



Expanding Women's Work in the University and Beyond – Carnegie Connections, 1923-1942

New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, Volume 7, Issue 2, 171-183, 2010

JENNY COLLINS

Unitec, Institute of Technology

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the significance of Carnegie Corporation philanthropic grants for the expansion of women's work in the academy during the first half of the twentieth century and considers ways in which a Corporation grant for 'home science education' helped to expand the work of women as 'domestic experts' in the academy and as social reform agents in the wider community. The first part of the paper considers the impact of the rise of philanthropic foundations on the growth of the new 'experts' in the late nineteenth century, and challenges previous scholarship claims that attribute the spread of Carnegie models of education and social reform to 'key men'. Drawing on previously unpublished sources from the Carnegie Corporation Archives it examines the significance of 'key women' who served as contacts for the Carnegie enterprise including Ann Gilchrist Strong, Professor of Home Science at The University of Otago, who utilised her relationships with Carnegie and her own professional networks to establish herself as a link with New Zealand universities and as a gate keeper for Carnegie grant and travel programmes. The second section of the paper focuses on a New Zealand case study to illustrate the way that Carnegie philanthropy helped to expand the 'domestic expertise' of women in the academy and their role as professional social reformers in contemporary society.

THE RISE OF INTERNATIONAL PHILANTHROPY

The private philanthropic foundation that arose in the United States was an institutional response to the rapid social, economic and cultural changes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Schramm, 2007). Triggered by the vast private wealth that accumulated in the decades following the Civil War, philanthropic foundations operated initially at the local level. The private foundation that emerged in the early years of the twentieth century owes its origin to Andrew Carnegie who believed that a man of great wealth must regard all his funds, save those necessary for modest and unostentatious living and the needs of his dependents, as 'trust funds' which he was called upon to administer for the benefit of his less fortunate brethren (Carnegie, 1933). The rise of the international philanthropic foundation reflected a growing belief that broadly defined public concerns such as public health, civil service reform, public education and the labour question could be addressed successfully by a new class of 'experts', including technically trained managers. This entailed not only the elevation of a new class of experts trained to manage charitable

organisations, philanthropic foundations, and industrial corporations but also the development of a new ethic of service.

At the core of this new ethic was the ideal of the disinterested intellectual, the objective expert who had a responsibility to society to ensure that institutions benefitted from the application of technical, 'scientific' knowledge. Increasingly, charity as a realm of private action gave way to a view of social reform as a public enterprise (Ealy & Ealy, 2006). Access to the new professions, ostensibly via 'merit', was determined by assumptions about race, culture, social class, and gender. In an era that emphasised the importance of women's domestic role for the preservation of society, the new 'expert' was expected to be a male and white; with small numbers of (mostly white) women 'experts' being located largely in highly gendered fields such as home science, nutrition, and child development (Collins, 2008a, 2008b; Harris, 1997). Although existing scholarship acknowledges the highly gendered nature of grant making (Glotzer, 2009; Lagemann, 1989; White, 1997), and some research has considered the role of middle-class women professionals as social reformers (Collins, 2008b), little work has been undertaken to understand the complex interrelationships between gender, class, and race, the philanthropic enterprise, and the expansion of women's work in the university and the professions. A key question for educational historians is whether the women who were able to take on professional roles in the academy and beyond were successful because of, or in spite of, their gender? This paper seeks to address some of these issues.

DEVELOPING INTERNATIONAL KEY CONTACTS¹

An important aspect of the Corporation's overseas ventures during the presidency of Frederick P. Keppel (1923-1942) was the concept of key contacts – highly qualified individuals with the capacity to mobilise their respective educational communities and public and governmental opinion in favour of educational innovation and reform (Glotzer, 2009).² Men such as Fred Clarke (1880-1952), Professor of Education at the University of Capetown in South Africa, Frank Tate (1863-1932), Director of Education for the State of Victoria in Australia, and C.E. Beeby (1902-1998), the foundation Director of the Carnegie-supported New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER), and later Director of Education (1939-1959) were key Corporation contacts outside the United States. These individuals frequently acted as conduits into government and universities, served as gate keepers for Carnegie grant and travel programmes, trained students and conducted research. Although the vast majority of this new class of corporate and experts were men (Lagemann, 1989), a number of 'key women' exercised important influences on Carnegie-sponsored work through their teaching, research, and writing. Professor Mabel Carney, who undertook cross cultural research in South Africa and the US, and Professor Ann Gilchrist Strong, who pioneered the expansion of Home Science

¹ For an expanded discussion of the Carnegie Corporation, the Dominion & Colonies Fund and 'new education' projects in New Zealand and Australia see (Collins, 2009).

