Curriculum Contrasts: A Historical Overview

by Allan C. Ornstein

The curriculum is the heart of every school program. Mr. Ornstein presents a curriculum primer — detailing the most important curriculum movements, their adherents, and their rationales.

The most fundamental concern of schooling is curriculum. Students tend to view schooling largely as subjects or courses to be taken. Teachers and professors give much attention to adoption and revision of subject matter. Parents and community members frequently express concern about what schools are for and what they should teach. In short, all of these groups are attending to one thing: curriculum.

Curriculum concepts and scope have changed over the years, and from these changes two differing views of curriculum have emerged. The first sees curriculum as a body of content or *subject matter* leading to certain achievement outcomes or *products*. The second views curriculum in terms of the *learner* and his or her needs; the concern is with *process*, i.e., the climate of the classroom and school.

The Subject-Centered Curriculum

Subject matter is the oldest and most used framework for curriculum organization, primarily because it is convenient. In fact, the departmental structure of secondary schools and colleges tends to prevent us from thinking about the curriculum in other ways. Curricular changes usually occur at the departmental level. Courses are added, omitted, or modified, but faculty members rarely engage in comprehensive, systematic curriculum development and evaluation. Even in the elementary school, where self-contained classrooms force the teachers to be generalists, curricula are usually organized by subjects.

Proponents defend the subject-centered curriculum on four grounds: 1) that subjects are a logical way to organize and interpret learning, 2) that such organization makes it easier for people to remember information for future use, 3) that teachers (in secondary schools, at least) are trained as subject-matter specialists, and 4) that textbooks and other teaching materials are usually organized by subject. Critics, however, claim that the subject-centered curriculum is fragmented, a mass of facts and concepts learned in isolation. They see this kind of curriculum as de-emphasizing life experiences and failing to consider adequately the needs and interests of students. The emphasis, such critics argue, is on the teaching of knowledge, the recall of facts. Thus the teacher dominates the lesson, allowing little student input. Let us look at five variations on the subject-centered curriculum.

Subject-Area Curriculum. The subject area is the oldest and most widely used form of curriculum organization. It has its roots in the seven liberal arts of classical Greece and Rome: grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. Modern subject-area curricula trace their origins to the work of William Harris, superintendent of the St. Louis school system in the 1870s. Steeped in the classical tradition, Harris established a subject orientation that has virtually dominated U.S. curricula from his day to the present.

The modern subject-area curriculum treats each subject as a specialized and largely autonomous body of verified knowledge. These subjects can be organized into three content categories, however. *Common content* refers to subjects considered essential for all students; these subjects usually include the three R's at the elementary level and English, history, science, and mathematics at the secondary level. *Special content* refers to subjects that develop knowledge and skills for particular vocations or professions, e.g., business mathematics and physics. Finally, *elective content* affords the student optional offerings. Some electives are restricted to certain students, e.g., advanced auto mechanics for vocational students or fourth-year French for students enrolled in a college-preparatory program. Other electives, such as photography and human relations, are open to all students.

Perennialist Curriculum. Two conservative philosophies of education are basically subject-centered: Perennialism and Essentialism.[1] Perennialists believe that a curriculum should consist primarily of the three R's, Latin, and logic at the elementary level, to which is added the study of the classics at the secondary level.

ALLAN C. ORNSTEIN is professor of education, Loyola University of Chicago.

The assumption, according to Robert Hutchins, is that the best of the past — the so-called "permanent studies" or classics — is equally valid for the present.[2]

One problem with Perennialism is its fundamental premise: that the main purpose of education is the cultivation of the intellect. Further, Perennialists believe that only certain studies have this power. They reject consideration of students' personal needs and interests or the treatment of contemporary problems in the curriculum on the ground that such concerns are frivolous and detract from the school's mission of cultivating the mind.

Essentialist Curriculum. Essentialists believe that the curriculum must consist of "disciplined study" in five areas: English (grammar, literature, and writing), mathematics, the sciences, history, and foreign languages.[3] They see these subject areas as the best way of systematizing and keeping up with the explosion of knowledge.

