





3 1293 00573 3179

L 24 082 008



This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled
THE HOLISTIC TEACHING METHODS OF
FRANCIS PARKER, JOHN DEWEY, RUDOLF STEINER,
HUGHES MEARNES, AND LAURA ZIRBES:
LITERACY VIA THE WHOLE CHILD

presented by

Mary Patricia Cavanaugh

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Teacher Education

Charles A. Blackman

Major professor

Date 2/2/90

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
<u>X-28-43</u>	MAR 11 2006	
<u>Apr 1</u>		
<u>X-28-43</u> 121		
JUN 7 9 1992		
SEP 27 1996		
<u>7E-8397700</u>		

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

THE HOLISTIC TEACHING METHODS OF
FRANCIS PARKER, JOHN DEWEY, RUDOLF STEINER,
HUGHES MEARNES, AND LAURA ZIRBES:
LITERACY VIA THE WHOLE CHILD

by

Mary Patricia Cavanaugh

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

1990

ABSTRACT

THE HOLISTIC TEACHING METHODS OF
FRANCIS PARKER, JOHN DEWEY, RUDOLF STEINER,
HUGHES MEARNES, AND LAURA ZIRBES:
LITERACY VIA THE WHOLE CHILD

by

Mary Patricia Cavanaugh

This is an historical description of the lives and educational endeavors of Francis Parker, John Dewey, Rudolph Steiner, Hughes Mearns, and Laura Zirbes. The lives and educational endeavors spanned 100 years. The findings have been divided into six areas commencing with the biographies of the five educators. This is followed by their study of children--the center of their schools and their curriculum--which includes a definition of childhood, how children learn, how they should be treated in a holistic classroom, of what they are capable, and the role of education and society in relation to children. Chapter III covers language and literacy and includes a theoretical base along with how children learn language, holistic methodologies for teaching and learning language, and practices to avoid. The section on academic and school discipline combines curriculum

discipline and methodological discipline. This discussion of school structure includes the history of the schools involved--the Quincy (Massachusetts) Schools, the Cook County (Illinois) Normal School, the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, the Chicago Institute, the Waldorf Schools, the Lincoln School of Teachers College at Columbia University, and the Laboratory School of The Ohio State University--their purposes, how they were organized, and the roles of the teachers, students, and parents. The study concludes with a comparatively brief presentation of the attitudes and practices of these five educators toward grading, evaluation, and assessment.

DEDICATION

I wish to dedicate this work--
what is printed here and all that has gone into it--
to my parents,

THOMAS J. and MARY MARGARET GIBBONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank all the people who aided in this endeavor. I received a tremendous amount of help from librarians and clerical workers who toil with great care and deliberation. I thank Dr. Sheila Fitzgerald for her support and encouragement. I thank Dr. Ben Bohnhorst for his initial comradeship and interest in our quest for information regarding Steiner's Waldorf Schools and for his steadfastness and wisdom throughout the many years I have been fortunate to know and work with him. I thank Dr. Stephen Tchudi for his initial direction and inspiration in the selection of this topic and for his substantial and positive criticism which saw me through to the completion of this study. I thank Dr. Charles Blackman for his patience, insight, historical prowess, and consideration. Not the least, I thank Ms. Barbara Reeves for not only the typing, printing, mailing, and delivering of the actual study, but for her faith in this writer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: BIOGRAPHIES	1
Francis Parker	4
John Dewey	24
Rudolph Steiner	42
Hughes Mearns	56
Laura Zirbes	62
Notes	67
 CHAPTER II: THE CHILD	 73
Introduction	73
Definition of Childhood	75
Childhood Learning	83
The Treatment of Childhood	90
Childhood Capabilities	109
The Role of Education and Society in Childhood	117
Postscript	119
Notes	122
 CHAPTER III: LANGUAGE/LITERACY	 129
Introduction	129
Theory of Language and Literacy	133
The Learning of Language and Literacy	139
Natural, Experiential, Interest	139
Developmental	153
The Methodology of Language and Literacy	162
Don'ts in Language/Literacy Learning	176
Summary	180
Notes	182

CHAPTER IV: ACADEMIC AND SCHOOL DISCIPLINE	186
Academic Discipline	187
Basic	187
Mental	199
Integrative	204
School Discipline	218
Notes	236
CHAPTER V: STRUCTURE: HISTORY, PURPOSE, AND ORGANIZATION	241
History	242
Purpose	252
Organization	263
Notes	301
CHAPTER VI: STRUCTURE: TEACHERS, STUDENTS AND PARENTS	307
Teachers	308
Students	321
Parents	323
Conclusions	325
Notes	328
CHAPTER VII: GRADING, EVALUATION, ASSESSMENT	331
Problems with Evaluation	332
Suggestions for Evaluation	335
Postscript	341
Notes	342
CHAPTER VIII: ESTOPPEL	344
Notes	352
REFLECTIONS	353
APPENDIX	358
BIBLIOGRAPHY	366

CHAPTER I

BIOGRAPHIES

An on-going protest against "the imposition of unpleasant tasks, against rote learning and drill, and against harsh and repressive discipline" appears to have been woven together philosophically five educators who, thought they had never met, seem to have a great deal in common in their attitudes toward children and toward "spontaneity, freedom, and joy in learning along with shared association."¹ The careers of Francis Parker, John Dewey, Rudolph Steiner, Hughes Mearns, and Laura Zirbes spanned one hundred years, 1853-1967. The pendulum of curriculum reform is not easily explained or moved, yet each of these five educators attempted to do so both for the good of the child and for the good of society.

Conditions in an unbalanced environment eventually led to change. In the late 1800s, there was a break in the relative homogeneity of the population in America. Once predominantly Yankee Protestant, it was becoming infiltrated and altered by the immigration of Europeans who had different traditions, religions, and languages and whose numbers challenged assimilation.² The rise of industrialization and urban expansion caused innumerable

changes, one of which was to add farmers to the growing urban population and the children of farmers along with the children of immigrants to the schools.

The children in American public schools were often being taught traditional, unrelated subjects by drill and memorization under repressive discipline. While some of these pupils could pass the end of the year examinations, this was not to say they understood, appreciated, or utilized what they were taught.

In 1875 Charles Adams, a member of the school board of Quincy, Massachusetts, initiated a change in the examination policy. Rather than use teacher-prepared examinations, board members examined the children with questions relevant to the material studied and with practical writing exercises. What they found out astonished them. The children could not use what they had been taught. Most could not write an impromptu theme or letter. Costs had risen, and the members of the school board realized they were getting less while spending more. Furthermore, not only was money being wasted but

Since intelligence is the most significant function in experience, the most important in all human life, it is most important in education for education is life. It should, therefore, follow that in school the constant aim, the only one worth emphasis, is training pupils in the use of intelligence, in the transformation of experience, and in the handling of problematic situations.³

Many years after Adams and the Quincy school board's struggle to improve conditions, John Dewey would comment,

No one can really be happy until allowed to mind his own business. No one can be intelligent about his affairs unless he knows the consequences of his actions. No one can know these when his experience is restricted by artificial barriers. Practical freedom requires intelligence and intelligence requires experience.

In the case of the Quincy schools, it happened that Francis Parker was looking for a position in education at the same time that Adams was searching for a superintendent who could propose and promote effective change. The ensuing partnership between Parker and the Quincy schools brought success and fame. Yet, this was not Parker's first position in education. He had been in, and briefly out, of education for some twenty years and, commencing again with Quincy, another twenty-five yet to come.

While both Parker and Dewey worked to improve society in the late 1800s through education, Steiner was called upon to do the same in the early 1900s in Germany. Though miles and ideologies apart, they struggled toward the same end which was to create a curriculum that centered upon the whole child--body, mind, and soul--and helped the child achieve independence and regard for society.

Then in the 1920s and 1930s, Mearns and Zirbes began their struggle in the same direction, although Mearns' focus was on high school writing and Zirbes' was on elementary reading. Regardless of their backgrounds, these five educators were interested in a strong, substantial education in which the child is the central focus.

Francis Parker

1837	Born, Piscataqua Village, New Hampshire
1844	Father died
1844-48	Farmer's apprentice, the Moore Farm, Goffstown, NH
1848-53	Attended school, Mt. Vernon, NH
1854-59	Taught in country schools, New Hampshire
1859-61	School principal, Carrollton, Illinois
1861	Accepted commission in New Hampshire Volunteers
1864	Wounded, Deep Bottom, James River, Virginia; married Phennie E. Hall
1865-68	Principal, North Grammar School, Manchester, NH
1868	Principal, First District School, Dayton, Ohio
1869	Principal, Normal School, Dayton, OH
1871	Phennie Hall Parker died
1872-75	Studied in Europe
1875-80	Superintendent, Quincy, MA, Public Schools
1881-82	Summer Institute, Martha's Vineyard
1882	Married Mrs. Frank Stuart
1883	Principal, Cook County Normal School, Englewood, IL
1899	Resigned Cook County Normal School to head Chicago Institute
1901	Merged Chicago Institute with University of Chicago Laboratory School
1902	Died, Pass Christian, Missouri

Francis Parker was born on October 3, 1837, in Piscataqua Village, New Hampshire. His mother, Mille Rand, had been a teacher before she married, and his father was a cabinet maker. Through his mother, he inherited the influence of another teacher, his grandmother; a Harvard librarian, James Rand; and an Indian fighter, Colonel John Goffs. From his father, he inherited a life line to ministers, soldiers in the Revolutionary War, and John Cotten. Francis Parker eventually became a teacher, a teacher of teachers, and, in his own small way in the arena of education, a revolutionary, a defender of democracy and individual freedoms.

Parker's paternal grandfather William was a wealthy speculator and landowner. Parker's father did not, however, inherit any of these financial skills. He was often in debt. When William Parker died, his estate had to be divided among ten children. Francis Parker's father Robert may have inherited \$2000, but it was not long before he, again, was in debt. In fact, when he died in 1844, he left only about \$200.

Francis Parker's uncle, James Walker, agreed to act as guardian for Frank and his sister after Robert's death. About a year later, Walker decided to apprentice Frank to a farmer named William Moore who lived near Goffstown. Frank Parker was eight years old. He was to be apprenticed to Moore until he was twenty-one year old. The negative aspects included separation from his family, minuscule personal accommodations (an attic room), and a shortening of his schooling to eight weeks annually. The positive

aspects were the kindness of the Moores, Mrs. Moore's good cooking, and the natural education he received on the farm.

As Parker's biographer Campbell reported,

Parker found that on the farm the word "study" did not apply to book learning only. He studied geography by observing the hills, valleys, and brooks on the old rocky farm. Topography was discerned in the neatly divided fields, pastures, and patches of woods. He studied geology and mineralogy in the soil he worked. He observed the effect of sunshine, draught, drainage, and fertilization. He studied botany with the hoe and his bare hands while he learned the name and characteristic of every weed and plant. He knew the trees by name--the best ones to climb, the best for lumber, fences, or firewood. He studied zoology. The animals of the farm were his subjects. He helped break steers, kill hogs, hunt for eggs, and feed and clean the animals.

Parker, of course, didn't realize then that all of this natural kind of education would one day be the basis of his educational philosophy.

He knew the wild animals, too, and the insects that "scurried away" when he turned over a stone. He knew the birds--the wrens that nested in the barn, the partridge that would die for her young. And he studied meteorology, learning the signs of different weather. The steady breezes from the east would bring the rain, and rain gave him a day off to go fishing. He knew the lack of shadows meant the noon hour and dinnertime. Most of all, the farm taught him how to be alone with himself and how to observe, investigate, and draw inferences.

According to Campbell, by the time Parker had reached the age of thirteen, his desire for the kind of knowledge he could not receive on the farm forced him to confront and disobey his guardian. He left the Moore's farm and went to Mt. Vernon, New

Hampshire, where he attended school and worked part-time at odd jobs to support himself. He did not complete his senior year. Instead, at age sixteen he got his first teaching job. That was 1854 in the Corser Hull School in Boscawen (now Webster). He made \$15 a month. Some of his students were older than he was, yet he seemed to be successful, perhaps, because of his concern for each of his students.

The next winter he taught at Over-the-Brook School in Auburn for \$17 a month and board. Parker was succeeding because he treated his pupils with respect. He loved education and teaching, and he managed to communicate this as soon as he began speaking. For example, he told his students that "his idea of a good school was a place to have a 'first class time' and that they must all take hold and work together."⁷ While he maintained high standards of academic and school discipline, he also maintained that the pupils had to have a stake in the school and that they were all there to have a good time. For example, if the school yard needed work, Parker and his students "turned out the rooting hogs, repaired and whitewashed the fence, pulled the weeds and planted grass and flowers."⁸ He and his students spent time outside playing and learning. He became very popular, taught the next three winter terms, and opened a "select school" the following autumn term.