² The Keppel years were framed by Corporation policies intended to internationalize American educational theories and practices throughout the English-speaking world. His background in Washington and Columbia University along with Carnegie's endowments to the British dominions and colonies brought together a set of interests that coincided with growing US foreign affairs involvement in the Pacific region.

as an academic and professional field in the United States, India, and New Zealand, had connections with Keppel through Teachers College, Columbia University. Both were to become key contacts in Carnegie work in the US and internationally.³

CARNEGIE IN NEW ZEALAND: EXPANDING WOMEN'S WORK IN THE UNIVERSITY

The first major Carnegie grant to New Zealand followed the 1928 visit of Dean James Russell, the Corporation's Special Assistant.⁴ The Corporation funded a university extension service in home science initiated by Professor Anne Gilchrist Strong, Dean of the School of Home Science at The University of Otago. Russell's interest in this project stemmed in part from his background in rural adult education, in part from his association with Strong (who was a former student of his at Columbia University), and in part from the advocacy of John Studholme: (a philanthropist and Canterbury farmer), who had helped to found the Chair of Home Science at Otago (Beeby, 1986) as is clear in the following correspondence between Studholme and Russell:

Knowing as I do the kindly interest you take in the good work of your country woman and old pupil Professor (Mrs.) Strong is doing at Otago University, NZ, and that your special knowledge enables you to fully realize the need and scope for its extension into country districts ... I venture to [suggest] ... that it would be better to allocate the whole amount to Otago University.⁵

In 1929, Strong received a grant of £1500 per annum for five years for the establishment of a Home Science Extension Bureau in Otago (Collins, 2008b). Three travelling tutors were appointed to offer informal education to women in rural areas. James Shelley, Professor of Education at Canterbury University College received a five-year grant of £500 per annum for the establishment and maintenance of a Canterbury Adult Rural Travelling Library.⁶ In 1930, Strong reported to Russell, 'It is almost incredible the interest that [the programme] has awakened'.⁷

The Council of The University of New Zealand, alerted to the potentially lucrative Carnegie funding and wanting to control the extent of Strong's influence in university extension programmes, formally requested that any

³ A Russell recruit of 1917, Carney visited Africa on sabbatical under the joint auspices of the British Ministry of Education and the International Missionary Council. This visit prompted comparative research in American Negro Education and African Native Education.

⁴ James Earl Russell retired from Teachers College, Columbia University to take up the position of Special Assistant at the Corporation. His son, John Russell, also visited New Zealand on behalf of Carnegie interests. He became secretary of the Dominion and Colonies Fund (DCF).

⁵ John Studholme to Dr Russell, 9 April 1928. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 349, Folder 16, CCC.

⁶ James Shelley took up a Carnegie travel award in 1931-32. He went on to become the founding director of NZ Broadcasting, and founded the *New Zealand Listener* and the New Zealand Symphony Orchestra among many other achievements. C.E. Beeby was a student of his at Canterbury University.

⁷ A.G. Strong to Dean Jas Russell, 22 August 1930. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 349, Folder 16, CCC.

further grants for the extension of Home Science work 'must be definitely in the hand of the Council of the [University] College concerned'.⁸ L.D. Coffman, President of the University of Minnesota, who had visited New Zealand and Australia in 1931 to report on grants to libraries and university administrations, briefed Keppel on the complexities of the old boy network and inter-University rivalry:

The old forces and vested interests are still in the saddle in the various communities in which university centers are located ... Of course you know I favor an extension of Mrs. Strong's work ... She and her associates are veritable missionaries carrying a new gospel of learning and service to the women in the back districts.⁹

By 1933, a territorial dispute between Strong and Shelley over the expansion of adult education programmes beyond Otago and Canterbury highlighted difficulties over the direction and leadership of the project. Once again, Coffman was called on to advise the Corporation:

Both Mrs. Strong and Professor Shelley are rather difficult personalities. Shelley is an impractical idealist, with tremendous enthusiasms ... His lack of tact was made obvious to me when he was in America last fall. Just the same he has established and won support for his extension work.