Essentialism shares with Perennialism the notion that the curriculum should focus on rigorous intellectual training, a training possible only through the study of certain subjects. Although the Perennialist sees no need for nonacademic subjects, the Essentialist is willing to add such studies to the curriculum, provided they receive low priority.

Both Perennialists and Essentialists advocate an educational meritocracy. They favor high academic standards and a rigorous system of testing to help schools sort students by ability. The goal is to educate each person to the limits of his or her potential.

Subject Structure Curriculum. During the Fifties and Sixties, the National Science Foundation and the federal government devoted sizable sums to the improvement of science and mathematics curricula at the elementary and secondary levels. The result was new curricular models formulated according to the structure of each subject or discipline. Structure includes those unifying concepts, rules, and principles that define and limit a subject and control the methods of research and inquiry. Structure brings together and organizes a body of knowledge, as well as dictating appropriate ways of thinking about the subject and of generating new data. Other subjects quickly followed the lead of mathematics and the sciences.

Those who advocated this kind of focus on structure nonetheless rejected the idea of knowledge as fixed or permanent. They regarded teaching and learning as continuing inquiry, but they confined such inquiry within the established boundaries of subjects, ignoring or rejecting the fact that many problems cut across disciplines. Instead, they emphasized the students' cognitive abilities. They taught students the structure of a subject and its methods of inquiry so that students would learn how to learn. But they tended to dismiss learners' social and psychological needs. As Philip Phenix wrote: "There is no place in the curriculum for ideas which are regarded as suitable for teaching because of the supposed nature, needs, and interests of the learner, but which do not belong within the regular structure of the discipline."[4]

The emphasis on structure led each discipline to develop its own unifying concepts, principles, and methods of inquiry. Learning by the inquiry method in chemistry differs from learning by the inquiry method in physics, for example. Moreover, curriculum planners could not agree on how to teach the structure of the social sciences and the fine arts. Science and mathematics programs continue even today to provide the best examples of teaching the structure of a subject.

Back-to-Basics Curriculum. A strong back-to-basics movement has surfaced among parents and educators, called forth by the general relaxation of academic standards in the Sixties and Seventies and declining student achievement in reading, writing, and computation. Automatic promotion of marginal students, the dizzying array of elective courses, and textbooks designed more to entertain than to educate are frequently cited as sources of the decline in basic skills. Even the mass media have attacked the "soft-sell approach" to education. The concerns voiced today parallel, to some extent, those voiced immediately after Sputnik. The call is less for academic excellence and rigor, however, than for a return to basics. Annual Gallup polls have asked the public to suggest ways for improving education; since 1975 "devoting more attention to teaching the basics" has either headed the list of responses or ranked no lower than third.[5]

By 1978, 33 states had set minimum standards for elementary and secondary students. All the remaining states have legislation pending or are studying the situation.[6] The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) recommends the use of certificates of proficiency for all students, whether or not minimal proficiency is made a requirement for graduation. Congress is also urging voluntary adoption by state and local education agencies of minimum competency testing programs.[7]

Although the back-to-basics movement means different things to different people, it usually connotes an Essentialist curriculum with heavy emphasis on reading, writing, and mathematics. Solid subjects — English, history, science, mathematics — are taught in all grades. History means U.S. and European history and perhaps Asian and African history, but not Afro-American history or ethnic studies. English means traditional grammar, not linguistics or nonstandard English; it means Shakespeare and Wordsworth, not *Catcher in the Rye* or *Lolita.* Creative writing is frowned upon. Science means biology, chemistry, and physics — not ecology. Mathematics means old math, not new math. Furthermore, these subjects are required. Proponents of the basics consider elective courses in such areas as scuba diving, transcendental meditation, and hiking as nonsense. Some even consider humanities or integrated social science courses too "soft." They may grudgingly admit music and art into the program — but only for half credit.[8]