Parker loved what he was doing, but then and throughout his career, he would be compelled to move on, so as to be able to

reach and help more children. He was working at a time when children needed help due to poor, meager school systems, industrialization, urbanization, immigration, and educational controversy over how to teach what to whom.

In 1859 when Parker received a call to become a school principal in Carrollton, Illinois, despite the distance and separation from home, the low pay, and rough school population, he headed west. He was popular with the students, teachers, and parents, but he gradually lost favor with the town fathers because of his pro-Union⁹ partisanship. He returned home the summer of 1861 to ponder his next course.

That year he accepted a commission in the New Hampshire Volunteers and headed south. He learned much during the war, not the least of which was how much he hated war and loved teaching. He learned that discipline and regimentation can be of benefit when presented and employed properly. For example, he made certain that his orders were made in such a manner that his men could understand their reasonableness. Though he demanded that their haversacks, knapsacks, canteens, and general mode of dress strictly adhere to regulation, his men realized that only in this way their regiment could be pronounced in good order.⁹ He learned, sometimes the hard way, that if people, in one case he and his men, were given an explanation rather than an order, the road to completion would be shorter and have fewer pitfalls. He always defended his men and was concerned for their welfare, hence earning their respect.

Parker was not a purist and perhaps this aided him in understanding human nature and the trouble humans could cause each other. He was a precocious child. He scolded his teachers if he did not approve of what and how they were teaching. Then in the army, though loved by his men, he did not always please his supervisors. He was accused of being drunk on duty, but the charges were never proven.

In 1864 he was wounded in the neck and chin; and while on recuperative leave, he married Phennie E. Hall of Bennington, New Hampshire. He left the army with a raspy voice and the title of lieutenant colonel. The lieutenant somehow was lost, but the rasp and the title colonel remained until he died. The title would help his career advance as he did not have much formal education.

Colonel Francis Parker was a thorough patriot. He was descended from and grew up with soldiers from the Revolutionary War. They believed this country had a mission for all the world which was the salvation of the human race bound up in a free government. Parker believed that the only salvation of democracy was in education. His motive for teaching was to fit people for the responsibilities of self-government. Therefore, when he left the army, though he offered military preferment, a political office, and a business position, he became the principal of North Grammar School in Manchester, New Hampshire, instead.¹⁰

In 1902 Wilbur S. Jackman, a co-worker of Parker's in Chicago, said of him,

Parker was a natural iconoclast, as the sparks fly upward, he was born to trouble. He was the arch-infidel of orthodoxy in educational creeds. Incisive in his thinking, in his best days he could demolish with a word where another, smothering courage and indiscretion, used arguments in folios.¹¹

The sparks commenced to fly in Manchester.

Parker began by concentrating on North Grammar School. He raised standards in academics and deportment while demanding almost militaristic discipline but not regimentation. His early childhood reading of Pilgrim's Progress and the Bible along with his farm education influenced him to appreciate physical strength, self-control, and resourcefulness. His military career confirmed his dislike of war and regimentation.¹² Yet the war had taught him to fight injustice as well as to hold command.¹³

He ranked the students according to scholastic achievement, attendance, and deportment and allowed the rank to change as the students' behavior and studies changed. He demanded the best from his students, and he gave them his. He worked all day and then spent half of the night planning for the next day. This was at an annual salary of \$1100.¹⁴ Parker scandalized New England scholastics with his advanced educational ideas; new promotion plans, new schemes for grading, new modes of classifying pupils, and new methods of supervised study. He also added physical education to the curriculum.¹⁵

Parker was the principal of North Grammar School from 1865 to 1868. He initiated changes and the school improved. The two

superintendents who served there during Parker's time were pleased and impressed with his work, but Parker had criticisms of the system. He found that though the children spent many hours learning to read, they really could not read very well. They spent many hours learning to spell--

. . . more than three thousand half-hour lessons in spelling without being able to write a common letter. He began to realize that the methods of cramming were only making the child's mind stultified. Each grade had a required number of pages to be memorized.¹⁶

Parker felt there was no coordination between grades on subject matter. Teachers did not have specific items to be taught at one level so that students would be prepared for the next level.

Despite the fact that he was asked to return for another year, Parker decided to move on. According to Washborne, he reasoned he could reach more people, thereby helping more children. In 1868 he accepted the principalship of the First District School in Dayton, Ohio. One reason may have been that the West seemed to be less restricting. Parker found Dayton ripe for change with an active citizenry and two opposing newspapers extremely interested in education. First District was mainly a primary school, and Parker was eager to work with young children. He felt it important to learn more about primary education and was surprised his teachers did not study education.

Though the Dayton School System had made some progressive innovations such as object teaching and a ranking system similar

to the one Parker had developed in Manchester, education was still based on the examination plan.

The whole idea of per cents was related to cramming and unnatural methods of learning. On examination days, the various neighboring cities went wild and even telegraphed each other to compare per cents. This whole procedure was to learn words and recite them, and then write¹⁷ them down in the examinations stiff and strong.

Parker continued his innovations. He switched reading instruction from a phonetic plan to word method, and he dropped the study of technical grammar. He brought parents and board members in to the schools to see the children perform in special ceremonies. He did not approve of textbooks which he felt dictated the curriculum so he dropped them. He added a controversial writing and drawing slate requirement. So many parents complained about the cost that Parker clashed with the school board on this, and he dropped the requirement.

In order to bring some cohesiveness to the district, the board organized the City Teachers Institute. Parker presided over these meetings which were mainly on methodology. That was in April 1869. In September Parker was named principal of Dayton's first normal school. He got on very well with the people of Dayton, for the most part. It was with the "old guard principals and traditionalist teachers that Parker frequently lost his own self-control. He battled for the children's right to think, to learn through their senses, and to have an attractive classroom."¹⁸ But he continued to maintain his popularity. One of the reasons some

people approved of him was because his students in the Sixth District School did not scratch their desks.

Sometime in 1869-70, Phennie Parker became ill. She died on December 6, 1870. Parker rarely spoke of his private life, so little is know about Mrs. Parker's death or where their little girl went to live afterward. One of Colonel Parker's biographers, Flora J. Cooke, wrote, "Parker would have been shocked at the interest in his life though he had an insatiable curiosity himself."¹⁹

In March of the following year, Parker took a major stand by refusing to take his regular renewal of certification exams. He reasoned that such tests either developed or reinforced rigidity in teachers. Then he rejected tests, grading, and the ranking system for his pupils; however, the school board did not allow these changes.

The normal school under his direction was prospering and receiving good press. So, in August 1871, Parker was named supervising principal. In this position he concentrated on the supervision of the primary grades, while the new superintendent concerned himself with the upper. They worked well together, but less than a year later, in June 1872, Parker left the Dayton Public Schools to study in Germany. He may have realized that he would need credentials to continue to advance in education, and he had been criticized for his poor educational background. He also wanted to strengthen his theories regarding the education of young

children. His years in Dayton seemed successful for the most part, yet Parker "was in constant conflict because he deserted the old methods, failed to respect traditions, and implied the customary ways were not the best."²⁰

Parker studied at the Frederick Wilhelms University in Berlin. He was not able to work for a degree, but he was allowed to study according to his own interests and needs. This was what he had advocated for his own students. He studied geography, history, philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy. He studied with Frederick Harms, a Hegelian professor who impressed Parker with Hegel's world spirit. This was close to Parker's belief that God was working out man's character through the schools.

Parker felt that the Germans were far above the Americans in methodology. He also found the confirmation of many of his theories such as self-activity and "the harmonious development of mind, body, and soul."²¹ What he could not understand was how such educated thinkers could approve a monarchy. Then he saw it. It was the structure. The structure of the organization of German schools was prescriptive, rigid, class conscious, and sexually segregated. Parker continued to believe the only preservation of democracy was co-educational, common public schools.

While he was abroad, Parker visited schools in Holland, Switzerland, Italy, and France. He ended his travels at the Vienna Exhibition. He was amazed at seeing the world in miniature but disappointed with the American exhibit. He lamented that an

observer of the exhibit could assume Americans were interested mainly in killing hogs, making sewing and mowing machines, and soda fountains.²² He liked the American education exhibit except that it did not clearly demonstrate the common tuition-less school concept.

Colonel Parker returned home in 1875, the year Charles Adams was in search of a school superintendent. Adams was having a difficult time locating the right person for the position. He found it "inexplicable [that] . . . men can be trained to care for children's bodies and teeth but not their minds."²³ Colonel Parker walked into the school board office to apply for the position.

Parker's themes were similar to those he formulated in Dayton though certainly strengthened and more clearly defined following his European studies. He fought for freedom and teacher education. He wanted to give the children freedom and have the teachers inspire them to learn. He intended to inspire the teachers. He demanded discipline but through self-control rather than mandates and penalties. He believed in sense learning first. For example, students in geography would not begin by studying a textbook. First, they would go outside and see the landscape and walk the land. In composition students would write first for enjoyment and emotion; later they would concern themselves with technical grammar. In other words, they would learn the sense, essence, and perception of the subject and seek the technical laws and rules at a later, more appropriate time.

Parker's ideas were revolutionary. He expected to teach his teachers. He became a teacher of teachers and held classes after school. He urged teachers to visit each other and observe, and he asked principals to help. At these meetings he urged teachers to talk about their classes. To shy or reticent teachers, he chided, "You ought to be glad to tell about it. It clarifies your thinking in your own mind."²⁴ He never posed before them as a know-it-all, nor did he want anyone to imitate his teaching. He "recognized and encouraged originality in thought, methods, and devices."²⁵ He set the example by going around the Quincy school system and teaching classes himself.

In time word spread and educators from all over the country came to observe "the Quincy method." Parker remained modest about his work and the Quincy achievements. These were conflicts, of course, among people who did not approve of the "new" education. Even Charles Adams, one of Parker's strongest proponents, said of him,

He lacked business methods, he had no practical judgment, he was apt to do the right thing at the wrong time and he was impatient of opposition. Yet when possessed with an idea he was indefatigable in his efforts to put it into practice.²⁶

He did achieve success. "Out of five hundred grammar school children taken promiscuously from all the schools, no less than four hundred showed results which were excellent or satisfactory."²⁷ Despite the work of the school committee and Parker, there were factors working against total success. Parker

had wanted to eliminate bad teachers. Instead, in some cases, lowered salaries eliminated good ones. Students classified as "dull" were taught along with regular students, and they could have been in the numbers tested.

Even though the school board voted to renew Parker's contract, he made the decision to move on. In 1880 he became one of six supervisors in the Boston public school system. He was responsible for forty-two primary schools, four hundred teachers, and roughly twenty-thousand children. He continued to pursue his desire to reach more teachers, thereby reaching more children. But he came in at a politically difficult time. The grammar school masters had recently lost control of the primary schools to these six supervisors. That power struggle would continue, and Parker had a way of stirring things up. He spoke to his teachers about the improvements he intended, but he was speaking to Bostonians who believed they had a fine school system. Parker survived the first year and was asked to return. He implemented some changes, encouraging teachers to adopt the Quincy methods. In ways, the Boston schools were slowly moving in that direction. They had a similar ranking system: academics, attendance, deportment. A new superintendent with whom Parker was in almost complete agreement was hired, and Parker wholeheartedly supported him. Still, he was a rough, rather uncultured outsider. "Without a formal education, Parker must have been regarded as a barbarian in Boston . . . 'I am going to have a hard fight here, and I am

going to be beaten, but I shall make it easier for the next man."²⁸

His first Boston summer, 1881, Parker lectured at a summer institute on Martha's Vineyard. His presence had not been well advertised, and only fifty students attended his classes. The next summer one hundred fifty students from twenty-three states and Nova Scotia attended.²⁹

It was at his first summer institute that Colonel Parker met Mrs. Frank Stuart. She was a graduate and teacher at the Boston School of Oratory. They continued their friendship during the next school year in Boston, and they were married before he moved on again.

Also during the summer institutes, Lelia Partridge, a teacher who was impressed with the colonel's work, took notes on his lectures and sought his permission to have them published. He revised her notes and 1883 they published Talks on Teaching. It sold more than any educational book of the time. Commissioner of Education, William T. Harris, claimed Talks on Teaching would be more helpful to stimulate student motivation than any other book.³⁰

History will relate what a revolution he inaugurated in methods of teaching and the government of little children . . . [then followed bitter and prolonged attacks] . . . today (1902) this book is to primary teachers what Blackstone is to lawyers--an inexhaustible source of help and inspiration in the daily work of the profession.³¹

In 1882, while still supervising in Boston, Parker received two requests for his services. One was the principalship of the Cook County Normal School; the other was the superintendency of the Philadelphia Public Schools. For every conceivable reason including salary, the Philadelphia position was the better offer. Parker chose Cook County Normal School over advice against it. His reasoning was two-fold: he could ultimately reach more people and, therefore, more children, and he could teach.