You, of course, know how vigorous and aggressive Mrs. Strong is. When I was there she had dreams of extending her work and her usefulness to the entire Dominion. While there is no better person in all New Zealand to have charge of this extension Home Science work than Mrs. Strong, still, some things that were said then and since my visit would lead me to believe that an effort to put her in charge of this work for the whole of New Zealand would not be favorably received.¹⁰

Although the Corporation normally preferred to exercise its influence from afar – it decided, in the interests of reaching an accommodation between the parties, 'as this was the Corporation's own plan to begin with' – to get involved.¹¹ John Russell spearheaded a compromise designed to neutralise the protagonists and to placate the Otago and Canterbury University Councils. An enlarged Carnegie Corporation Advisory Committee, chaired by Sir James Allen, a former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Otago, and including representatives of The University of Otago and Canterbury University College, took over responsibility for the administration of the 'Strong-Shelley Project' with Strong and Shelley

⁸ E.P. Norris [Registrar, University of NZ] to Keppel, 28 May 1932. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 349, Folder 16, CCC.

⁹ D. Coffman to F.P. Keppel, 5 July 1932. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 349, Folder 16, CCC.

¹⁰ L.D. Coffman to F.P. Keppel, 13 January 1933. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 349, Folder 16, CCC.

¹¹ J.M. Russell to President Coffman, 17 October 1933. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 349, Folder 16, CCC.

reporting to it separately. In 1935 a new body was formed, the Association for Country Education (ACE), which covered the Dunedin-based and Christchurch-based projects. Over a ten year period the Corporation granted \$US102,500 to support the development of 'travelling libraries and ... home science courses' (Stackpole, 1963, pp. 12-13). Its funding taken over by the Labour Government, the scheme formed the basis first, of a country library service (1937) and second, the National Library Service (1946).¹²

Strong, as the result of her dealings with the Corporation in these years, became one of Keppel's key contacts in New Zealand. She maintained a regular correspondence with James and John Russell and with Keppel, personally hosting Corporation visitors to Otago and visiting Corporation headquarters in New York in 1933. She presented regular reports on the status of adult education and university administration issues, made recommendations about future projects, and suggested potential candidates for travel awards:

The enquiry contained in your letter with regard to those professors who would most profitably make use of an opportunity to spend six months or one year abroad has fired my imagination. It would be a wonderful thing if it were possible for Mr. Chapman, the Registrar, to visit other Universities. His work is so confining, and his influence upon the University in the absence of a President is so great.¹³

BEYOND THE UNIVERSITY? EXPANDING WOMEN'S WORK AS SOCIAL REFORMERS

Corporation Grant Files in the 1930s and 1940s indicate that most of the people receiving grants were men. Small numbers of women received travel grants; most of these were located in highly feminised fields such as home science, early childhood, library work, adult education, and child health (Stingone, 2001). An examination of the lists of travel awards to New Zealand women in the 1930s and 1940s identifies six recipients: Ann Gilchrist Strong, Professor of Home Science (1933), Alice Minchin, librarian (1932-33), Gwendolen Somerset, adult educator (1935), Dorothy Neal, librarian (1936), Dr Elizabeth Gregory who succeeded Strong as Professor of Home Science at Otago (1940), and Dr Helen Deem, Director of the Plunket Society (1947).¹⁴ The following section of this paper will focus on a New Zealand case study to consider ways in which a Corporation grant for 'home science education' helped to expand the work of women as 'domestic experts' in the academy and as social reform agents in the wider community.

Corporation intentions are signalled in Keppel's informal report on his 1935 visit to New Zealand. Identifying parochialism, the absence of 'disinterested counsel', and 'lack of unity in the development of higher education' as key obstacles to Corporation activity in New Zealand, Keppel saw

¹² Memo from A.E. Campbell to the Director of the British Dominions and Colonies Fund, n.d. (c1953). Admin Records, Policy & Program, Series 111A, Box 6, Folder 7, CCC.

¹³ A.G. Strong to Dean Jas E. Russell, 7 August 1930. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 349, Folder 16, CCC.