These proponents believe that too many illiterate students pass from grade to grade and eventually graduate, that high school and college diplomas are meaningless as measures of graduates' abilities, that minimum standards must be set, that the basics (reading, writing, math) are essential for employment, and that students must learn survival skills to function effectively in society. Some back-to-basics advocates are college educators who would do away with open admissions or relaxed entrance requirements and grade inflation; they would simply insist that their institutions require students to meet a reasonable standard in the basic disciplines — that students be able to understand homework assignments, write acceptable essays, and compute numbers accurately.[9]

Critics point out that the decline in standardized achievement test scores — a grave concern of back-to-basics enthusiasts — may be linked less to curriculum than to higher student/teacher ratios, a decrease in the number of low-achieving students who drop out of school, and the more permissive attitude of society.[10] There is no guarantee, they argue, that the student who masters specific skills for today's world will be better prepared for the world of tomorrow. They also worry that a narrow focus on basics will suppress students' creativity, encouraging instead conformity and dependence on authority.[11] Others expect the back-to-basics movement to fail because teaching and learning cannot be defined and limited precisely and because testing has too many inherent problems.

While the debate is raging, the movement is spreading quickly in response to public pressure. State legislators and state boards of education seem convinced of the merit of minimum standards. But there are also unanswered questions. If we adopt a back-to-basics approach to education, what standards should be considered minimum?[12] Who determines these standards? What do we do with students who fail to meet these standards? Are we simply punishing the victims for the schools' inability to educate them? How will the courts deal with the fact that proportion-

"Progressive educators believed that, when the interests and needs of learners were incorporated into the curriculum, intrinsic motivation resulted."

ally more minority than white students fail the competency tests in nearly every state that has a testing program?[13] Is the issue minimum competence, or is it equal educational opportunity?

The Student-Centered Curriculum

If the subject-centered curriculum focuses on cognitive aspects of learning, the student-centered curriculum emphasizes students' interests and needs. The student-centered approach, at its extreme, is rooted in the philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau, who encouraged childhood self-expression.

Implicit in Rousseau's philosophy is the necessity of leaving the child to his or her own devices; he considered creativity and freedom essential for children's growth. Moreover, he thought a child would be happier if free of teacher domination and the demands of subject matter and adult-imposed curriculum goals. This hands-off policy was Rousseau's reaction to the domineering teacher of the traditional school, whose sole purpose was to drill facts into a child's brain.

Progressive education gave impetus to the student-centered curriculum. Progressive educators believed that, when the interests and needs of learners were incorporated into the curriculum, intrinsic motivation resulted. I do not mean to imply that the student-centered curriculum is dictated by the whims of the learner. Rather, advocates believe that learning is more successful if the interests and needs of the learner are taken into account. The student-centered curriculum sometimes overlooks important cognitive content, however.

John Dewey, one of the chief advocates of the student-centered curriculum, criticized educators who overlooked the importance of subject matter. His intention was to establish a curriculum that balanced subject matter with student interests and needs. As early as 1902, he pointed out the fallacies of either extreme. The learner was neither "a docile recipient of facts" nor "the starting point, the center, and the end" of school activity.[14] More than 30 years later, Dewey was still criticizing overpermissive educators who provided little education for students under the guise of meeting their expressed and impulsive needs.[15] Dewey sought instead to use youngsters' developing interests to enhance the cognitive learning process.

There are at least five variations of the student-centered curriculum.

Child-Centered Schools. The movement from the traditional subject-dominated curriculum toward a program emphasizing student interests and needs began in 1762 with the publication of Rousseau's *Emile.* In this book Rousseau maintained that the purpose of education is to teach people to live. Early in the next century the Swiss educator, Johann Pestalozzi, began to stress human emotions and kindness in teaching young children. Friedrich Froebel introduced the kindergarten in Germany in 1837. He emphasized a permissive atmosphere and the use of songs, stories, and games as instructional materials. Early in the 20th century Maria Montessori, working with the slum children of Rome, developed a set of didactic materials and learning exercises that successfully combined work with play. Many of her principles were introduced in the U.S. during the Sixties as part of the compensatory preschool movement.