Parker again believed the West was ripe for change and would be more receptive to his new education. "Parker's personal touch had always worked magic, but he was now in search of a universal touch."³²

Colonel Parker was twenty-five years ahead of his time and the incomparable leader of this new educational movement. He was portly, florid, and had an erect military bearing. He was somewhat wheezy and short of breath. And he was gentle with a sweet attitude toward children--"let the children rule."³³

He was a thorough non-conformist, intense, vehement, tender, intuitive, aggressive, dominating, witty, and sarcastic. He respected integrity and freedom. He showed the marks of self-education. He was gruff and spartanlike. He was called by some an ignoramus and a faddist.³⁴

Cook County Normal School had been founded fifteen years earlier. Its purpose was to train local high school graduates to teach in the rural schools. There were influential people who did not care about rural children let alone about the training of their teachers. The school budget was low and times always hard. Parker entered a situation which was not altogether popular with

theories he intended to practice which were not altogether popular. Fortunately, he seemed to thrive on agitation.³⁵

He found success in his innovative methods and in his battles against his opponents for sixteen years. He deplored the exclusive emphasis on oral reading; he believed publishers should not determine education through textbooks; he believed there were no bad children, only bad homes, bad habits, and bad conditions; he opposed elementary industrial education because it predetermined a given way of life; he was concerned about the immigrants; he believed rulers forced anarchy upon the poor; he loathed sham and impractical idealism. Clearly he was going to anger some of the Cook County citizens.

Parker set about to collect the best teachers he could find and he began. He made great demands but he put forth so much of himself he was an inspiration. He maintained constant contact and communication with his staff through a system of lieutenants named daily. He did not want his teachers imitating him but becoming teacher-artists in their own right.

Parker's standard for his teachers was

. . . high and stern. He searched for teachers with personality, power, and scholarship. His teachers were to see education as both science and art. They were to possess vigor of body, alertness of mind, independent spirit, a prodigious sense of humor to keep them sweet and sane, wide interests which they would never have time to enjoy, and be in love with children. (He said) there is no coin small enough to pay the salary of a poor teacher; there is not gold enough in the mines of the world to measure the value of a good teacher.³⁶

Prior to Parker's arrival, students at Cook County Normal School remained one year. Parker did not feel that was enough and convinced twenty students to remain a second year, thereby establishing a two-year course. There were two divisions of instruction: professional training and school practice. There were four teachers, each with twelve to fourteen students in each corner of the room. Each practice teacher had to submit his plans to the room teacher who in turn submitted them to Miss Spear, the assistant principal, and each week the entire staff met with Colonel Parker.

Parker established a manual training department and physical education classes in which he emphasized health, posture, and carriage.³⁷ These were new to Cook County, but the colonel explained his changes to his staff and to concerned parents of the children who attended the practice school. Parker rarely had trouble with his staff or parents. His main source of opposition were politicians who had different agendas.

A battle of sorts was carried on for much of Parker's tenure at Cook County Normal School--most of it political. The county did not want the expense, so they gave up responsibility. The city of Chicago had to assume control but not without battle. They did not want the fiscal responsibility and some on the Chicago Board of Education did not want Parker. In 1887 the board lowered Parker's salary in an attempt to force him to resign out of professional pride. His supporters fought and won a reprieve.

But the battles continued. Finally, Parker was offered a different solution. Mrs. Emmons Blaine, daughter of Cyrus McCormick, was enthusiastic about Colonel Parker and his teachings. She was aware of the political pressure and offered to endow a new, private school for Parker.

The spring of 1899 was a tragic and tumultuous time for Parker. He lost his wife to cancer. It was a deep loss for him, and he left Cook County Normal School, which also was a great loss for him. He began to organize the new Chicago Institute, funded by Mrs. Blaine. He had ambitious plans for the new school. He would not have to work alone because 14 of his teachers and many of their students, the practice teachers, left Cook County Normal for the Parker-Blaine Chicago Institute. Parker encountered financial difficulties again, and they began in temporary quarters the summer of 1900. The school year was plagued with the sense of a temporary existence and the financial concerns continued.

For a variety of reasons the Chicago Institute merged with the University of Chicago's educational endeavors to become the Department of Education. Parker was to be the head of the new department and the director of the kindergarten, the elementary school, and the Francis W. Parker School on the North Shore. In June 1901, a ground breaking ceremony was held for the new school of education. A generous tribute was given to Colonel Parker.

Colonel Francis Parker died on March 2, 1902. He had not been in very good health since his wife died, and he left the public

schools--the schools he championed as the only answer to the continuance of democracy. He had spent time in a sanatorium in Alma, Michigan, in early 1900. He was planning an early retirement, and he meant to return to a farm in New Hampshire. In February 1902, Parker journeyed to Pass Christian, Mississippi, for rest and recuperation. By March his condition had deteriorated. Near the end, his nurse dispatched emergency telegrams to his friends and family, but no one was able to be there in time for his passing.

No one had really known how tired and sick he was. He had been fighting for his cause for twenty-five years. His cause was to find and fight for the best way to educate children. "He cared for nothing but the sake of the little children of the land; when he dies, they lose their warmest friend, ablest champion, and wisest benefactor."³⁸

John Dewey

1859	Born, Burlington, Vermont
1867	Began school
1872	Began high school (age 12) in Burlington, VT
1875	Entered University of Vermont (age 16)
1880-1881	Taught elementary School, Oil City, Pennsylvania
1882	Taught LakeView Seminary, Charlotte, VT; entered the Johns Hopkins University
1884	Instructor, University of Michigan
1886	Married Harriet Alice Chipman
1888	Professor of Philosophy, University of Minnesota
1889	Chair, Philosophy Department, University of Michigan
1894	Chair, Philosophy Department, University of Chicago
1895	Chair, Pedagogy Department, University of Chicago
1896	Opened University Elementary School
1901	Chicago Institute and University Elementary School merged
1902	Head, School of Education, University of Chicago
1904	Resigned, University of Chicago
1905	Professor, Columbia University
1919-1921	Far East lectures
1924	Turkey, educational consultant
1926	University of Mexico lectures
1928	American educators visit Russia
1928-1929	Gifford Lectures, Edinburgh University
1930	Retired from Columbia

1934 Attended South Africa Education Conference
 1946 Married Roberta Lowitz Grant
 1952 Died, New York City

John Dewey was born in 1859 in Burlington, Vermont. Both his father, Archibald Sprague Dewey, and his mother, Lucina Artemisia Rich, came from farming families. Lucina's grandfather had been a congressman for ten years, and her father had served in the Vermont General Assembly for five years. Archibald entered the Civil War as a Vermont Cavalry Quartermaster a few years after John was born. After three years' separation, Lucina moved her family to North Virginia to be near her husband.

In Social Ideas of American Educators, Curti observed that during his early childhood, "persons and situations influenced Dewey more than books. He grew up in a rural culture with democratic neighborliness and nonconformist individualism. This did much to develop his own independent and democratic temper."³⁹

In Coon's Columbia: Colossus on the Hudson, he wrote, "Dewey changed school from a place where children prepare for life to a place where children live."⁴⁰ His own introduction to education in September 1867 was less than ideal. He had no formal education during the war, but when it ended the family returned to Burlington. At that time, Dewey's biographer Dykhuizen reported,

. . . public education had deteriorated to a degree little short of scandalous. Crowded classrooms (Dewey's had fifty-four students age seven through nineteen), low standards, lax

discipline, irregular attendance, poorly prepared teachers, and run down school buildings were the general rule.⁴¹

Concerned citizens had been working for improvements. By Dewey's second year classes were graded, and there was some uniformity within the district. Still the methodology was in the traditional manner which included drill, memorization, recitations, and lifeless oral readings. Dewey was keen to learn. He took reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, grammar, history, and geography, but he was bored by the way these were taught.

Dewey began high school in 1872 and selected the college-preparatory course in case he might attend college. He studied Latin, Greek, French, English, and math. By this time, he loved to read. His parents encouraged him in this and, although very religious, did not restrict his selections.

The Dewey family was Congregationalist. John was somewhat influenced by liberal Evangelicalism and he believed in the Bible, but he also felt interpretation should be left to the individual reader. His mother often asked him, "Are you right with Jesus?"⁴² He remained a practicing Congregationalist for many years, but eventually left the church. Mrs. Harriet Dewey, John's first wife, once remarked that "religious attitude is indigenous in natural experience. It is theology and ecclesiastic institutions that benumb it rather than promote it."⁴³

In 1875 at the age of sixteen, Dewey entered the University of Vermont. The faculty there "believed in the sanctity of the human

mind and its right to think freely and independently."⁴⁴ The curriculum of the first three years was of a classical nature based on the past. Dewey was bored with historical studies. He wanted to read current philosophy. Consequently, for his first three years, he maintained only an average grade point. During this senior year, the courses were organized to follow the theme of the problems of human existence. Dewey was more interested in these studies. For example, he took a course in physiology for which the text was Huxley's Elements of Physiology. In it he was exposed to the idea that a biological organism has an interdependence of parts. This led him to realize the possibility of an interdependent and interrelated existence. As a consequence, he began his lifetime philosophical search for the resolution to the problem of "how to resolve the chasms that seemed to separate the material and the moral sciences."⁴⁵

Students were rather rambunctious then, though in his earlier schooling Dewey was quiet, well-behaved, almost shy. The worst he did was fidget about and yawn when too bored by recitations.⁴⁶ In college he was part of a group that tied a door shut and locked a professor in a room. He also skipped military drill.

At age twenty despite a B.A. degree, Dewey could not find a high school teaching job because he was too young. At last, due to help from a relative who was a high school principal, Dewey was hired to teach elementary school in Oil City, Pennsylvania. He was there for two years, 1880-1881. He taught Latin, algebra, and

natural science. He was friendly, sincere, modest, and well-liked.

In the winter of 1882, he taught at the LakeView Seminary in Charlotte, Vermont. The students there were not prepared to do high school level work. Since there were some resulting discipline problems, certain people in Charlotte assumed Dewey was not a good teacher.⁴⁷

Dewey returned to Burlington and began independent studies of philosophy through H.A.D. Torrey of the University of Vermont and Dr. W.T. Harris, editor of the Journal of Speculative Philosophy, also the Commissioner of Education, who had admired Parker's work. He decided he would prefer to further his studies in philosophy than teach high school. He was accepted as a graduate student at The Johns Hopkins University in 1882. He applied for a fellowship, a teaching assistantship, and a scholarship but all were denied. The University "recognized his mental power but questioned his pedagogic power."⁴⁸

Dewey began an intense study of philosophy with history and political science as minor fields of study. He had selected Johns Hopkins because of its excellent reputation, but at that time the emphasis and the larger portion of the university's budget went to scientific studies. The Philosophy Department consequently was not as large, nor could it offer as many courses as Dewey would have liked. During his first year, he studied history, political theory, biology, and elocution. He was introduced to the work of

Hegel through Professor G.S. Morris, a visiting professor from the University of Michigan. Morris was able to help Dewey obtain a teaching assistantship at Johns Hopkins. Dewey accepted Hegel's views because they recognized the interdependence and interrelatedness which Dewey preferred to study. Dewey wrote,

Hegel's synthesis of subject and object, matter and spirit, the divine and the human . . . operated as an immense relief, a liberation. Hegel's treatment of human culture, of institutions and the arts, involved the dissolution of hard and fast dividing walls, and had a special attraction for me."⁴⁹

During his second year, Dewey studied logic with Charles S. Pierce, but he was disappointed at the time because it was mathematical and scientific "rather than what he sought which was a study of the different forms of knowledge, their origins and development, their interconnection, and their comparative value as embodiments of truth."⁵⁰ He also studied physiology, experimental psychology, and scientific pedagogy with G. Stanley Hall. "With Hall he encountered the genetic orientation that came by way of Haeckel and Spencer, and the idea of studying the development of children from a scientific, evolutionary point of view."⁵¹ Though there were times when Dewey wondered if he should have left secondary education, he was finally able to teach the subject in which he was so interested.

In September 1884, Dewey became an instructor of philosophy at the University of Michigan. George Morris, Dewey's teacher from graduate school, was chairman of the Philosophy Department, and

the two men worked together on re-structuring and course offerings.

Dewey became interested in the need for a link between the high school and the college. In 1871 the University of Michigan had established a system of accreditation. Prior to that, all students who wished admittance to the University had to pass entrance examinations. Following accreditation, students with diplomas from accredited schools were admitted. Accreditation was given to schools which met the university's standards. These were judged by a committee from the university. Dewey served on some of these investigation committees. He realized the high school was much closer to the elementary school than it was to the college. He understood the need for a strong link. He also studied the elementary schools. He felt that the teaching methods were not compatible with the current psychology of learning. First, the quality of the secondary school was dependent upon the quality of the elementary school. Next, he felt that the elementary training did not coincide with the normal learning processes of young children. He criticized programs, methods, and the lack of coordination between the levels. He instigated a search for new methods that would integrate educational, psychological, and philosophical ideas.⁵² Dewey was developing his attitude about elementary education while Colonel Parker, well aware of the problems in elementary, was by that time on the battlefield of Cook County.