¹⁴ Grant Files, Series 111B, Box 99, 1937-41, CCC. AAVZ W3148, Box 24, Applications for Visitors Grants, 1939-1941, ANZ.

a more useful role for the Corporation in supporting women's work in the university and the professions in the expanding fields of domestic science, child welfare, and Māori development:

Domestic science and child welfare are comparatively strong ... At present there is a great interest in the Maoris in New Zealand, perhaps more sentimental than realistic, but work with these people is not to be neglected in the program of the Corporation.

Keppel (1935, p. 12)

Awards given to women in these years are indicative of Carnegie's perception of women's role as social reform agents facilitating the expansion of new educational ideas. In 1933, Strong took up a Carnegie award to 'study the methods of organisation and administration of Home Economics Extension teaching'. Invited to apply for a grant by Keppel – 'We shall not allow you "to apply"; we invite you to come!' – she spent several months in the US observing university extension work in Texas and California.¹⁵

Inspired by her experience, Strong turned her attention to the 'problem' of the health and welfare of the remote rural Māori communities in Northland. Drawing on her networks in the Department of Health, Strong, along with Dr Duncan Cook (Medical Officer of Health, Northland) and Mary Lambie (Director of Nursing, Department of Health), put a proposal to John Russell for a 'Maori [Māori] Scholarship' that would 'take a qualified Maori nurse and give her a special course in Cookery and Dietetics, Textiles and Clothing, Houseing [sic] and Sanitation, as well as some training in extension methods of teaching'.¹⁶ Keppel, convinced by Strong of the merits of the scheme during his 1935 New Zealand visit, approved the plan and cabled Russell to expedite the payment as the university year was about to commence.

The scholarship enabled 'Miss Emily Kaa¹⁷ [a Māori nurse] to take a course in Home Science, Housing, Sanitation, etc., at Otago University'.¹⁸ Kaa, whose nursing credentials were already known to Lambie, and whose reputation for health work among Māori was growing, completed a year long course in Home Science at The University of Otago (Collins, 2008b). Cast as a 'Maori apostle of Home Science [chosen] to carry the principles of modern housekeeping to her race', Kaa undertook a three-month tour under the auspices of the Department of Education, visiting sixteen native schools, meeting parents, giving adult lectures at the schools and on the marae.¹⁹ In a letter to Strong, which was forwarded to John Russell, Kaa wrote of her experience at Omanaia, a remote settlement in the Far North:

¹⁵ F.P. Keppel to A.G. Strong, 16 November 1932. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

¹⁶ Memo from Mrs. Strong to J. M. Russell, 'Maori Girl's Scholarship', 16 February 1935. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

¹⁷ Emere is named as Emily Kaa on her file at Carnegie, but in other correspondence she is Emere.

¹⁸ F.P.K.'s cable to J.M.R., 2 February 1935, & Payment Order Office of the Secretary, 19 March 1935. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 193, Folder 7, CCC.

¹⁹ *New Zealand Free Lance*, 2 October 1935, p.18. BAAA 10001/142a, Māori Schools, ANZ.

I talk to the children half an hour and for another half hour make them do some practical work – chiefly bandaging. The children were keen and exceptionally good with the practical side – Mrs. Snelling is going to have a Junior Red Cross at Omanaia. The parents are keen and willing to help ... For the adults I enlarge on my talks to the children. The women were particularly anxious that I should talk midwifery. I did ad lib.

The poverty at Omanaia is appalling. I wish you could have seen the houses – five in a room big enough for a bed, a fireplace and a petrol case and small table. Some of the children had one set of clothes to wear and on Saturday live in father's coat while they were washed and dried. The Women's Institute do not reach these people as the women are too ashamed of their poverty to attend meetings.²⁰

Kaa's description of her work in remote rural communities drew on progressive discourses of social reform and the need to address the 'root causes' of poverty and poor health. Embedded in these discourses were assumptions about the superiority of the white race ('Dr Smith ... has the Maori question at heart. '), and middle-class values ('The children at the school are clean – free from scabies and lice and on the whole, considering the homes they come from, very tidy.').²¹

While it is possible to criticise a social control model of reform that attempts to impose the values of a white middle-class on the working-class poor, on Māori and on other ethnic groups, it is necessary to recognize that the views expressed by reformers such as Kaa and Strong represented attitudes that were pervasive in the culture. Indeed, it is significant that these women worked to alleviate poverty and improve the health and welfare of Māori living in remote rural communities at a time when many education and health programmes in the United States and New Zealand were influenced by Social Darwinist attitudes of 'survival of the fittest' and eugenics (Harris, 1997).