Early Progressive educators in the U.S. adopted the notion of child-centered schools, starting with Dewey's organic school (which he described in *Schools of Tomorrow*) and including many private and experimental schools — the best known of which were Columbia University's Lincoln School, Ohio State's Laboratory School, the University of Missouri Elementary School, the Pratt Play School in New York City, the Parker School in Chicago, and the Fairhope School in Alabama.[16] These schools had a common feature: Their curricula stressed the needs and interests of the students. Some stressed individualization; others grouped students by ability or interests.

Child-centered education is represented today by programs for such special groups as the academically talented, the disadvantaged, dropouts (actual and potential), the handicapped, and minority and ethnic groups. Many of these programs are carried on in "free" or "alternative" schools organized by parents and teachers who are dissatisfied with the public schools. Most of these new schools are considered radical and anti-Establishment, even though many of their ideas are rooted in the child-centered doctrines of Progressivism.

Summerhill, a school founded in 1921 by A. S. Neill and still in existence today, is perhaps the best-known free school. Neill's philosophy was the replacement of authority by freedom.[17] He was not concerned with formal learning; he did not believe in textbooks or examinations. He did believe that those who want to study *will* study and those who prefer not to study will *not*, regardless of how teachers teach. Neill's dual criteria for success were the ability to work joyfully and the ability to live a happy life.

Although Neill, Edgar Friedenberg, Paul Goodman, and John Holt[18] all belong to an earlier generation of school reformers, new radicals have also emerged. They include George Dennison, James Herndon, Ivan Illich, Herbert Kohl, and Jonathan Kozol. These educators stress the need for and in many cases have established child-centered free schools or alternative schools.[19] These schools are typified by a great deal of freedom for students and noisy classrooms that sometimes appear untidy and disorganized. The teaching/learning process is unstructured.

Critics condemn these schools as places where little cognitive learning takes place. They decry a lack of discipline and order. They feel that the radical reformers' attacks on Establishment teachers and schools are overgeneralized and unfair. Moreover, they view the radicals' idea of schooling as not feasible for mass education. Proponents counter that children do learn in these schools, which do not stress conformity but instead are made to fit the child.

Activity-Centered Curriculum. This movement, which grew out of the private child-centered schools, strongly affected the public elementary school curriculum. William Kilpatrick, a student of Dewey's, was its leader. In 1918 Kilpatrick wrote a theoretical article, "The Project Method," that catapulted him into national prominence. He advocated purposeful activities that were tied to a child's needs and interests.[20] Kilpatrick differed with Dewey's child-centered view; he believed that the interests and needs of children could not be anticipated, making a preplanned curriculum impossible. He attacked the school curriculum as unrelated to the problems of real life and advocated purposeful activities that were as lifelike as possible.

During the Twenties and Thirties, many elementary schools adopted some of the ideas of the activity movement, perhaps best summarized and first put into practice by Ellsworth Collings, a doctoral student of Kilpatrick's.[21] From this movement a host of teaching strategies emerged, including lessons based on life experiences, group games, dramatizations, story projects, field trips, social enterprises, and interest centers. All of these activities involved problem solving

"[C]hanges made in the name of relevance have led to a watered-down curriculum."

and active student participation; they emphasized socialization and the formation of stronger school/community ties.

Recent curriculum reformers have translated ideas from this movement into community and career-based activities intended to prepare students for adult citizenship and work and into courses emphasizing social problems. They have also urged college credit for life experiences.[22] Secondary and college students often earn credit today by working in welfare agencies, early childhood programs, government institutions, hospitals, and homes for the aged.[23]

Relevant Curriculum. Unquestionably, the curriculum must reflect social change. This point is well illustrated in a satiric book on education, *The Saber-Tooth Curriculum*, written in 1939 by Harold Benjamin under the pseudonym of Abner J. Peddiwell.[24] He describes a society in which the schools continued to teach fish-catching (because it would develop agility), horse-clubbing (to develop strength), and tiger-scaring (to develop courage) long after the streams had dried up and the horses and tigers had disappeared. The wise men of the society argued that "the essence of true education is timeless . . . something that endures through changing conditions like a solid rock standing squarely and firmly in the middle of a raging torrent."[25] Benjamin's message was simple: The curriculum was no longer relevant.