On July 28, 1886, Dewey married Harriet Alice Chipman. Harriet was a former school teacher from Fenton, Michigan, and then was a student at the University of Michigan. She lived in the same boarding house as Dewey. They might have married sooner but for financial considerations. Dewey was then an assistant professor but still not making very much money, and that influenced his next move.

Dewey became professor of philosophy and chairman of the Philosophy Department at the University of Minnesota. This not only meant a salary increase, but also the opportunity for developing and enlarging the department. While at Minnesota he continued his interest in the need for a link between the schools and the colleges. The University had developed a sub-freshman class because the incoming students were not prepared for college-level work. There was resentment because many faculty members felt it was the responsibility of the schools to prepare students for college.

Dewey did not remain long enough to be very effective or make many changes. In March of 1889, George Morris, Dewey's friend and mentor, died of over exposure on a fishing trip. The University of Michigan asked Dewey to return and accept the chairmanship of the Philosophy Department. He did and remained until 1894.

Dewey was very active with students while at the University of Michigan. He worked with the student literary magazine, the students' Christian association, and the philosophical society.

In 1894 President Harper of the University of Chicago offered Dewey the position of head professor and chairman of the Philosophy Department. There were two enticing challenges. One was to develop a new curriculum and department, and the other was the opportunity to work with graduate students. Though he would be making less money, he was offered longer vacations. To Dewey this meant more time to be with his family and more time to write.

Dewey's reputation brought students and faculty to the university. As the department grew, so did their published research. Dewey also spread their philosophical developments via lectures around the country. He spoke at Chatauqua, the University of California at Berkeley, Brigham Young Academy, and at the North Central Association.

President Harper was also very interested in public education. So, upon Dewey's suggestion, Harper opened the Department of Pedagogy and appointed Dewey chairman. Dewey's psychology of education was learning through purposeful activity. He did not believe in the absence of control or direction.⁵³ He felt that traditional education wanted school desks for listening while the new education wanted desks for working. He believed that "education is the reconstruction of experience."⁵⁴ As a child growing up in the mid-1800s in New England, Dewey's initial education was based on and developed by experience both individual and through that of others. "Most children shared in the activities and responsibilities of the home. In the course of

growing up, they became aware, at first hand, of the round of simple industrial and agricultural occupations."⁵⁵

In 1896 Dewey and Harper opened the University Laboratory Elementary School. This was to be an experimental school where Dewey could "put substance and concreteness into a form developed from his abstract ideas."⁵⁶ In January 1896, the school had sixteen students and two teachers. By 1902 there were one hundred four students and twenty-three teachers, plus several graduate assistants.

Many people seemed to be angry, disappointed, and disillusioned at the discrepancy between the American ideal and the American reality. There were armies of reform: labor unionists, free silverites, civil service reformers, female suffragists, settlement workers and populists. The attitude seemed to be that if there were something wrong outside the schools, there must be something wrong inside. The people had been told to

. . . educate your children so they will vote wisely. The upper class were told to be taxed so poor children can be educated. This will lead to universal reason and contentment. Your property will be safe, your workers will be happy, virtuous, and productive. The lower class was told that education was the great equalizer of conditions. Your children will rise to more profitable and honorable employments. Yet after a half a century of universal education, there was chronic political corruption, vandalism, rioting, unemployment, and impoverishment. It was generalized exploitation of one order⁵⁷ by another. So the people were ripe for reform.

Harper's administrative innovation, the University Extension Division, was to bring the University and its faculty to the people. The university also sought to raise educational standards and improve articulation with the schools. There were many courses and non-credit campus meetings and lectures regarding education, so Dewey had a large and keen audience. He also spoke at the Chicago Athenaeum, Cook County Normal School, the Chicago Free Kindergarten, Hull House, the Civic Federation, and the Chicago Women's Club. In these lectures he attacked the formal discipline of the memoriter, symbol-centered recitation school.

Under criticism from members of all classes in the lay population owing to broad societal disillusionment, under assault from practitioners and theoreticians among professionals, the old education was thought to lack practical and theoretic justification.⁵⁸

There was an equally determined force of both lay and professional people who suspected the new education and its promoters. In Chicago at the time "every educational controversy became a bitter clash between pro- and anti-Parker forces . . . he (Parker) was said to have come to Chicago because he expected it to be the educational storm center of the nation."⁵⁹

Dewey did not appear to be such a forceful fighter. Discussions following papers he presented forced him to defend and clarify his ideas and consider other theories.⁶⁰ For example, he was working on the concept of child study through experimental psychology and the philosophy of instrumentalism whereby education adopts the scientist's technique of hypothesis development and

experimental and experiential trial and error.⁶¹ He needed stimulation and challenge from people and events in order to work out his ideas. In Dewey's Chicago, McCaul wrote:

Institutional changes are made by people; in our society people act in response to persuasion. If the reformer is to effect change, he must persuade people. To persuade them he must reach them with his arguments and proposals. Institutional structures provide him with avenues by which he can reach an audience and by which an audience can reach him. Persuasion is facilitated if the audience is already in a state of readiness.⁶²

The people of Chicago appeared to be ready for a change.

Parker and Dewey respected each other. Dewey regarded Parker as the "father of progressive education," and Parker applauded Dewey's work and his ideas. Local reporter Ellen Eames Degraff in December 1894 wrote on Dr. Dewey's address at the Cook County Normal School:

Dr. Dewey is one of the quietest and most modest appearing men imaginable. He appears like a gentle young man who is studious and willing to learn. To see him on a platform in his gray sack coat, dropping moustache, hair part in the middle, and his "excuse me for intruding" as opposed to Colonel Parker, with his massive bald head, his impressive and aggressive personality and his "you had better not get in my way" air, one would never dream that the quiet man with his level eyebrows and pleasant, gentle voice, was⁶³ the lion and the great Colonel Parker the lamb.

Also, both men feared that the rapid change from an agrarian society to an industrial one challenged the democratic tradition.⁶⁴ They believed the best way to meet the challenge was through education.

In 1901 Parker and his Chicago Institute merged with the University of Chicago. Parker became the head of the Department of Education and the training school Dewey remained chairman of the Departments of Philosophy and Pedagogy and the head of the University Laboratory School. Harper had wanted to merge the schools, but temporarily backed down under faculty and parental pressure and protest. Following Parker's death, Dewey was nominated to head the School of Education. He, in turn, selected Mrs. Dewey to run the training school. The selection was not welcomed by the faculty of the training school. They complained to Harper who promised them Mrs. Dewey would receive a temporary, one-year appointment. Something about the way this decision was or was not communicated to the Deweys angered them. They resigned one day apart--April 5 and 6, 1904.

In search of a new position, Dewey wrote to James Cattell, a friend from graduate school at Johns Hopkins, who was at Columbia University. Cattell replied that there were no vacancies but that he would see if anything could be done. Dewey had a reputation and national following by then. Cattell reasoned with President Butler that if they did not hire Dewey, someone surely would. Butler managed to obtain an anonymous donation and the Deweys moved to New York.

Dewey wanted nothing to do with administration. But that did not necessarily mean he was about to enter a tranquil period. His assignments were to teach and supervise theses and research. He

added metaphysics and politics to his interest in education. He spoke out in support of teachers' unions. He also supported women's suffrage. He was against American intervention in both world wars. He attacked invasions of civil rights and academic freedom. In 1920 he supported and joined the ACLU.

Following World War One, Dewey and his wife began to travel. While on sabbatical in California, he decided to go to Japan where he lectured at the University of Tokyo. Even though Dewey lectured all over the world, he was not a good speaker, but he was popular because he "articulated what many believed." At the University of Tokyo he gave eight lectures. There were eight thousand in attendance at his first lecture and a mere thirty listeners at the last. Even so, he lectured at the University of Peking and was asked to remain an additional year.

Back in New York in 1924, Dewey supported Robert LaFollette, the Progressive Party candidate, for the presidency. That same year the Turkish government requested his services as an educational consultant.

In 1926 when Dewey was lecturing at the University of Mexico, his wife Alice learned she had a serious heart condition. Her health deteriorated. Dewey took a term off in order to be with her. She died in July 1929. They had been married for forty-one years. This was a great loss to Dewey. At this difficult time, it must have been helpful to be asked to join a group of American educators on a tour of Russian schools.

In 1928 Dewey was named honorary president of the Progressive Education Association. Through this office he urged schools to attempt to organize subject matter along the lines of the intellectual history of the subject development and to study conditions that are favorable to learning. He stressed the quality of activity rather than the quantity. He criticized Thorndike's "all can be measured"⁶⁵ He did not believe in the absence of control or direction.⁶⁶

More than any other American educator, Dewey was instrumental in breaking the shackles of harsh school discipline and inflexible teacher routine. But he did not want unwarranted freedom or the absence of a program. He had, unfortunately, overzealous disciples who took the bit in their mouths and ran away with the wagon--much to the chagrin of the master.⁶⁷

The problem was his "interests were eclectic enough, his language imprecise enough, and his publications frequent enough for many varieties of progressivism to be sheltered under his mantle."⁶⁸ That same year Dewey delivered the Gifford lectures at Edinburgh University in Scotland.

Professor Dewey became Professor Emeritus in Residence in June 1930. He wanted to write, speak, and support causes. He had been a teacher for forty-five years. His strongest belief remained:

If I were asked to name the most needed of all reforms in the spirit of education I should say: cease conceiving of education as mere preparation for later life, and make it full of meaning for present life. And to add that only in this case does it become truly preparation for after life, is not the paradox it seems. An activity which does not have worth enough to be carried on for its own sake cannot be very effective as

preparation for something else. It (the new spirit of education) forms the habit of requiring that every act be an outlet of the whole self and it provides the instruments of such complete functioning.⁶⁹

Some progressive educators carried the theme of freedom, the spirit of inquiry, and the avoidance of formalism and regimentation too far. Some allowed children to determine what they wanted to study. Some declined to give any direction at all. The only rule in some classrooms was that there were no rules. Children were not designed to deal with such total freedom. Dewey foresaw the problems and the criticisms that these classroom situations would cause.

By 1938 even though his patience with over zealous and underbright disciples seemed limitless, Dewey felt it necessary to clarify his position regarding new progressive methods. He criticized the extremes in disregarding the organization of subject matter in favor of active experience. The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Experience and education⁷⁰ cannot be directly equated to each other.

Dewey came from seven generations of farmers. "Could that account for his sense of reality, sense of directness, immediacy, and simplicity?"⁷¹ He was

. . . enormously sensitive, delicately receptive, open, exposed to stimulation from people and events; yet an inward laceration inflicted upon him by the separations and divisions of his New England heritage and culture fostered in him an intense emotional craving for unity. This unity of tensions generated by surface incompatibility and diversity of experience and emotional need, and his genius are what made him a great philosopher.⁷²

Parker and Dewey were intrepid warriors but they did not completely understand their opposition. "At times Parker faintly realized that the existing system of economics threatened his scheme of values."⁷³ "Dewey underestimated the force of aristocratic or Hamiltonian tradition in American life."⁷⁴ Both believed in education with the child and his experiences at the center as the force to drive democracy.

Dewey's supporters held special conferences and gala events for Dewey's seventieth birthday. He did not attend the festivities in honor of his eightieth birthday. He changed his status with Columbia by dropping the "in residence" from his Professor Emeritus title. He continued to read, write, lecture, and speak out on important issues of the day. For example, he presided over the international hearings of Trotsky held at the home of Diego Rivera in Mexico.

In 1946 Dewey married Roberta Lowitz Grant when he was eighty-seven, and she was forty-two. They adopted two Belgian war orphans.

In 1949 friends and loyal supporters celebrated Dewey's ninetieth birthday. He attended with Roberta and the children, and then he and Roberta traveled to Burlington, Vermont, for a reunion. They toured the town and had dinner at the university. Dewey enjoyed seeing his old friends and neighbors and being honored by his alma mater.

Dewey had always been healthy but age was robbing his resistance. He suffered from colds, flu, virus infections, congested sore throat, and bronchitis. He broke his hip while playing with his young adopted children, and he never fully recovered nor regained his strength. That was in November of 1951, and he was ninety-two. In May 1952 he developed pneumonia. On June 1, Dewey died. Roberta had sent the children to a neighbor, but she was with him at the end.