The success of the programme among Māori – 'As a Ngatiporou [Ngāti Porou] of blue blood, Miss Kaa has "gone over big" ... [She] is able to approach them on their own ground and in their own language.'²² – was all the more remarkable when one considers the obstacles created by contemporary attitudes to Māori and the poverty of remote rural communities (Mountain Harte, 2001). Encouraged by the positive response, Strong campaigned to expand the project. She drew on parallels with the conditions facing 'coloured' communities in the southern states of the US and the success of extension programmes there to advocate for a similar model for social reform in remote rural communities in New Zealand:

²⁰ Emere Kaa to Mrs Strong, 23 February 1936. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

²¹ Emere Kaa to Mrs Strong, 23 February 1936. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

²² H. Snelling and J. Thomson to Mr Ball, 7 May 1936. BAAA 10001/142a, Māori Schools, ANZ.

Conditions in many places were like those of the southern States with coloured people living under poor conditions ... There was a willingness among Maoris to learn and that fact should make it easier for extension work.

Evening Star (22 April 1936)

A letter to John Russell outlined the programme she envisaged and her hopes for support for her programme from the new Labour Government, which had come into power in 1935:

We are convinced that if superior Maori girls could be selected and given two years training in the Household Arts, they would make excellent assistants to the District Nurses, and would be able to organize the women and instruct them both in health matters and housecraft.²³

However, despite its apparent success among Māori, the 'home science' programme did not continue.²⁴ Russell deferred a decision 'until next fall, the beginning of the, new financial year', and there is no further correspondence on the matter in the Corporation files.²⁵ Perhaps the Corporation felt it had done enough for Strong, or that the needs of Māori had been addressed in its \$US12,500 funding of the 'Maori adult education program' to the Māori Purposes Board (1933) (Stackpole, 1963). Whatever the reasons, the project did not continue; schools took over the teaching of home science subjects while District Nurses continued to have responsibilities for health issues in Māori communities. At a time when most Māori were isolated, and thus effectively excluded, from a health care system which was beginning to improve health and decrease infant mortality among the general population (Mountain Harte, 2001), Emere became a district nurse in Kaikohe, working with the sick and with pregnant women in remote rural areas.

While one can speculate that funding issues, political factors, and resistance to changing the status quo may have played a part in the demise of the home science programme, the context is also significant. As a project that was advocated for and run by women, it focussed on complex issues of poverty and isolation in remote rural Māori communities; issues that lacked popular appeal and for which there was no quick solution. Despite its high profile in the newspapers in the early months of 1936, its long-term survival depended on a political commitment from the newly elected Labour Government and ongoing funding from the Carnegie Corporation, both of whom seem to have lost interest in supporting women's professional work for social reform in remote rural Māori communities. By mid-1936 it had all but disappeared. Keppel's comment in 1935 that the 'great interest in the Maoris in New Zealand' was 'more

²³ Ann Strong to John Russell, 14 March 1936. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

²⁴ Advocates included Janet Fraser, the wife of Peter Fraser, Minister of Education and later Prime Minister.

²⁵ John Russell to Ann Strong, 29 April 1936. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

sentimental than realistic' seems, with hindsight, to have been prophetic (Keppel, 1935).

Strong's personal and professional networks, her enthusiastic advocacy of women's academic work in household science, and her role as an agent of social reform were the basis of her influence as a key Corporation contact. While her 'vigorous and aggressive' personal style seems to have alienated some of her male colleagues, her work had a high profile in New Zealand and she had an extensive and loyal following amongst the wider community:

Thousands of husbands through the Dominion owe their good digestions and well ordered domiciles to Professor A.G. Strong, who for the past 20 years has held the office of Dean of the Home Science School ... she has been in the fullest sense of the words 'a good citizen' and the conferring of the Order of the British Empire in 1936 was an honour which had been fully earned.²⁶

Keppel's own loyalty to her extended to advocating on her behalf with the then Minister of Finance, Walter Nash, to assist her to transfer her retirement income to the US, at a time when there were restrictions on exporting funds out of New Zealand:

Your letter of January 4 reporting your conversation with the Minister of Finance with respect to Professor Strong's retirement is a most welcome one, and I am grateful to you for your prompt attention to the matter ... It is good, therefore, to know that she may count on the help and counsel of three such good friends as yourself, Sir Thomas Hunter, and the Minister of Finance.²⁷

THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF WOMEN'S WORK: PROBLEMATISING THE DISCOURSE

This paper raises important questions about the nature of professional and academic work for women such as Ann Gilchrist Strong and Emere Kaa. What was the extent of their success as agents of social reform? What role did professional networks and discourses of gender and race play in their academic and professional lives? Strong's position as an educated middle-class white woman with extensive political, social and personal connections certainly facilitated easy working relationships with the existing social and political elites in the Carnegie Corporation and heightened her impact on the tightly bounded world of New Zealand education. As an academic working in the highly feminised fields of home science and adult education, she was able to draw on prevailing assumptions about gender, her 'international' credentials as an academic in the field of household science, and contemporary beliefs about the importance of women's role as social reformers to expand opportunities for

²⁶ 'A vigorous life', *Auckland Weekly News*, 25 September 1940. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

²⁷ 'Confidential', F.P.K. to T.D.H. Hall, Esq., C.M.G. House of Representatives, Wellington, N.Z., 5 February 1940. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

women's academic and professional work in the academy and beyond. Nevertheless, her forceful approach and her American connections may have posed a threat to some of her male colleagues, this being exemplified in their use of masculine adjectives 'vigorous and aggressive' to describe her, and in measures to control her attempts to expand university education for adults into a national project (Collins, 2008a).²⁸ Similarly, Strong's efforts to expand a successful home science programme in remote Māori communities seem to have met with inertia and resistance.

An analysis of the significance of Emere Kaa's work as a professional and a social reformer is rendered more problematic as she had to negotiate complex and frequently contradictory discourses about gender and race. On the one hand as an educated Māori woman, and a trained nurse, she was seen by government agencies such as the Department of Education as having the credentials to carry the 'principles of modern housekeeping to her race'.²⁹ She was able to utilise her professional networks in the Department of Health and with Home Science to build on the health work that she had already been undertaking amongst her own people (Coney, 1993).³⁰ As a wellborn member of the Ngāti Porou tribe, and a fluent speaker of Māori, Emere found a ready welcome from Māori in the remote rural communities of the Far North, 'We all thought she was lovely and so softly spoken, in Māori too'.³¹ On the other hand, Kaa found herself having to negotiate contemporary discourses embedded with assumptions about the superiority of the white race, discourses which permeated her work as a woman and a social reformer, but which debased her knowledge and experience as a Māori. That she was able to negotiate a pathway through the minefield is apparent in her correspondence with Strong in which she outlined how she taught the practical skills required by the Department to Māori children in the schools and the success of this approach: 'The children were keen and exceptionally good with the practical side'.³²

At the same time, and almost as an aside, Kaa described going outside her brief from the Department to respond to the needs of local Māori women who wanted to hear her talk about midwifery. As she reported it, 'I did ad lib'.³³ Her ability to negotiate an individual pathway is evident too in her response to the demise of the 'home science programme'. Rather than return to maternity work in hospitals, which few Māori women could access, she took on the job of District Nurse in Kaikohe, a role that frequently involved travelling by horseback to work with the sick and with pregnant women in remote rural areas (Coney, 1993).³⁴

²⁸ Although she spent much of her life in New Zealand, Strong retained her US citizenship. (Taylor, 2007)

²⁹ *New Zealand Free Lance*, 2 October 1935, p.18. BAAA 10001/142a, Māori Schools, ANZ.

³⁰ In her role as Sister in charge of maternity annex at Rotorua hospital, Kaa had a reputation for firmness, insisting on fresh air for babies even in winter.

³¹ Communication with Ngahue Hau Te Paa, December 1992, cited in Coney (1993, p. 112)

³² Emere Kaa to Mrs Strong, 23 February 1936. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

³³ Emere Kaa to Mrs Strong, 23 February 1936. Grant Files, Series IIIA, Box 341, Folder 15, CCC.

³⁴ In 1939 she resigned from district nursing to marry Walter Clapham Mountain. His taxi became an ambulance for 12 years and 'Nurse Kaa' always kept her medical bag in the boot. Kaa was awarded the Coronation Medal for services to the community in 1937 and the QSO in 1979 (Coney, 1993).