There is a renewed concern today that the curriculum be relevant. But the emphasis has changed. We no longer worry so much about whether the curriculum reflects changing social conditions. Instead, we are concerned that the curriculum be relevant to students. This shift is part of the Dewey legacy. Learners must be motivated and interested in the learning task, and the classroom should build on their real-life experiences.[26]

The new demand for relevance comes from both students and educators. In fact, the student disruptions of the late 1960s and early 1970s were related to this demand. Proponents see as needs: 1) the individualization of instruction through such teaching methods as independent inquiry, special projects, and contracts; 2) the revision of existing courses and development of new ones on such topics of student concern as environmental protection, drug addiction, urban problems, cultural pluralism, and Afro-American literature; 3) the provision of educational alternatives (e.g., electives, minicourses, open classrooms) that allow more freedom of choice; and 4) the extension of the curriculum beyond the school's walls through such innovations as work-study programs, credit for life experiences, and external degree programs.[27]

Efforts to relate subject matter to student interests have been largely ad hoc. Many of the changes have also been fragmentary and temporary, a source of concern to advocates of relevance. In other cases, changes made in the name of relevance have led to a watered-down curriculum.

Hidden Curriculum. The notion of a hidden curriculum implies that values of the student peer group are often ignored when formal school curricula are planned. C. Wayne Gordon was one of the first educators to describe the hidden curriculum — the "informal school system" that affects what is learned.[28] Gordon argued that students' achievement and behavior are related to their status and roles in school; he also suggested that informal and unrecognized cliques of students control much of adolescent performance both inside and outside of school. These cliques or factions are sometimes in conflict with the formal school curriculum, with textbooks, and with classroom rules.

The hidden curriculum also includes the strategies adopted by students to outwit and outguess their teachers. According to John Holt, "successful" students become cunning strategists in a game of beating the system.[29] Experience has taught these students that trickery and even occasional dishonesty pay off. The implication is that teachers must become more sensitive to students' needs and feelings in order to minimize counterproductive behavior. A school that encourages personal freedom and cooperative group learning — instead of competitive individualization, lesson recitation, "right" answers, and textbook/teacher authority — is more conducive to learning because the atmosphere is free of trickery and dishonesty. Or so the argument goes.

Another interpretation of the hidden curriculum suggests that some intentional school behavior is not formally recognized in the curriculum or discussed in the classroom because of its sensitivity or because teachers do not consider it important. At the same time, students sometimes see what *is* taught as phony, antiseptic, or unrelated to the real world. For example, certain ethnic or minority groups are discussed in a derogatory manner in some homes. This raises several questions. Should curriculum specialists or teachers try to suppress the hidden curriculum in order to further the purposes of the school? Or should they try to incorporate it into school life? At what age is the student mature enough to discuss such sensitive topics as racial and ethnic stereotypes? A student-oriented school, some educators contend, would try to reduce the disparity between the student's world outside of school and that within.[30]

Humanistic Curriculum. Like many other modern curriculum developments, humanistic education was a reaction to the emphasis on cognitive learning in the late Fifties and early Sixties. Terry Borton, a Philadelphia schoolteacher, was one of the first to write about this movement. He contended that education in the Seventies had only two major purposes: subject mastery and personal growth.[31] Nearly every school's statement of objectives includes both purposes, but Borton saw the objectives related to personal growth and to values, feelings, and the happy life as "only for show. Everyone knows how little schools have done about [them]."[32] Borton believed that the time had come for schools to put their noble phrases about children's social and personal interests into practice.

In his best-selling book, *Crisis in the Classroom*, Charles Silberman also advocated the humanizing of U.S. schools.[33] He charged that schools are repressive, teaching students docility and conformity. He believed that schools must be reformed, even at the price of deemphasizing cognitive learning. He suggested that elementary schools adopt the methods of the British infant schools. At the secondary level, he suggested independent study, peer tutoring, and community and work experiences.