Rudolph Steiner

- 1861 Born, Kraljevic, Austria
- 1862 Moved to Pottschach, Austria
- 1868 Moved to Neudorfl, Hungary
- 1872 Attended secondary school, Wiener-Neustadt, Hungary
- 1879 Moved to Vienna, Austria; attended Vienna Institute of Technology
- 1884 Resident tutor, editor Goethe's writings
- 1890 Co-editor of Weimar Edition of Goethe's natural science writings
- 1891 Ph.D., University of Rostack, Germany
- 1897 Editor, Magazin for die Literatur des in - und Auslandes (Magazine for German and Foreign Literature) Berlin, Germany
- 1899 Married Frau Eunicke
- 1900 Theosophic lecturer
- 1902 General secretary, Germany section, Theosophical Society
- 1913 General secretary, Anthroposophical Society; foundation stone laid for Goetheanum
- 1914 Married Marie von Sievers
- 1920 Established Waldorf School, Stuttgart, Germany; Goetheanum opened, Dornach, Switzerland
- 1922 Goetheanum destroyed by fire; life threatened
- 1923 Re-founded Anthroposophical Society
- 1924 Established class in Esoterics
- 1925 Died, Dornach, Switzerland

Rudolf Steiner was born in 1861 in Kraljevic, Austria. "His parents came from Lower Austria, and were German speaking, belonging therefore to the ruling power in the area."⁷⁵ His father had once been a game warden but when Rudolf was born he was employed by the Austrian Southern Railway. In 1862 he was transferred to Moedling. A few months later he was promoted to station master and moved to Pottschach, Austria. Even with promotion he did not earn much money. Like Parker and Dewey, Steiner felt financial burdens much of his life.

In 1868 the Steiners moved to Neudorfl. Rudolf grew up in small rural towns as had Parker and Dewey, and he loved nature as did they. He had no actual farming background and influence, but the family did have a vegetable garden in which Steiner worked and harvested.

Steiner loved the natural beauty of his surroundings, but even at an early age he was fascinated with the mechanical element of life. Part of it must have been due to spending time in his father's railroad stations. But it went beyond that. He wanted to understand thoroughly how things worked.

I needed to understand how things worked from start to finish. I spent as much time in the mill as they would allow. I studied with all my heart the work of the miller. I forced a way for myself into the interior of nature.⁷⁶

Johann Steiner was eager for his son to learn to read. When they were in Pottschach, he sent Rudolf to the village school, but the teacher was not a good teacher. Also, according to Rudolf,

the teacher's son was a scamp. Therefore, Rudolf reasoned that anyone with such a son could not teach. In his Story of My Life, Rudolf tells a story about this school. One day the scamp made a mess with the ink. The scamp's mother blamed Rudolf. When Steiner's father learned of this, he went to the school and confronted the teacher. He told him that his son would never set foot in that school again.

Johann decided he would teach his son to read and write, but Rudolf merely imitated his father. He could see no reason to do the things his father taught just for his own improvement. He had become, he explained, rooted in all that formed the practical life.⁷⁷

Also about this time, Rudolf became aware of another world--a spiritual world. He could sense or see beings and objects outside the material world. He realized, too, that he could not talk about this with the people with whom he had contact. "I was filled with questions I had to carry around unanswered. Questions about all possible sorts of things. This made me as a boy very lonely."⁷⁸

In 1868 the Steiners moved to Neudorf, Hungary. Here Steiner entered the village school. He commented on his early schooling: "It was simply impossible to do anything save let the mind fall into dull reverie while the hands almost mechanically took care of copying."⁷⁹ Like Parker and Dewey, Steiner did not like the monotony of his early schooling.

In those days the railway station served as a central meeting place of the two notables. The priest and the doctor often met there to converse with Johann Steiner. These men could see how curious Rudolf was. In time Rudolf learned the principles of astronomy from the village priest and the philosophy of Lessing, Goethe, and Shiller from the doctor.⁸⁰ In school his teacher introduced him to geometry, music, and drawing. Geometry fascinated Rudolf. He wrote,

. . . that one can live within one's mind in the shaping of forms perceived only within oneself, entirely without impression upon external senses--this gave me the deepest satisfaction. I found in this solace for the unhappiness which my unanswered questions had caused me. To be able to lay hold upon something in spirit alone brought me inner joy. I am sure I learned first in geometry to experience this joy. The objects and occurrences which senses perceive are in space. But, just as this space is outside of man, so there exists also within man a sort of soul-space which is the arena of spiritual realities and occurrences. Through geometry one is permitted to know something which the mind alone, through its own power, experiences.⁸¹

Steiner, despite not having many of his questions answered, thrived on mathematics and drawing. His teacher at the village school was so impressed by Steiner's drawings that he gave him a good examination grade. Good examination grades made the villagers happy because that spoke well of their school. But Steiner had not learned to read and write very well, and he passed over words when reading. His mind went immediately to perceptions, concepts, and ideas.

I got no feeling from reading or spelling or writing grammatically. In writing I fixed word forms in my mind to sounds spoken in dialect. It was through most arduous effort that I gained the facility for writing a literary language.⁸²

Steiner's father decided to send him to the Real-Schule (Modern) rather than the Gymnasium (Classical) because he thought his son might go into engineering. The son cared little which school he attended. He had burning questions regarding life, the world, and the soul. Nonetheless, in 1882 Steiner began his secondary school training in Wiener-Neustadt.

It was during this period of his schooling that Steiner began home study or self-teaching. He began with Kant. He purchased a copy of The Critique of Pure Reason. His interest arose from his spiritual life. "I must go to nature in order to win a standing place in the spiritual world. I am striving to understand what human reason might be able to achieve toward real insight into the being of things."⁸³ 23

Continuing his interest in math, he taught himself analytical geometry, trigonometry, and differential and integral calculus. He became a tutor to aid the family finances. This he enjoyed because he learned the subject more thoroughly and objectively by having to teach it. He had to learn the curriculum of the Gymnasium after all in order to tutor his pupils. Steiner commented that in school he

. . . learned in a dream, a trance, a half-waking state. I was only awake to learning on my own or from a benefactor such as the doctor. When tutoring I had to vitalize my own knowledge. This

compelled me to concern myself with practical pedagogy. I learned the differences of the development of the human mind through my pupils.⁸⁴

Steiner also had responsibilities at home. He worked in the garden harvesting fruit and vegetables. He did the grocery shopping, and he enjoyed practical work.

At the Real-Schule Steiner's favorite teacher was the chemistry instructor. He taught almost entirely by means of experiments. He spoke very little. He let the natural processes speak for themselves.⁸⁵ On the other hand, his least favorite was the history teacher. His lectures were strictly from the textbook. Steiner could learn the material better on his own, so he cut sections out of a textbook and hid Kant within the covers.⁸⁶ Math remained the "foundation of all his strivings after knowledge. Through math one learns to understand the world. In order to do this, one must evoke math out of the human mind."⁸⁷

In 1879 the Steiner family moved to Vienna so that Rudolf could attend the Vienna Institute of Technology. There was still no one with whom Steiner dared discuss his awareness of a spiritual world. There had been a meeting with a country herbalist. This man had little schooling but did have a deep understanding of nature and understood the spirit experience. He and Steiner had discussed the spirit world. He also taught Steiner the curative powers of plants. But discussions like that were rare. "At that time I had no one to whom I could have spoken of these perceptions."⁸⁸ At times this was very difficult because

as much as he wanted to discuss, he feared he would drive people away. "I always had to slip outside of my own being and leap across into another skin, as it were, when I was in company with this friend."⁸⁹ Years later Steiner would use this phrase again in describing what formal education was doing to children . . . "it makes them need to jump out of their skin."

Steiner never allowed his insight into the spiritual world to disturb his study of science. He "hoped someday that a blending of a natural science with his knowledge of the spirit would be granted."⁹⁰

Steiner had two professors who made an impression on him then and in his future. He had great respect for Professor Reitlinger, his physics professor. Reitlinger used a strong inductive method of research in teaching, was a universal thinker, and discussed the relation of general philosophical ideas with physics. He gave Steiner a testimonial which helped to secure pupils for tutoring.

Schroer was Steiner's literature teacher. Schroer loved Goethe and influenced Steiner's life long study of Goethe. Steiner would later become an editor of Goethe's natural science writing. Schroer had been the director of an evangelical school in Vienna, and he wrote a book on teaching titled Questions on Teaching.

Tutoring became Steiner's profession for a number of years after he graduated. Schroer definitely influenced Steiner's conception of education. Schroer "spoke against the mere

imparting of information and in favor of the evolution of the full and entire human being."⁹¹ Steiner spent two hours in preparation for a half hour lesson. He meant to get the material in a form that would take the least time to present, cause the least strain on the pupil, yet allow him to reach the highest capacity for achievement.⁹² He set the same standards for his Walford teachers 40 years later.

As librarian of the Reading Room, Steiner wrote to prominent authors begging for books. He "became acquainted with scientific, artistic, culture-historical, and political literature of the time."⁹³ He made many friends at school. He had not gone public with his spiritual beliefs, but people could see "he believed in an invisible reality and that he had an innate instinct for seeing all sides of a question."⁹⁴ This ability caused him to be elected and later impeached as president of the University Reading Club. He was elected because he could clearly see all sides of an issue. He lost popularity because, in seeing all sides, he could not decide for any party.

After Steiner graduated he remained in Vienna. He became a resident tutor and editor of Goethe's natural science writing. As a tutor he was responsible for a young backward boy who could not read, write, or concentrate. Steiner perceived the boy did have the

. . . capability of intellectual development,
if his soul-life could be roused from the sleepy
detachment from his physical faculties in which it
was held. Here was a practical opportunity to

apply the theory of metamorphosis of the physical organism by spirit activity. He established an intimate soul-relationship with his young pupil, and thereby gradually changed his defective soul-outlook.⁹⁵

After two years with Steiner as his tutor, the boy was able to attend school. Steiner continued to tutor him through secondary school, and later the boy went on to qualify as a doctor.

In the late 1880s Steiner experienced intense spiritual concentration. He spent much time with writers, thinkers, theologians, and actors."⁹⁶ In 1888 he became the editor of Deutsche Wochenschrift (The German Weekly). Steiner remained non-partisan, so it was difficult to write the editorials. It did, however, waken him up to politics.

Grandduchess Sophie of Saxony invited Steiner to join other scholars on a project to edit the unpublished work of Goethe. In 1890 he moved to Weimar, Germany. It was during this time that Steiner decided to obtain his doctorate. He could not do so in Austria because he had attended a Real-Schule, not a Gymnasium. But in Germany a student had only to find a professor who would accept his dissertation and preside over his oral examination. Steiner submitted his dissertation to Professor Stein of the University of Rostock. Steiner said of his work Wahrheit und Wissenschaft (Truth and Science),

The task I set myself in my doctor's dissertation was inner experience: understanding man's consciousness with itself. For I saw that man can understand what genuine reality is in the outer world only when he⁹⁷ has perceived genuine reality within himself.

Professor Stein replied,

Your dissertation is not such as is required; one can perceive from it that you have not produced it under the guidance of a professor; but what it contains⁹⁸ makes it possible that I can very gladly accept.

During the 1890s Steiner began to communicate his concepts regarding the spiritual nature of the human being. He began to lecture (two titles: "Fancy as the Creatress of Culture" and "The Possibility of a Monastic Conception of the World on the Basis of a Real Knowledge of the Spiritual") and publish (one title: "Against Ethics Uprooted from an All-World Reality"). These did not receive a good response. In fact, two of his papers offended people he respected, though he felt that was due to their mistaken interpretation.⁹⁹ And it was again a lonely time for him. "I lived in a spiritual world, no one in my circle followed me there."¹⁰⁰ "I was deeply grieved when I was really uttering that which had for me profoundest import, yet to my friend I was talking of nothing. Such was my relationship with many people."¹⁰¹ Thus, he ended his Weimar period at age 36.

In 1897 Steiner moved to Berlin and became editor of Magazin fur die Literatur des in- und Auslandes (Magazine for German and Foreign Literature). It published the "latest literary expressions of the intellectual life of the day."¹⁰² He also had to work for the Freie Literarische Gesellschaft (Free Literary Society) in order to increase subscriptions. He wrote and co-produced plays for the Free Dramatic Society, and he was

elected to the board of directors. As Steiner reported it, the society's purpose was to produce "misunderstood" plays.¹⁰³

Around 1900 the Eunike family, for whom Steiner had once been a resident tutor, moved to Berlin. Steiner had been in "utter misery living in a home of my own." He married Frau Eunicke but did not write of this because "private relationships do not belong to the public."¹⁰⁴ There is as little known of Frau Eunicke, Steiner's first wife, as of the first Mrs. Parker.

