Teachers who inspire are deeply valued by their students. The FEI did its students proud in this respect. A few (representing the tip of an iceberg) across the span of the years are included here. No men taught at the College until Molly Brearley became Principal. The chapter begins by paying tribute to these inspirational tutors with illustrations of their work. They are Rosalie Lulham, Dr Mollie Davies MBE, Gwen Allen, Elizabeth Hitchfield, Sheila Roberts and Professor Kevin Brehony. The chapter then summarises recently completed studies by PhD students who were awarded bursaries by The Froebel Trust.

Rosalie Lulham, by Kevin Brehony

Rosalie Lulham (1872–1934) was born in Brighton, the second daughter of a family of eight children of whom six were girls. She attended Brighton High School, and in 1891 she was accepted by Royal Holloway College to study science. She took a particular interest in Zoology but left Royal Holloway, apparently due to the limited science equipment, before taking her degree and graduating from University College London (UCL). She obtained a research scholarship at UCL and at the same time began lecturing at Westfield and King’s Colleges.

In 1896, she began part-time lecturing in Zoology at the Incorporated Froebel Educational Institute (IFEI) in Colet Gardens. This became a full-time post in 1900 and she taught botany and zoology and developed a nature study department. An IFEI student wrote that, ‘she led us into those intimate relations with living nature which she herself so humbly yet exultingly possessed’. In 1901 Rosalie Lulham founded the first Society of the College called the Natural History Club, the aims of which were ‘to increase in its members the knowledge and love of nature and to encourage original investigation’. In 1916 the Club was re-named the Guild of St. Francis. The name indicated Lulham’s spiritual inclinations and those of the Froebel tradition’s approach to the study of nature. Lulham has been described as a mystic by temperament and was hailed as a great teacher due to her ‘vision of beauty and wonder’ that she sought constantly to share.

Opportunities for nature study were restricted at Colet Gardens but when the IFEI moved to Grove House in 1921, they were much expanded. In 10 years she had identified 66 different
types of bird in the college grounds. Along with birds there were foxes, badgers and hedgehogs in what she described as ‘a paradise for nature work’.

In addition to using the grounds of Grove House for nature study, Rosalie Lulham led students on field trips around her house in Peaslake in Surrey and to Hickling Broad. Her book, *An introduction to Zoology through Nature Study with directions for practical work (invertebrates)* is still available and, when first published, became a standard work in the field.

Rosalie Lulham also took a great interest in the ‘social question’. In 1913 she went to Birmingham and there began to engage in social work. She had previously organized holidays for 5-year-olds and worked with blind children; but in Birmingham she worked at the Settlement in Summer Lane, a welfare centre for the poor when there was no welfare state. She visited infant health centres, babies’ clubs, infants’ and special schools and attended School Medical Care Committees and After-Care Committees.

Love of nature, a desire to study it and a dedication to helping the poor or disadvantaged distinguished many Froebelians from other educators, and in these endeavours, Rosalie Lulham was unsurpassed (Martindale, 1948).

**Dr Mollie Davies, MBE, by Tina Bruce and Louie Werth**

Dr Mollie Davies MBE, FRAD is an international expert on dance in education, with a particular interest in early childhood. She was the youngest Head of the Department of Movement and Dance in the UK when appointed at the Froebel Educational Institute until her retirement in 1990. This became part of the University of Roehampton and a new purpose-built set of dance studios, the Davies Building, were named to honour her work. Because Froebelians did not see publication as a key part of their role in Colleges of education until the 1990s, the extent of her contribution may not be evident. She pioneered the acceptance of Movement and Dance as high status subjects of study, and ensured that both were a daily part of the curriculum in nursery and primary schools. She was a great influence on the Froebel Research Nursery School in the Froebel College grounds in the 1970s. She established *Dance and the Child International* (daci), organising international conferences where children shared dance and disseminating a Froebelian approach with unstinting energy.