Exploring international connections in the field of educational work has its pitfalls. Dangers include superficiality, lack of depth and the failure to understand the significance of national histories and culture. However, by adopting wider frames of reference, scholars can add new insights into the way educational values have been shaped in particular historical contexts and how the work of educators and policymakers continues to be influenced by developments at the local, national, and international level. This paper has examined the spread of new educational ideas across geographical and conceptual borders and some of the key influences on the nature of educational work, particularly women's academic and professional work. It has added new perspectives to scholarship that had limited its analysis to the role of 'key men', by detailing the way in which key women such as Ann Gilchrist Strong exercised strategic influence in universities and government policy making through their role as gate keepers for grant and travel programmes and purveyors of educational ideas.

Utilising a New Zealand case study it examined ways in which a Corporation grant for 'home science education' helped to expand the work of women as 'domestic experts' in the academy and beyond. It considered the way Strong and Kaa drew on their professional networks to disseminate progressive ideas of education into new fields such as home science, adult education, and child health while expanding opportunities for women's academic and professional work as social reform agents who were helping to diagnose and treat the root causes of poverty in the community. As demonstrated in the above, in the years from 1923-1942 the Carnegie Corporation influenced the spread of new educational ideas across geographical and conceptual borders and helped to define, develop, and distribute women's work in the academy and beyond.

NOTES ON SOURCES

CCC Carnegie Corporation Collections

ANZ Archives New Zealand

REFERENCES

Beeby, C. E. (1986). *The influence of the Carnegie Corporation on New Zealand* (No. ACCNO 5043). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Carnegie, A. (1933). *The gospel of wealth*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Doran.

Collins, J. (2008a). Beyond the domestic sphere? A home science education at the University of New Zealand, 1911-1936. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 41(2), 115-130.

Collins, J. (2008b). Glorified housekeepers or pioneering professionals? The professional lives of Home Science graduates from the University of New Zealand, 1911-1935. *History of Education Review*, 37(2), 40-51.

- Collins, J. (2009). Creating women's work in the academy and beyond: Carnegie connections, 1923-1942. *History of Education*, 38(6), 791-808.
- Coney, S. (1993). *Standing in the sunshine: A history of New Zealand women since they won the vote*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Ealy, L. T., & Ealy, S. D. (2006). Progressivism and philanthropy. *The Good Society*, 15(1), 35-42.
- Glotzer, R. (2009). A long shadow: Frederick P. Keppel, the Carnegie Corporation and the Dominions and Colonies Fund area experts 1923-1943. *History of Education*, 38(5), 621-648.
- Harris, C. (1997). Grace under pressure: The Black home extension service in South Carolina, 1919-1966. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 203-228). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Keppel, F. P. (1935). *Informal report of the president on visit to southern British Dominions, January-June, 1935*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Lagemann, E. C. (1989). *The politics of knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, philanthropy and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Mountain Harte, H. (2001). Home births to hospital births: Interviews with Maori women who had their babies in the 1930s. *Health and History*, 3, 87-108.
- Schramm, C. J. (2007). Law outside the market: The social utility of the private foundation. *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 30(1), 355-415.
- Stackpole, S. S. (1963). *Carnegie Corporation: Commonwealth program, 1911-1961*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Stingone, W. (2001). *Inventory of the Carnegie Corporation of New York Records 1872-2000*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- Taylor, L. (updated 22 June 2007). Strong, Ann Monroe Gilchrist 1875-1957. *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*. Retrieved from www.dnzb.govt.nz
- White, M. (1997). Carnegie Philanthropy in Australia in the nineteen thirties: A reassessment. *History of Education Review*, 26(1), 1-24.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge a Unitec Research Committee grant which made this research possible and to express her appreciation to the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

Manuscript Submitted: 12 August 2010 Manuscript Accepted: 9 February 2011
--

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jenny Collins
Unitec Institute of Technology



Jenny Collins is an Associate Professor in the Department of Education Unitec Institute of Technology where she leads a post-graduate programme in educational studies.

She is co-editor of the *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice* and Associate Editor of *History of Education*.

Her research interests include the academic and professional lives of women and the history of Catholic education in the post-war years. She is currently researching the professional lives of Colombo Plan scholars who studied in New Zealand universities.

Email: jcollins@unitec.ac.nz