The magazine Steiner was editing did not make much money. Finances were a "constant source of anxiety" as they were for Parker and Dewey.¹⁰⁵ Consequently, Steiner was pleased when the executive committee of the Berlin Workers' School asked him to teach history courses and practice in speaking. He was eager to teach mature men and women. He warned the committee that he would teach according to his own beliefs, one of which was that he had to learn how his students thought in order to make himself understood. He was a popular teacher among the students. It was a time of social change, and the people were eager to hear about the forces of history. When he tried to show the workers how to be free, the leaders wanted him out. Their attitude was "we do not wish freedom in the proletariat movement; we wish rational compulsion."¹⁰⁶

Also in 1900 Steiner began lecturing for the Theosophical Society. Though he warned them that his lectures would be from his perspective, he became a popular lecturer. In 1902 he became

general secretary of a German Theosophical Society. He met Marie von Sievers, his future wife, on one lecture.

For the next 10 years Steiner lectured, published, and traveled throughout Europe. He had never fully accepted the beliefs of the Theosophists. He spoke and acted according to his personal thinking. There were arguments and angry feelings at times. Finally, in 1913 he broke completely from them and formed the Anthroposophical Society. He moved to Switzerland and began construction of the Goetheanum. This was to be a magnificent structure which was to become the seat of learning for Steiner and his followers. In 1914 he married Marie von Sievers.

After World War One Steiner returned to Germany. He gave public lectures against scientific and political materialism. This brought public rebuttals and criticism from some, but approval from many including a Stuttgart factory owner, Emil Mott. Mott feared a breakdown in the social and economic life in Germany. He believed it could not be healed by changing governments and substituting political systems. A fundamental cultural renewal was called for, and this was only possible through education. In 1919 he approached Steiner with a scheme to offer education to the workers in his factory. Steiner agreed provided he was given complete freedom. The factory workers were pleased with not only what they were learning but also with the prospect of a school for their children. Steiner agreed to develop a system of education which combined spiritual individuality and the importance of every human.¹⁰⁷

The Waldorf School was unique. Steiner organized the curriculum according to the development of the child. Nothing was to be presented to him which "would make him want to jump out of his skin." The teachers were selected for their excellence in their fields. They were then trained in pedagogy by Steiner. The teachers themselves ran the school. To promote cooperation rather than competition, there were no examinations or grades. Steiner also taught in many of the classrooms.

The concept of the Waldorf School spread throughout Germany to Switzerland and to England. Hitler closed the German Waldorf Schools on the grounds that the purpose of education was to develop citizens for the state, not to develop citizens who could think for themselves.¹⁰⁸

Like Parker and Dewey, Steiner had many devoted followers and a smaller number of antagonists. His life was threatened while on a lecture tour; consequently, he left Germany. In 1922 the Goetheanum was destroyed by arson, and his life was threatened again. Steiner wrote The Story of My Life not by choice but as an explanation and rebuttal of his critics. Even today his work continues to so disconcert people that his followers maintain a "conspiracy of silence in public awareness of Steiner and his work."¹⁰⁹

In 1924 Steiner became ill and was confined to bed, but he did not stop working. He wrote weekly installments of letters to the members of the Anthroposophical Society and segments of his book.

He continued to read as much as possible, but gradually, he weakened.

Early on March 30, 1925, Marie Steiner, his wife, received a message to return at once to Dornach. She set out immediately, but she was too late to be with her husband before he died. Dr. Wegman, Steiner's personal physician, asked him if he had a final word for his people As Easton reported in Herald of a New Epoch,

Faithful to the last to his unwillingness to impinge on the freedom of others, knowing that any such last message would become a binding injunction . . . he made no reply. A few moments later, folding his hands across his breast, he closed his eyes. Without any sign of even a moment's struggle, he soon afterwards passed peacefully across the threshold into the spiritual world.¹¹⁰

Hughes Mearns

1875	Born, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1893	Graduated, Central High school, Philadelphia
1894	Attended Philadelphia School of Pedagogy
1902	Graduated (B.S.), Harvard; began teaching, Philadelphia School of Pedagogy
1902-1908	Graduate school, University of Pennsylvania
1914	Director, Shady Hill Day School, Philadelphia
1917	Morale officer, judge advocate, educator, psychopathologist, American Armed Forces
1920	Lincoln School, Columbia University, New York
1925	Associate Professor, New York University
1926-1946	Full professor and chairperson, Creative Education Department, New York University
1932	Progressive Education Association Convention Address
1933	Music Supervisors' Eastern Conference; North Central Conference Address
1946	Retired, New York University
19__	Board of Directors of Plays and Players
19__	Director, American Society for the Extension of University Teaching
1965	Died, Bearsville, New York

Unlike Parker, Dewey, and Steiner, Hughes Mearns was not born in a rural village but in the city of Philadelphia on September 28, 1875. But like Parker, Dewey, and Steiner, he was unhappy with his early schooling. Mearns and his classmates were told that bad spellers never earn any money. Yet they saw many of

their fellow students drop out of school and earn great sums of money in that "great historic industrial expansion."¹¹¹ Those who remained were expected to memorize the history text which Mearns called presumptuous ignorance

We children learned the exact height in feet of all the mountains of the world and the exact population of American cities according to the 1880 census. The mountain tops are where they were, but, alas, the inhabitants of cities have moved about, thus killing my chance to shine in polite conversation. That kind of knowledge went out of style a hundred years or more before the schools gave it up.¹¹²

Despite his dislike of his schooling, Mearns graduated from Central High School in Philadelphia in 1893.

In 1894 Mearns attended the Philadelphia School of Pedagogy. From there he went to Harvard where he graduated with a B.S. degree in 1902. Unlike Parker and Dewey who both chose teaching, Mearns went into the field strictly for money to support his desire to write for the stage. He began teaching at the Philadelphia School of Pedagogy in 1902 and continued in the field of teaching until he retired from New York University in 1946. Forty-four years of successfully doing something he never intended to do. He went to graduate school at the University of Pennsylvania from 1902 to 1903 and worked with William James. The doctorate of philosophy had been imported from Germany and was the vogue at the time. Mearns and some of his peers determined to make a place in education without the degree and with this Professor James agreed.¹¹³ Mearns later remarked on the pomposity

of professorial titles, "Can you imagine two people alone in a room calling each other professor?"

From 1914 to 1917 Mearns was the director of the Shady Hill Day School in Philadelphia. There he experimented with the creative processes of children. He learned how to make them forget he was around. He kept records of their conversations. He never asked questions and he never showed surprise. He came to three conclusions: (a) children had amazingly acute powers of observation, (b) children could be completely selfish and merciless to each other, and (c) parents and teachers smother children's individuality--the source of creative effort--by trying to mold them.¹¹⁴

During World War One, Mearns served as a morale officer, a judge advocate, an educator, and a psychopathologist. When he returned he was offered the superintendency of a large school district and a position at the new experimental Lincoln School at Teachers College, Columbia University. Like Parker, he had the choice of a prestigious educational position or the opportunity to teach and he chose to teach. He accepted the later and spent five successful years in the English Department at the Lincoln School. There he continued his experiments in creativity. He taught in the secondary school working with older students. He demanded much but gave his students a generous amount of freedom to write what they felt and when they felt it. He developed an atmosphere which allowed the students to feel their writing was important to themselves and to others.

Mearns allowed his students to express themselves in writing which was not automatically scrutinized for spelling and grammatical errors. He encouraged them to encourage each other. He refrained from negative criticism of their writing. However, he did not praise poor writing. He worked with his students building their personal attitudes and found that by doing so, their writing improved. One day he was called upon to arbitrate a problem regarding a student's work. The class had selected a student's poem as worthy of publication. The author claimed the writing was poor and actually a joke on the class. After much earnest and free discussion on the poem in question, one student accused the author of not even knowing when something was good. The young author finally admitted that despite his joke, he had worked hard on the poem and had revised it several times.

At the Lincoln School Mearns worked with Dr. P.W.L. Cox who moved on to New York University. He arranged to have Mearns join him there. Mearns began as an associate professor in 1926. He became a full professor and chair of the Creative Education Department where he remained until his retirement in 1946. During this time he wrote several books on creativity and a large number of magazine and journal articles.

According to J.C. Duff, Mearns was of average height, a little chunky, and meticulously well-groomed. He began speaking to his classes before the general chatter ceased. Since his voice was so quiet only those in front heard but it got immediate attention.

As a lecturer, he did not document everything by citing research but by presenting examples of teaching and learning his students could accept intuitively. In private he knew the literature very well. He was friendly, gracious, and amused most of the time. Unlike Parker, Dewey, and Steiner, he avoided school politics.¹¹⁵

In 1933 Mearns spoke to the sessions of the Music Supervisors' Eastern Conference. He was not without credentials. He had always been interested in theatre and music. Years earlier he wrote the popular quatrain, "As I was walking up the stair, I met a man who wasn't there. He wasn't there again today. I wish, I wish he'd go away." It became rather well known and many claimed authorship. Mearns never criticized even some of his own students who did so. Eventually, the truth was discovered and Mearns received compensation.

Like Dewey, Mearns was quite family-oriented. He was very close to his wife and daughter. He was seventy-one when he retired from New York University. His greatest fear as a teacher of the creative spirit was that "he would so stir his students they couldn't calm down to exist in ordinary society."¹¹⁶

Mearns was on the Board of Directors of Plays and Players and director of the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching.

After retiring Mearns and his family moved to Bearsville, New York. He was eighty-nine years old when he died on March 13, 1965. J. C. Duff admonished future researchers: "There will be

references to the books and articles Mearns wrote, but one may hope the light and happy spirit characteristic of Bill Mearns will not be traded for a mess of statistics ground out of electronic computers."¹¹⁷

Laura Zirbes

1884 Born, Buffalo, New York
 1901 Attended Cleveland Normal Training School
 1903 Elementary school teacher, Cleveland, Ohio
 1920 Attended Teachers College, Columbia University
 1921-1925 Assistant Editor, Journal of Educational Psychology
 1925 Received B.S. degree, Teachers College
 1925-1928 Lecturer, Teachers College; received A.M. and Ph.D. degrees
 1926-1928 Journal of Educational Research, Assistant Editor
 1928 Joined faculty, Ohio State University
 1929-1938 Director, Ohio State Summer Demonstration School
 1930 Developed University Elementary School
 1933 Chairman, Committee on Education of Teachers, Progressive Education Association
 1935 Developed new curriculum for elementary education Ohio State University
 1938-1939 Held Summer Teacher Workshops in "Creativity in the Classroom"
 1947-1949 Chairman, Editorial Board, Childhood Education
 1967 Died, Columbus, Ohio

Laura Zirbes was born on April 26, 1884, in Buffalo, New York. Very little is known about her childhood except that at some point she moved to Cleveland, Ohio. In 1901 she entered the Cleveland Normal Training School. In 1903, at the age of nineteen, she became an elementary teacher. She had a difficult time at the

public school. Her creative and innovative methods were not well accepted. The principal suggested she transfer to a private boys school where he thought she would be more acceptable. She did so and remained until 1919.

In 1920, the same year as Mearns, Zirbes went to Teachers College, Columbia University. She took classes and conducted research in reading. In 1925 she received the Bachelor of Science degree. She remained at Columbia as a graduate student and lecturer until 1928. She received Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy degrees.

In 1928 Zirbes returned to Ohio. She began working with the State Department of Education and joined the faculty of the Ohio State University where she remained until she retired in 1954.

Zirbes was the director of the Ohio State Summer Demonstration School from 1929 to 1938. Among many areas, she offered a special three week training institute for nursery school teachers unhampered by restrictive limitations imposed by standardized requirements.¹¹⁸

Zirbes campaigned vigorously for the creation of a university elementary school. She won. Zirbes and others from the Department of Education established a kindergarten and an elementary school in a private dwelling on Frambes Avenue in 1930. She would like to have been the director, "but local influentials have their adversaries and she reluctantly settled for seeing that many of her Columbus staff members were included on the staff."¹¹⁹

The school always had an enrollment problem: not enough students during the depression and after that too many.¹²⁰

Parker's Chicago Institute was first and temporarily housed in a former bar. One student reported he could smell barley during his lessons. Steiner's first Waldorf School opened in a renovated restaurant, and another student remembered odors unusual for a classroom. And Zirbes was in a private dwelling for two years before the regular building was completed.

In 1935 Zirbes worked on the curriculum of the elementary education courses. The students were to move from passive reception by students to active involvement in their own education. Zirbes believed that students and teachers must continue to grow; adjust to different ages, needs, and problems; to learn by experiment; to study resources; and to associate with people who make the most of opportunities.¹²¹

In the summers of 1938 and 1939, she led workshops on creative exploration. The participants were involved in group activity. They developed materials for use in their own classrooms.

Zirbes developed the September Field Experience. This was for prospective elementary teachers. They would work in their hometown elementary schools before the university opened in the fall.