Her earlier text was a chapter, ‘Movement: action, feeling and thought’, in a groundbreaking publication, *Fundamentals in the First School* (1969), which was edited by the then Principal of the Froebel Educational Institute, Molly Brearley. Her PhD dissertation was titled *An Investigation into Movement Related to Some Aspects of Cognitive Development in Young Children* (Davies, 1976). Her seminal publication remains *Movement and Dance in Early Childhood* (Davies, 2003), and this has been translated into Chinese.

The role of the practitioner as a guide and provider of a stimulating environment is explained when describing the value of early childhood settings in creating opportunities for developing physical literacy (Davies, 2003: 98). There is also discussion on the role the teacher can play in a Primary School context (189–206) which (similar to Froebel’s writings) give practical suggestions for adults to support children’s physical development through specific Movement Games. There is also an emphasis on the adult taking the lead from the child and using dance to develop elements of the teacher-child relationship.

Another deeply Froebelian concept is the idea of all movement being expressive (128). Davies saw all movement in young children as meaningful and purposeful and her work resonates with Froebel who highlighted how physical movement can be seen in terms of the inner becoming outer and expressing the inner through outer forms, particularly during very early childhood.
Davies also discussed the issue of movement and cognitive development along with the idea of 'moving and thinking and moving and feeling' (61). Her chapter on movement and learning (61–86) presents the interconnectedness of learning and demonstrates how movement can have educative effects in a range of areas, including intellectual and emotional areas. Such a view demonstrates the Froebelian ideas of connectedness and the various forms of learning that can occur through simple Movement Games and activities.

Gwen Allen, by Louie Werth and Tina Bruce

Gwen Allen was a member of staff in the 1960s following in a long tradition from the time of Rosalie Lulham. Their way of working chimed with the way Froebel had worked with the children he taught. Fieldwork was important and both wrote field guides to support the observations of the children, their families and the teachers who worked with them. Gwen Allen, with a colleague Joan Denslow, made a major contribution in this respect with the series known and still much used, called the Clue Books (Allen and Denslow, 1970), which range from flowers to trees and every aspect of nature study.

She worked with the students inspiring exploration and problem solving and encouraging what they found particularly interesting. For example, she would set out an array of animal skulls on the table and ask the students to say what the animal or bird would have eaten, to describe its habitat and consider the size. This led to students, who could touch the skulls, trying out jaw movements and seeing how a sheep would chew compared with a fox. So what did each eat? What kind of teeth would they need? Were the eye sockets placed in order to see their prey? Students would go pond dipping in the beautiful lake in the College grounds and use magnifiers to sketch the creatures they found and to ponder nature.

Her book on science (1958) highlights the importance of the teacher in organising and making available useful and engaging resources, equipment and books that would help children with their enquiries and teachers drawing attention to things and being available to help find the answers to questions children might pose. The emphasis on the child’s own curiosities and interests leading science teaching is refreshingly Froebelian.

In her concluding section, ‘Some questions to ask ourselves’, a number of Froebelian elements are evident. Firstly, there is a focus on the need for teachers to reflectively evaluate their teaching and consider not just the present needs and interests of the children but also the as-yet latent scientific interests. Gwen Allen stressed education of the whole human being – physical, emotional, intellectual, social and spiritual – and prompted teachers to ask themselves questions about the curiosities they might kindle in children: Am I in touch with children’s real interests? Have I encouraged the children to express the results of their experiences? Have I been able to say with humility ‘I don’t know’? Do I inspire pupils with the long succession of discoveries in the history of human kind?

She valued pupil excitement and engagement as a marker for good teaching rather than skills for delivering information. Science was concerned with exploration, answering questions and enquiry and experimentation. Her Froebelian approach was clear: children’s curiosities and developing thinking took precedence over information learning.

Elizabeth Hitchfield, by Louie Werth and Tina Bruce

During the 1950s Molly Brearley, Principal of the Froebel Educational Institute, appointed Elizabeth Hitchfield (later known as Dr. Bevan Roberts) as the first psychologist to join the staff.
She also worked closely with Molly Brearley organising children’s clubs for children and their families to attend in order to ensure that this Froebelian tradition was sustained at a time when Froebelian elements were a challenge to keep in practice. The students helped as volunteers.

