which we should be mindful as we continue our investigations of the materiality of education in America during the nineteenth century. First, schoolhouses are not merely loci of education. Rather, they are active community centers. As such, the archaeological record reflects a variety of social, dramatic, political, and religious dramatic activities, just to name a few. And

second, although we can apply the knowledge we have gained from our investigations of domestic sites, we must also be aware that the depositional processes in school yards are different from those at residential homelots. Since the schoolhouse does not generally represent an occupation, the objects recovered archaeologically had to be brought to the site with a degree of deliberate intention. Therefore, an apparent dearth of domestic objects may yield considerable information.

Clearly – since I did not have a firm data set with which to work – these ideas are in their formative stages and remain untested. I hope that next year I will be able to report on the progress of this research. So here’s hoping we find a schoolhouse!

#### *Acknowledgments*

I would like to thank Chuck Niquette, President of Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc., for providing intellectual, logistical, and financial support to this project. My thanks also to James Gibb and April Beisaw whose work was incredibly interesting and useful in my own quest to understand the materiality of rural education in America. And finally, I wish to thank Andrew Gulliford, whose collection of historical photographs is truly extraordinary.

*Bibliography*

Barber, Marshall

1953 *The Schoolhouse at Prairie View*. University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.

Gibb, James, and April Beisaw

2001 Learning Cast up from the Mire: Archaeological Investigations of Schoolhouses in the Northeastern United States. *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, forthcoming.

Gulliford, Andrew

1996 *America's Country Schools*. University Press of Colorado, Niwot.

Hale, Sarah

1838 *Sketches of American Character*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Philadelphia.

Kaestle, Carl F.

1983 *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York.

Mayhew, Ira

1848 *A Compilation from the Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan for the years 1845 and 1846, with Important Additions, Embracing the Report for the Year 1847*. Detroit.

Miller, G. L.

1980 Classification and Economic Scaling of Nineteenth Century Ceramics. *Historical Archaeology* 11:1-40.

1991 A Revised Set of CC index Values for Classification and Economic Scaling of English Ceramics from 1787 to 1880. *Historical Archaeology* 25(1):1-25.

Nelson, A. H.

1902 The Little Red Schoolhouses. *Educational Review* 23 (January – May):305.

Pena, Elizabeth S.

1992 Educational Archaeology: Historical Archaeological Investigations at Schoolhouse 12 in the Town of LeRay, Jefferson County. *The Bulletin, Journal of the New York State Archaeological Association* 103:10-19.

Rotman, Deborah L.

2001 Beyond the Cult of Domesticity: Exploring the Material and Spatial

Expressions of Multiple Gender Ideologies in Deerfield, Massachusetts, ca. 1750-ca. 1911. Ph.D. dissertation prepared for the Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Tyack, David B.

1974 *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA and London, England.

Wall, Diana diZerega

1991 Sacred Dinners and Secular Teas: Constructing Domesticity in Mid-19th-Century New York. *Historical Archaeology* 25(4):69-81.

1994 *The Archaeology of Gender: Separating the Spheres in Urban America*. Plenum, New York.

Yentsch, Anne E.

1991 The Symbolic Divisions of Pottery: Sex-Related Attributes of English and Anglo-American Household Pots. In *The Archeology of Inequality*, edited by R. H. McGuire and R. Paynter, pp. 192-230. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.