Zirbes believed that education must move from

. . . stereotyped conformity to free expression, from passive compliance to active identification, imposed direction to cooperative planning, extrinsic motivation to intrinsic values

and concerns, submissive acquiescence to wholehearted involvement, restrictive domination to responsible self-direction, stultifying repression to spontaneity, and fixed habits and skills to the cultivation of a flexible adaptive response to life-related situations.¹²²

Zirbes criticized parents for solving educational problems the easy way. If a school were not good enough many parents simply moved to a better school district or sent their children to a private school. Zirbes accused them of solving their problem as parents at the expense of their role as citizens. She criticized compulsory school attendance. It was "at best only a mobilizing device, like the draft, which makes sure every eligible individual did his part."¹²³

Zirbes had a well-tempered, steely mind; yet she had great yet child-like qualities. She was playful, yet she never did things for a single value.¹²⁴

Zirbes was interested in early childhood education. She asked for parent education and social responsibility for pediatric care. She did not understand why government and education seemed far more concerned with the last part of childhood and little or nothing about the first. She wanted periodic health examinations and cited as an indicator of assessment coming far too late the free Selective Service examination which discovered dietary deficiencies fifteen or more years after the fact.¹²⁵

Zirbes wrote and lectured on education throughout her career. She was chairman of the editorial board of Childhood Education and assistant editor of the Journal of Educational Psychology and the

Journal of Educational Research. She was active in nine professional associations. She taught for fifty-one years. She was eighty-three years old and had just published an article when she died on June 9, 1967, in Columbus, Ohio.

Leland B. Jacobs, in his "Dedication to Laura Zirbes," wrote:

Compromise was not in the vocabulary. Willing to stand up and be counted for a social or educational viewpoint. Courageous in rebellions against routinized, lock-step administration of education. Denials of open and subtle forms of caste and privilege. Supporter of teachers' freedoms. Espousal of superior schooling for all children. Often--and well aware of the possible personal consequences and hurts--stood out against the crowd, against the powerful individual or commercial enterprise, against the current socially or educationally respectable position. What one values one must try to live.¹²⁶

Notes

¹Edward Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920 (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 431.

²Richard Hofstadler, The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), 8.

³Frederick S. Breed, "Progressive Education," School and Society, 37(1933):545.

⁴Clyde R. Miller, "Some Popular Appraisals of John Dewey," Teachers College Record, 31(1929):218.

⁵Jack Campbell, The Children's Crusader (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), 5.

⁶Campbell, 5.

⁷Campbell, 13.

⁸Campbell, 13.

⁹Campbell, 33.

¹⁰Campbell, 39-40.

¹¹Wilbur S. Jackman, "Colonel Francis Wayland Parker," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1902):400.

¹²Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (Patterson, New Jersey: Pageant Books, Inc., 1959), 376.

¹³Campbell, 34.

¹⁴Lelia Patridge, Notes on Talks on Teaching (New York: E.L. Kellogg & Co., 1883), xiv.

¹⁵Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, The Child-Centered School (New York: World Book Co., 1928), 11.

¹⁶Marion Foster Washburne, Francis Wayland Parker: His Life and Educational Reforms (New York: E.L. Kellogg, 1900), 42.

¹⁷Washburne, 118.

¹⁸Washburne, 53-54.

¹⁹Flora J. Cooke, "Colonel Francis W. Parker and His Influence upon Education," Progressive Education, 14(1937):538.

- ²⁰Patridge, xv.
- ²¹Campbell, 70.
- ²²Campbell, 72.
- ²³Campbell, 77.
- ²⁴Cooke, 586.
- ²⁵Washburne, 49.
- ²⁶Campbell, 90.
- ²⁷Patridge, xvii.
- ²⁸Campbell, 100.
- ²⁹Patridge, xvii.
- ³⁰Campbell, 106.
- ³¹Ossian Lang, "Francis Wayland Parker," The Forum, 34(1902):115.
- ³²Campbell, 43.
- ³³F.C. Fox, "A Personal Glimpse of Colonel Parker," Progressive Education, 9(1932):59.
- ³⁴Curti, 375.
- ³⁵Campbell, 55.
- ³⁶Flora J. Cooke, "The Social Philosophy of Francis Wayland Parker," Progressive Education, 14(1937):630.
- ³⁷Helen M. Hefferan, "Colonel Francis Wayland Parker," Chicago Schools Journal, 18(1936):6.
- ³⁸Patridge, xxi.
- ³⁹Curti, 500.
- ⁴⁰Horace Coon, Columbia: Colossus on the Hudson (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1947), 178.
- ⁴¹George Dykhuizen, The Life and Mind of John Dewey (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), 4.

- ⁴²Dykhuisen, 6.
- ⁴³Dykhuisen, 54.
- ⁴⁴Dykhuisen, 10.
- ⁴⁵Arthur Wirth, John Dewey as Educator (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966), 7.
- ⁴⁶Dykhuisen, 4.
- ⁴⁷Dykhuisen, 34.
- ⁴⁸Dykhuisen, 40.
- ⁴⁹Wirth, 11.
- ⁵⁰Wirth, 12.
- ⁵¹Wirth, 13.
- ⁵²Wirth, 15.
- ⁵³Coon, 178.
- ⁵⁴Rugg, 1.
- ⁵⁵Wirth, 4.
- ⁵⁶Robert L. McCaul, "Dewey's Chicago," The School Review (Summer 1959), 277.
- ⁵⁷McCaul, 268.
- ⁵⁸McCaul, 274.
- ⁵⁹McCaul, 269.
- ⁶⁰McCaul, 274.
- ⁶¹Curti, 507.
- ⁶²McCaul, 277.
- ⁶³McCaul, 273.
- ⁶⁴Curti, 504.
- ⁶⁵Patricia Graham, A History of the Progressive Education Association (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), 50.

⁶⁶Coon, 178.

⁶⁷H.E. Bucholz, "Dewey Mocked by N.E.A.," Educational Administrators and Superintendents, 18(1932):416.

⁶⁸Graham, 15.

⁶⁹Clyde R. Miller, "Some Popular Appraisals of John Dewey," Teachers College Record, 31(1929):216.

⁷⁰Graham, 78.

⁷¹Miller, 211.

⁷²McCaul, 278.

⁷³Curti, 392.

⁷⁴Curti, 539.

⁷⁵Stuart Easton, Herald of a New Epoch (Spring Valley, NY: The Anthroposophic Press, 1908), 13.

⁷⁶Rudolf Steiner, The Story of My Life (London: Anthroposophic Publishing Company, 1928), 7.

⁷⁷Steiner, 6.

⁷⁸Steiner, 10.

⁷⁹Steiner, 10.

⁸⁰A.D. Shepherd, A Scientist of the Invisible (1954; Edinburgh: Floris Books, 1983), 30.

⁸¹Steiner, 11-12.

⁸²Steiner, 18.

⁸³Steiner, 23.

⁸⁴Steiner, 28.

⁸⁵Steiner, 27.

⁸⁶Shepherd, 32.

⁸⁷Steiner, 42.

⁸⁸Steiner, 68.

- ⁸⁹Steiner, 55.
- ⁹⁰Steiner, 43.
- ⁹¹Steiner, 69.
- ⁹²Steiner, 72.
- ⁹³Steiner, 58.
- ⁹⁴Shepherd, 36.
- ⁹⁵Shepherd, 42.
- ⁹⁶Steiner, 97.
- ⁹⁷Steiner, 125.
- ⁹⁸Steiner, 40.
- ⁹⁹Steiner, 137.
- ¹⁰⁰Steiner, 174.
- ¹⁰¹Steiner, 192.
- ¹⁰²Shepherd, 55.
- ¹⁰³Steiner, 255.
- ¹⁰⁴Steiner, 270.
- ¹⁰⁵Steiner, 270.
- ¹⁰⁶Shepherd, 61.
- ¹⁰⁷Shepherd, 76.
- ¹⁰⁸Henry Barnes, "An Introduction to Waldorf Education," Teachers College Record, 81(1980):325.
- ¹⁰⁹John Davy, Ed., Work Arising (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1975), 12.
- ¹¹⁰Easton, 362.
- ¹¹¹Hughes Mearns, "Salvation by Information," The North American Review, 229(1930):65.
- ¹¹²Mearns, "Salvation," 67-69.

- 113 John Carr Duff, "Hughes Mearns: Pioneer in Education," The Clearing House, 40(1966):419.
- 114 Current Biography (New York: H.W. Wilson Co., 1940), 570.
- 115 Duff, 420-421.
- 116 Hughes Mearns, "Promoting Self-Expression," World's Work, 53(1929):63.
- 117 Duff, 421.
- 118 Laura Zirbes, "Workshops in Elementary Education," Educational Research Bulletin, 20(1941):130-137.
- 119 William Van Til, My Way of Looking at It (Terre Haute, IN: Lake Lure Press, 1983), 79.
- 120 Herbert L. Coon, A Handbook for University School Parents (Columbus: University Press, The Ohio State University, 1954), 8.
- 121 Leland B. Jacobs, "Dedication to Laura Zirbes," Childhood Education, 44(1967):210.
- 122 Laura Zirbes, "Experimenting, Interacting, Growing," Childhood Education, 44(1967):233.
- 123 Laura Zirbes, "Priorities in Childhood Education," Progressive Education, 20(1943):103.
- 124 "Laura Zirbes--a Creative Person," Childhood Education, 44(1967):216.
- 125 Laura Zirbes, "Inalienable Rights of Children," Childhood Education, 21(1945):341-342.
- 126 Jacobs, 210.

CHAPTER II

THE CHILD

Introduction

In Chapter II, I will discuss the attitudes of Francis Parker, John Dewey, Rudolph Steiner, Hughes Mearns, and Laura Zirbes toward children and their relation to education and to life. The child was the center of the curricula proposed by these educators. It was for and about the child that determined the purpose of education. Though with different backgrounds and procedural intentions, these five educators were determined, clear, and critical in their statements regarding the treatment of children. They directed most of their discussion toward the schools, but they often addressed parents in both group discussion and published articles. They believed that a child is a child and should be approached and treated that way in a kind, understanding, sympathetic, yet structured and disciplined manner.

This discussion is divided into five sections. They are (a) The Definition of Childhood (What is a child? What should a child be?); (b) Childhood Learning (How does a child learn? How does he make sense out of what is presented to him/her?); (c) The Treatment of Childhood (How should a child be treated? How should

teachers plan to treat children?); (d) Childhood Capabilities (What is a child capable of doing? What is a child capable of thinking? How much more could a child do with the proper kind of stimulation?); and (e) The Role of Education and Society in Childhood (What is education's responsibility to children? What is society's responsibility to children? What is education's responsibility to society? What is the child's responsibility?).

Each of the five educators under study concentrated on the treatment of childhood, which accounts for roughly 40% of their writing. There the similarity of concentration ended. Parker and Dewey were more vocal about the role of education and society in childhood. Steiner was more concerned with the definition of childhood than any of the others. Four of the five leaned more toward discussing childhood capabilities than childhood learning. Zirbes was the exception.

Information is not available on Zirbes, but Parker, Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns criticized the manner in which they were educated. They had a respect and appreciation for the acquisition of knowledge and were life-long learners. What they did not appreciate was the rigidity, the strictness, the formality, the dullness, the lack of integration and the lack of respect for the individual as a thinking, feeling, individual, and they targeted these methods for reform. Undoubtedly, this was a basis for at least a part of their determination of both what and how children should learn. They realized what it was like to desire knowledge

and yet to be both frustrated and bored by the method of acquisition. Consequently, they intended to make learning worthwhile in both substance and acquisition.

Definition of Childhood

Rugg and Schumaker in The Child-Centered School reported Mearns commenting on the lack of freedoms in the schools: "All God's chillun got wings, until he remembered that all God's chillun are not permitted to use them."¹ Naturally, the five educators under study had some varying degrees of differences in their discussion of a definition of some of the characteristics of childhood. However, they all agreed on what a child is not--and that is a little adult. They chastised adults for demanding adult-like behavior, adult-like standards, adult-like thinking from children who are by nature a cornucopia of marvels but who are also by nature children. Zirbes wrote that "little children are not little men and women. Their drives and needs are not discoverable by logical analysis of organized knowledge into elements that are structured into logical sequences."² Adults are the analyzers of childhood but they do it from the wrong perspective--that of an adult. Children do not see the world--real or imagined--as adults see it.