Her study of giftedness for the National Children’s Bureau (Hitchfield, 1976), although not overtly Froebelian, draws on Froebel’s holistic view of the child, concurs that children develop individually through their personal interests, building on their skills, and her emphasis on parent-school partnerships has a Froebelian tone.

Sheila Roberts, by Tina Bruce

Sheila Roberts was Head of the Mathematics Department at the FEI in the 1960s and later became Deputy Principal. She was also a Trustee and Treasurer of the National Froebel Foundation (NFF). She understood that many students, although required to have Grade C mathematics GCE, did not have good feelings about the subject. Her course was very practical, such as chasing buses down Roehampton Lane with stop watches and washing lines marked out in feet, so that quite quickly students understood with clarity concepts such as distance and speed. Every student was required to make practical mathematical equipment, which could be taken and used in school. This was a modern take on Froebel’s Gifts: Froebel had used the base 8, whereas students (before 1972) made their apparatus to base 12 (feet and inches). Balances were made from buckets to introduce children to weight, volume and capacity in ways suitable for very young children.

On retirement she became Chair of Governors at Ibstock Place School, which had been the Demonstration school of the College. A building was named after her on the initiative of the Headmistress, Franciska Baylis.

Professor Kevin Brehony (1948–2013), by Louie Werth and Tina Bruce

The International Froebel Society was founded in 2002 through the vision and initiative of the first Froebel Professor, Kevin Brehony, who worked with Dr Peter Weston, Francisca Baylis and Professor Maurice Craft to bring this to fruition. He became its President in 2010. He envisioned an opportunity for scholars and those working directly with children and families in leadership roles to promote Froebelian philosophy. The IFS has fulfilled this (see Chapter 37). Kevin Brehony has empowered young scholars to work in this field and they are working in Universities across the world as a result.

Kevin Brehony frequently attempted to challenge the status quo (Brehony, 2017) with regard to the understanding of Froebel’s works and pedagogy. There are two articles in particular which demonstrate this aspect to his work. The first relates to concepts of play and work. Brehony (2003, 2013) proposed that that whilst Froebel was a great supporter of play, he saw it as subordinate to work and that Froebel’s thoughts on play are more complex than usually portrayed. Froebel, he argued, believed that play and work were inter-related but, with regard to self-active representation, play had a subordinate role to work in achieving this. Froebel, he said, saw the purpose of education conceived through and for work (Brehony, 2013). Importantly, he submitted that it was the revisionists who put greater emphasis on play and abandoned traditional Froebelian views on work (2013) (see Chapter 9). Kevin Brehony’s work exudes his passion for ‘true’ Froebelianism. He drew a line between Froebel’s own work and perceptions and the revisionists and demonstrated that many of the Froebelian practitioners of the early twentieth century had lost some key elements through the revisionist process.
Kevin Brehony ignited further controversy amid the Froebelian movement by arguing (Brehony, 2009) that during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, education drew upon psychology to effect a greater sense of its seriousness as a discipline. He also argued that rational knowledge nearly always took precedence over observation in Froebel's approach, but that Froebel's approaches began to be challenged by the empiricism of childhood studies and observation as these gained prominence. He concluded that a break occurred in the Froebel movement when education was legitimated by empirical as opposed to philosophical epistemologies and approaches. However, the philosophical and metaphysical aspects of Froebelian pedagogy did not entirely disappear but were expressed in new ways. His article delved deeply into the foundations and character of the Froebelian movement and created a literary window through which the current Froebelian movement can reflect, consider and negotiate its relationship with the foundations of its approach to Froebelian philosophical ideas. These include observation, rationalism, psychology, political and socio-economic agendas and the need for a careful balance of all of the above.

Kevin Brehony also reflected on the long neglect of early childhood education despite the surge of interest in early childhood in government policy since the 1990s (Brehony, 2009).