The humanistic model of education stems from the human potential movement in psychology. Within education it is rooted in the work of Arthur Jersild, who linked good teaching with knowledge of self and students, and in the work of Arthur Combs and Donald Snygg, who explored the impact of self-concept and motivation on achievement.[34] Combs and Snygg considered self-concept the most important determinant of behavior.

A humanistic curriculum emphasizes affective rather than cognitive outcomes. Such a curriculum draws heavily on the work of Abraham Maslow and of Carl Rogers.[35] Its goal is to produce "self-actualizing people," in Maslow's words, or "total human beings," as Rogers puts it. The works of both psychologists are larded with such terms as maintaining, striving, enhancing, and experiencing —

"The subject-centered curriculum and the student-centered curriculum represent two extremes on a continuum. Most schooling in the U.S. falls somewhere in between. . . ."

as well as independence, self-determination, integration, and self-actualization.

Advocates of humanistic education contend that the present school curriculum has failed miserably by humanistic standards, that teachers and schools are determined to stress cognitive behaviors and to control students *not* for their own good but for the good of adults.[36] Humanists emphasize more than affective processes; they seek higher domains of consciousness. But they see the schools as unconcerned about higher planes of understanding, enhancement of the mind, or self-knowledge. Students must therefore turn to such out-of-school activities as drugs, yoga, transcendental meditation, group encounters, T-groups, and psychotherapy.

Humanists would attempt to form more meaningful relationships between students and teachers; they would foster student independence and self-direction and promote greater acceptance of self and others. The teacher's role would be to help learners cope with their psychological needs and problems, to facilitate self-understanding among students, and to help them develop fully.

A drawback to humanist theory is its lack of attention to cognitive learning and intellectual development. When asked to judge the effectiveness of their curriculum, humanists generally rely on testimonials and subjective assessments by students and teachers. They may also present such materials as students' paintings and poems or talk about "marked improvement" in student behavior and attitudes. They present very little empirical evidence, however, to support their stance.

The subject-centered curriculum and the student-centered curriculum represent two extremes on a continuum. Most schooling in the U.S. falls somewhere in between — effecting a tenuous balance between subject matter and student needs, between achievement outcomes and learning climate.

---

1. These two terms were coined by Theodore Brameld in *Patterns of Educational Philosophy* (New York: Holt, 1950).

2. Robert M. Hutchins, *The Higher Learning in America* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1936).

3. Arthur Bestor, *The Restoration of Learning* (New York: Knopf, 1956).

4. Philip H. Phenix, "The Disciplines as Curriculum Content," in A. Harry Passow, ed., *Curriculum Crossroads* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1962), p. 64.

5. See the annual Gallup polls published in the December 1975, October 1976, October 1977, September 1978, September 1979, and September 1980 issues of *Phi Delta Kappan*.

6. Ben Brodinsky, "Back to the Basics! The Movement and Its Meaning," *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 1977, pp. 522-27; Chris Pipho, "Minimum Competency Testing in 1978: A Look at State Standards," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May 1978, pp. 585-87; and Rodney P. Riegel and Ned B. Lovell, *Minimum Competency Testing* (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1980).

7. James L. Jarrett, "I'm for Basics, But Let Me Define Them," *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1977, pp. 235-39; and Richard M. Jaeger and Carol K. Title, eds., *Minimum Competency Achievement Testing* (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1979).

8. Brodinsky, op. cit.; Pipho, op. cit.; and Michael Zieky and Samuel Livingston, *Manual for Setting Standards on the Basic Skills Assessment Tests* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1977).

9. Jarrett, op. cit.; and Martin Mayer, "Higher Education for All?," *Commentary*, February 1973, pp. 37-47.

10. Joyce E. Johnson, "Back to Basics? We've Been There 150 Years," *Reading Teacher*, March 1979, pp. 644-46; and Ellen V. Leininger, "Back to Basics: Concepts and Controversy," *Elementary School Journal*, January 1979, pp. 167-73.

11. Gene V Glass, "Minimum Competence and Incompetence in Florida," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May 1979, pp. 602-5; and Arthur E. Wise, "Minimum Competency Testing: Another Case of Hyper-Rationalization," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May 1979, pp. 596-98.