Kevin Brehony's outstanding contributions to scholarship were extensive and wide ranging in their subjects, which included the development of Froebelian approaches in Russia (Valkanova and Brehony, 2006), Dewey and English education (Brehony, 1997), the Froebel movement and state education (Brehony, 1987), progressive education (Brehony, 2001a), methodological approaches (Deem and Brehony, 1994), Montessori (Brehony, 2000b) and primary schooling under New Labour (Brehony, 2005).

In the Preface to the book which pays tribute to Kevin Brehony (May, Nawrotzki and Prochner, 2017) a favourite quotation from Froebel is chosen. It feels right to include it here.

The last word of my theory I shall carry to my grave, the time is not yet ripe for it. If three hundred years after my system of education is completely and according to its real principle carried through Europe, I shall rejoice in heaven. If only the seed be cast abroad, its springing up will not fail nor the fruit be wanting.

(Froebel In Baroness Bertha von Marenholz-Bulow, 1877: 17)

PhD bursaries awarded by the Froebel trust from 2012

The world of research in education is slowly beginning to shift, and it is gradually becoming acceptable to study and put forward a thesis which begins from an exploration and deepening understanding of a Froebelian framework. There is a constant pressure which suggests that Froebelian education can only be examined in a research thesis if it compares Froebelian education with other specific approaches, or if it attempts to prove that Froebelian education is the best. It is not yet fashionable to return to how Froebelian education began with the emphasis on establishing the natural history before attempting to measure how the approach succeeds. There is a tendency to tack Froebelian principles onto mainstream current research and theory as an afterthought. There is also the challenge that there is very little identifiable and articulated Froebelian practice that can be researched, although that situation is changing quite rapidly because more Froebel practitioners are being trained through continuing professional development routes. This constraint is frustrating and holding back Froebelian scholarship, which has therefore tended to focus on historic aspects. These are important and make an invaluable contribution with key messages enabling possibilities for current researchers, practitioners and policy makers to learn the lessons of history rather than repeating mistakes. The examples of PhD theses which
follow are funded by bursaries from the Froebel Trust and reflect these challenges. They explore topics which, although mainstream, link with Froebelian approaches, encouraged by the Chair of the Research Committee, Dr Peter Elfer.

Perhaps the most significant result of the bursary holders has been that they have been appointed to posts in universities where they contribute to early childhood education. If they become lecturers in universities with Froebelian tradition and expertise, such as Roehampton, Canterbury or Edinburgh there is the possibility to develop their work using a Froebelian framework to do so. The rationale of the Froebel Trust in setting up the bursary programme has been to bring about an increased interest in Froebelian research and teaching at university level which introduces students to Froebelian approaches.

Chris Gomez

In an article for EYE (Gomez, 2010) Chris Gomez describes in accessible terms the thesis for her doctorate. She became an Associate lecturer at the Open University and a visiting lecturer at the University of Roehampton. Her PhD title was *Attitudes to child-rearing and young children in Kent, England and Murcia, Spain: A comparative multiple-case study of pre-compulsory early years settings*.

Sally Howe

Sally Howe became a Lecturer at the University of Roehampton and leads the early Childhood Studies course. Her PhD thesis was *Children’s changing perceptions over the course of the transition from the foundation stage to key stage 1*.

Amy Palmer

Amy Palmer became a lecturer at the University of Roehampton. Her PhD thesis was *Nursery schools or nursery classes? An analysis of national and local policy in England 1918–1972*. This thesis makes a contribution to the study of education policy in England by analysing decisions taken by the Board of Education and its successor bodies, from 1918 to 1972, concerning whether self-governing nursery schools or nursery classes attached to infant schools should be the preferred institution for pre-school education. It draws on documentary sources and archives, offering a qualitative analysis influenced by policy and decision-making theory. It argues that these decisions were determined both by fundamental beliefs about what nursery education was for and by the fact that nursery education was a low political priority. It demonstrates that the Board/Ministry operated largely as a policy making elite in this area, and neither the voices of the established policy network of educationalists nor marginalised constituencies such as working parents had a significant influence on the decisions. This exclusion militated against the successful implementation of policy.