12. New York is the only state currently insisting that high-school-level material be included in the minimum competences required of graduating students. This requirement will prevent several thousand New York students from graduating.

13. In Florida, a federal court postponed for an interim period the use of competency tests for graduation, because the tests seemed to be punishing the victims of past discrimination. The court did not find the test to be racially or culturally biased, however.

14. John Dewey, *The Child and the Curriculum* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902), pp. 8, 9.

15. John Dewey, *Art and Experience* (New York: Capricorn Books, 1934).

16. A number of these early experimental schools are discussed in detail by John Dewey and his daughter Evelyn in *Schools of Tomorrow*, published in 1915. Another good source is the 1926 yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, a two-volume work titled *The Foundations of Curriculum* and *Techniques of Curriculum Construction*. Lawrence Cremin's *The Transformation of the School*, published in 1961, is still another good source. Finally, Ohio State's Laboratory School is best summarized in a 1938 book titled *Were We Guinea Pigs?*, written by the senior class.

17. A. S. Neill, *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing* (New York: Hart, 1960).

18. See Edgar Z. Friedenberg, *The Vanishing Adolescent* (Boston: Beacon, 1959); Paul Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd* (New York: Random House, 1960) and *Compulsory Mis-Education* (New York: Horizon Press, 1964); and John Holt, *How Children Fail* (New York: Pitman, 1964) and *How Children Learn* (New York: Delta, 1972).

19. See George Dennison, *The Lives of Children: The Story of the First School* (New York: Random House, 1969); James Herndon, *The Way It Spozed to Be* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1969); Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971); Herbert R. Kohl, *The Open Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1969) and *On Teaching* (New York: Schocken, 1976); and Jonathan Kozol, *Free Schools* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972).

20. William H. Kilpatrick, "The Project Method," *Teachers College Record*, September 1918, pp. 319-35.

21. Ellsworth Collings, ed., *An Experiment with a Project Curriculum* (New York: Macmillan, 1923). Another description of the activity-centered program was provided by Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, *The Child-Centered School: An Appraisal of the New Education* (Yonkers, N.Y.: World Book, 1928).

22. See *American Youth in the Mid-Seventies* (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1973); James S. Coleman et al., *Youth: Transition to Adulthood*, Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974); National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, *The Reform of Secondary Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973); *The New Secondary Education*, a Phi Delta Kappa Task Force Report (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976); and U.S. Office of Education, *Report of the National Panel of High School and Adolescent Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974) and *The Education of Adolescents* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976).

23. Mario D. Fantini, *The Reform of Urban Schools* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1970).

24. Harold Benjamin, *The Saber-Tooth Curriculum* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939).

25. Ibid., pp. 43, 44.

26. John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1938).

27. See Donald E. Orlosky and B. Othanel Smith, *Curriculum Development: Issues and Ideas* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978); Louis Rubin, ed., *Curriculum Handbook: The Disciplines, Current Movements, and Instructional Methodology* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1977); and Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, *Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice*, 2nd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1980).

28. C. Wayne Gordon, *The Social System of the High School* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957).

29. Holt, *How Children Fail*.

30. Mario D. Fantini and Gerald Weinstein, *The Disadvantaged Child* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968); Robert Goldhammer, *Clinical Supervision* (New York: Holt, 1969); and Louis E. Raths et al., *Values and Teaching*, 2nd ed. (Columbus, O.: Merrill, 1978).

31. Terry Borton, *Reach, Touch, and Teach* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970).

32. Ibid., p. 28.

33. Charles A. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1971).

34. Arthur T. Jersild, *In Search of Self* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1952) and *When Teachers Face Themselves* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1955); and Arthur Combs and Donald Snygg, *Individual Behavior*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1959). See also Arthur Combs, ed., *Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming*, 1962 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962).

35. Abraham H. Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1962) and *Motivation and Personality*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1970); and Carl R. Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951), *On Becoming a Person* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961), and *On Becoming* (New York: Delacorte, 1979).

36. Jack R. Frankel, *How to Teach About Values* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977); and Richard H. Willer, ed., *Humanistic Education: Visions and Realities* (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1977). □