The thesis also analyses decisions made within four Local Education Authorities (LEAs), two which invested almost exclusively in nursery classes and two which established both schools and classes. These differences emerged prior to World War II and were caused by the varying values and beliefs of the education committees. Despite increased central control after the war, the established paths constrained new developments so that the original patterns largely persisted. Therefore, the local picture offers a small correction to the elitist model of policymaking as it demonstrates that some voices outside central government had an impact on the implementation process.
Jessica Pitt

Jessica Pitt completed her doctorate in 2014. She became a lecturer leading the MA in Early Years Music at the Centre for Research in Early Childhood (CREC) in Birmingham and includes Froebelian teaching in this. The course, with its identifiable Froebelian element is gaining in popularity with students attending from the Netherlands as well as the UK. The title of her thesis was *An exploratory study of the role of music with participants in children's centres* (http://hdl.handle.net/10142/321585). The research was based on experiences of working as a member of an interdisciplinary team at a children’s centre. Musicians rarely get the chance to be an integral part of a multi-disciplinary team as a full-time member of staff. Findings from groups of practitioners and parents relating to why music is offered by children’s centres, revealed seven main themes: Social, Emotional, Learning, Teaching, Links to Home, Parenting and Organisational. Practitioners found the learning benefits for children to be the most beneficial and the parents were more focused on the emotional benefits for their children. Practitioners perceived that the music group activities were more beneficial for parents than the parents reported themselves. The ‘ritual’ of the music group permitted adults and children the chance to co-participate in a space and time that was separate from the everyday. This seemed to allow for performance and participation that was not possible in other parent-child activity groups. Interaction in the group was multifaceted with opportunities for intimate, one-to-one, parent-child interaction and socialisation with peers, and other adults, all on offer.

By foregrounding parent-child activity groups in the research it was possible to highlight parents as important in their children’s development. Music in early childhood does not have high status (Ouvry, 2004a; Ouvry, 2004b; Pitt and Hargreaves, 2016, 2017; Huhtinen-Hilden and Pitt, 2018) – this research contributes to a small but growing field of academic study. Music that children experience in their mother’s (father’s/caregiver’s) arms can have a profound impact on lives: emotionally, socially, cognitively and musically.

The destiny of nations lies far more in the hands of women, the mothers, than in the possessors of power, or those of innovators who for the most part do not understand themselves. We must cultivate women, who are the educators of the human race, else the new generation cannot accomplish its task.

*(von Marenholtz-Bülow, 1887)*

Lucy Parker Ball, by Suzanne Flannery Quinn

*Exploring the formation of pedagogical beliefs* in female early years employs a feminist social constructionist framework in order to gain a greater understanding of how early years teachers develop their pedagogy in relation to their life stories.

Lucy used a life history approach to the data collection, incorporating objects selected by participants to aid in the interview process. She found that maternal identity and childhood experiences were some of the strongest factors that participants recollected as contributing to pedagogy. The analysis gives us insight into how female early years teachers in the UK talk about their pedagogy and what has contributed to its formation. Their narratives reveal commonalities as well as differences. Common strands in the participants interviewed were the use of open ended resources (what some participants called ‘stuff’ to be used creatively), the importance of children being active when they are learning, and the significance of the outdoors, particularly with regard to the opportunity being outdoors affords children with regard to risk, as well as freedom.
Lucy’s research does important work in sharing the stories of female teachers, who often have restricted time to think and whose voices are often not heard over the din of economic striving.

**Dr Jennifer Clement**

Jennie undertook her doctoral research with a supervisory team (Kathy Gooch, Sacha Powell and Trisha Maynard) at Canterbury Christ Church University, although her base was in Wales, which also formed the geographical context for her study (submitted in December 2017) entitled: *Spatially Democratic Pedagogy: A pedagogical intervention to support children’s design and co-creation of classroom space. A new trajectory for Froebel’s kindergarten spaces?*