Parker believed that "every child creates a world in which he lives in his fancy and in this world of his imagination he lives and moves and has his being."³ Mearns likened the child to a

creative spirit "dancing, rhythmic living, laughing, flashes of mind, strength of control, swiftness, action, unwritten poems, songs without words; it is life adding its invisible living cells to more and abundant life."⁴ It is that spirit fantasy world of childhood through which all adults have passed and have since forgotten. Mearns wrote "we know next to nothing about youth. Our memory is false memory, for it gives us almost nothing but conventional adult pictures."⁵ Mearns attempted to learn what he could about children and childhood by taking his open curiosity to their level. He became a keen and silent observer of children at play, at work, and at rest. Eventually, he became a shadow in terms of the attention the children paid to him. He learned that children observed their world as well as he observed them and that through their observations children were naturally creative. The problem was that parents and teachers smothered this creative spirit by trying to mold children to adult standards--into little men and women.⁶

Parker and Steiner tended toward a more religious description of children. Parker, referred to as the "devoted apostle of childhood, saw in every little child the image of God. In the center of civilization he saw a little child and wise and loving care and nurture of that child would make all human interests secure."⁷ Steiner believed that the child was a spiritual being reincarnated in a physical body and that it was the teacher's responsibility to liberate the spirit of the child for later

service to humanity.⁸ Dewey, Mearns, and Zirbes, while holding private religious views, did employ such terms as "soul," "spirit," and "three-fold nature." Dewey, Parker, and Steiner spoke and wrote of the three-fold nature which should be focused upon when dealing with children--that is, mind, soul, and body.

At the University of Chicago Laboratory School, Dewey's aim was to utilize rather than suppress the four-fold impulses of the child: (a) interest in conversation, (b) interest in inquiry, (c) interest in construction, and (d) interest in artistic expression.⁹ This was based on what he had determined to be the five native impulses of children: social, constructive, investigative, experimental, and expressive.¹⁰ Steiner believed in an esoteric psychological concept of the child whereby he had four levels to be reached: (a) the physical body, (b) the etheric or bioplasmic energy, (c) the astral body, and (d) the ego.¹¹ He also believed that children have a natural inclination and "naive delight in color, a love of dramatic portraiture that flows with uncanny ease into expression."¹²

Steiner discovered that until children reached puberty (or shortly before), their consciousness had a pictorial rather than conceptual character. He used this discovery to direct the curriculum and pedagogical methodology in his Waldorf Schools. The study and pleasure of art was the integrative leveler that pervaded the school lives of his pupils.

The child's whole being is called into play
by artistic education for art speaks to the
whole being, it profoundly engages the feelings

of the child. An artistic education develops the capacity for inward picturing out of which at a later age thought is born. Every art is centered in a rhythmic element and rhythm is natural so it least tires the learner and best promotes healthy development.¹³

Mearns likewise believed that drawing and writing are natural urges of children.¹⁴ He observed that children naturally imitate but that adults ignore this native gift and instead they drown potential creativity with doggerel rhymes, set phrases, and adult idioms. The little men and women should, as soon as possible, speak and write like big men and women. "Imitation, however excellent, is never art. Left to themselves, children speak naturally in poem form without searching for a medium. Their minds are wholly intent upon something real within them. Their language is instinctive."¹⁵

While Steiner and Mearns realized the child artist, Parker also felt that every child was a born worker.

. . . there never was a lazy child in God's busy world. Oh yes, you are lazy now; I understand that, but that came after you were educated. You want to work, to sing, to think, to give play to beautiful imagination, to labor. The boy or girl who never made mud pies in the street is fit for little in this world.¹⁶

Parker believed all children should learn to draw. He described art as a power and a love--the expression of thought through the hands.¹⁷

Dewey agreed with Parker that children are not lazy. His idea of interest--engage the child's interest in what needs to be

learned--undermined the notion that children are by nature perverse, lazy, and opposed to learning. Dewey maintained that children are by nature children with interests which they will actively pursue if left to themselves. He accused the rigid restrictions of the schools for making children seem perverse and lazy. He accused teachers of expecting their pupils to behave like miniature adults and suggested that if teachers would reconstruct their expectations, children would cease to be oppositional and inattentive. Children were, in Dewey's belief, interested, active, and curious.¹⁸

Steiner would have agreed. He said he himself was never fully awake and functioning in full consciousness in schools. He was extremely receptive to what he heard and read and was able to pass exams with no problem. But he felt knowledge thus acquired was not his own.¹⁹ Yet, as Dewey suggested, as a student Steiner had many interests and hungrily pursued them on his own. Parker had actually chastised certain of his teachers for not teaching him properly. Mearns ridiculed some of the facts and figures his teachers required him to memorize.

Because of Dewey's ideas of interest and Steiner's desire to have students own the knowledge they acquired, they each developed interest and activity levels which corresponded to stages of a child's growth.

Dewey's stages were (1) ages 4-6, (2) ages 8 or 9-10 or 11, (3) and ages 13-15. Steiner's stages were (1) birth-7 years or

until the teeth change, (2) 7-14 years or until the teeth change to puberty, and (3) 14-21 years. In Dewey's Stage 1, the teacher was to direct the personal and social interests of the child who desired to explore his world with all sensory equipment. The child had a strong need to express himself in motor and expressive activities, in manipulation, investigation, and oral communication. At this stage Dewey wanted children to play games, listen to and tell stories, and take part in informal conversations. This should lead the child toward inquiry and experimentation. The children should work according to ability not grade level, with older children tutoring younger children. Since they didn't have to waste time with recitations (against which Parker helped lead the battle), they could communicate about their experiences which would lead to stimulating intellectual interchange. The studies at this stage should be relevant to the experiences of the child. Nature study, manual training, and sewing were continuous with life outside the school. Formal studies were grouped around and evolved from activities familiar to the child. For example, number work grew out of measuring and weighing in cooking or painting. By Stage 2, the students developed a need for clearer, more long-range goals and mastery of more complex skills. In Stage 3 students were able to deal with and had an interest in specialized studies. Dewey's study of the developmental stages of children was based on a scientific evolutionary point of view. "As mankind was forced to develop

more specialized methods of thought and action to achieve desired ends, so maturing children needed to increase powers by learning more disciplined and refined skills."²⁰

In Steiner's Stage 1, the child learns by imitation, never by precept. From birth to three years, the child's awareness comes from movement and sensual discovery. At three years the child becomes a distinct individual and calls himself "I." He models his play after adult patterns and is an incessant talker. He asks many questions but doesn't listen to many answers. During Stage 2 the child becomes more thoughtful and reserved. He continues to ask questions and now he listens to the answers. He gains a sense of rhythm and music. He is still a dreamer. He is still an imaginative rather than an abstract thinker incapable of intellectual concepts. He is an instinctive artist delighting in contrasts and perceiving beauty. By Stage 3 besides physical changes, the child's thinking powers are strengthened. He is now an abstract thinker and mental concepts which at an earlier stage would have "chilled and repelled him" acquire real meaning.²¹

Steiner thought that children could be classified into the four temperaments: choleric, melancholic, phlegmatic, and sanguine. Though he cautioned that most children have characteristics from all four, still in a general, flexible way a categorization could be made. Steiner advocated teacher awareness of these characteristics so that measures could be taken to develop the desirable ones and change the less desirable. Steiner

saw the choleric child as short and stocky with a bull-neck and a rounded head rigid on his shoulders, extremely sturdy and possessing untiring energy. He could dominate his companions like a ring leader. If provoked he would burst like a volcano. His outbursts could easily degenerate into fits of frenzy. He could be one-sided, egotistical, and fanatic. Choleric children tended to use much red in their paintings.

Steiner saw the melancholic child as tall, lanky, with a small, elongated head and sloping shoulders. Every experience made a deep impression on him and set him brooding. His thoughtful nature led him to develop a rich and interesting inner life, but he seemed too shy to disclose it. He played by himself and read a great deal. He was gifted in music, poetry, and painting. He used soft blues and violets in his art work. Though different from the choleric, they could both be anti-social.

According to Steiner, the phlegmatic child was fat, dumpy, and lazy. However, he was also extremely pleasant and thoroughly good-natured. He preferred a nice restful green in his paintings.

The most normally proportioned child was the sanguine. He had small, nimble hands and feet which were seldom still. Every passing impression distracted his attention. He seemed unable to concentrate, tiring perceptibly when called upon to do so. Yet, he was a lover of gaiety and was a bright spot in the classroom. He delighted in color contrasts but yellow was his favorite. Any predominant temperament may be softened by a mixture of the other

three. And a temperament may change through age, maturation, and/or development.²² Though Steiner cautioned that most children were a combination of these characteristics and that children changed through age, maturity, and development, he and his followers appear almost dogmatic regarding these characteristics and their application for classroom methodology.

Childhood Learning

Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes would all agree that children learn best by doing. Parker believed that education was the fulfilling of God's design of changing being into character.

A human being is latent energy, organic under laws. Laws are translated into actions and actions change latent energy into power. All activity is doing. Thinking is doing. A state of consciousness is observation. Symbols and oral language arouse consciousness--this is hearing and listening. Books contain symbols that bring about a change in consciousness. When a state of consciousness is held, that is study. This holding constitutes the difference between study and reading. Reading is thinking by means of words. There is an intensity in the holding of thought in study. When I study, I do. Conscious mental activity leads to growth. The responsibility of the teacher is to try to bring out all-sided growth. Character is a bundle of habits. A habit is a tendency to do from repeated acts and each repetition is a doing.²³

Steiner said, "A child will understand a subject better if he first experiences it, rather than attempting to understand it before having an experience with it."²⁴ Dewey believed that

learning is effective only when truly assimilated and that growth advances only by the reconstruction of experience.²⁵ Zirbes wrote that many concepts and attitudes are developed through sensory experiences.²⁶ Mearns agreed with the learning by doing theory. He applied this theory to "good reading--good thinking which means nothing unless it is done with the whole body."²⁷ Parker believed that in order for children to love beauty, they must try to create it. They must "dramatize and act, sing, dance, cook, sew, model, paint, and construct as well as read, write, and spell. This leads their thinking to be vivid and true."²⁸

The theory of learning by doing or learning through experience was promoted by each of the five educators under study. They did not suggest this is the one way to learn, but a better, stronger, longer-lasting method. They believed new information should be presented developmentally by building a relationship between old and new experiences. Dewey suggested that subject matter should be in

. . . agreement with the child's changing attitudes and abilities, and that it should be linked with what was valuable in his past experience to his present and his future. The control gained by a child in one situation might be carried on to the next to insure the continuity of experience, the habit of initiative, and the increasing skill in the use of the experimental method.²⁹

Children should be presented information in a developmental manner; that is, whatever the current presentation, it should be paving the way for the next. Dewey suggested pupils should have

"good beginning master tools of thought and methods of inquiry and activity that will enable them to begin more specialized study such as the systematic work in geography, chemistry, physics, history, mathematics, and literature."³⁰ Parker believed that children are most interested in facts that are nearest their own experience. So history could be taught through the lives of people: how they lived; what their housing, food, and clothing were like. In this way students could learn the reality of the failures and successes of societies. Parker believed study of ordinary people rather than the great and famous was more important and more realistic. "It was the former that made the latter possible."³¹

The five educators under study felt that the traditional curriculum did not lend itself to learning through experience. Zirbes realized that children need to learn flexibility and adjustability but the "traditional school order and regimen force children to be dependent and irresponsible."³² She believed that history taught from a textbook has no relation to the real, present world. And she complained that because students are given no experience in their own creative drives, they develop no love or appreciation of great art and literature which, in turn, drives them to commercialized art and cheap literature.³³

Parker felt that "teaching children to memorize page after page of dry dates and empty generalizations is the best means of inducing weakness and disgust in pupils."³⁴ Dewey maintained

that a "child should never feel adult standards imposed. He should develop his own standards out of habitual social behavior which should be free from conscious competition or biased criticism of others."³⁵

In a traditional school room setting, Mearns found that there is "thinking and group echoes."³⁶ He noted that children learn too early that a "sure way to become disliked is to express one's real self."³⁷

Steiner observed that children actually come to school eager to learn and that it is a shame not to have them leave that way.³⁸

Dewey and Parker worked out a moralistic attitude toward thinking and learning. Through thinking and learning, children should be concerned for and considerate of themselves as individuals and themselves as members of a larger group. Dewey determined that thinking is actually problem solving. A child thinks he has a problem. The way he thinks is determined by what he already knows, what he perceives as the problem, and what goal he desires. According to Dewey the whole object of living is growth. The child must go on facing and solving problems. "Thinking ceases when all one's values become fixed and there are no live, interesting, and new things to think about. The learning process occurs within a context of concern and challenge, and life takes on value as long as this continues as an active process."³⁹

Dewey believed only through hard and active individual thinking and adjustments comes anything of educational significance. The child must learn to face problems and adjustments on his own. When facing a problem the child will generally check an impulse allowing a period of reflection. During reflection the new and immediate impulse should be examined in connection with other impulses, habits, and experiences. Dewey's morality is concerned with the child's reaction to the new impulse. If balance is maintained and the child accepts and reacts with his whole self, if he is unified rather than narrowed or weakened, then his action and reaction are moral. Dewey used the analogy of eating. "The man who eats to live is good for the satisfaction of hunger is functional to the whole self and to life. The man who lives to eat is bad because he is sacrificing much of himself to one partial expression of himself."⁴⁰

For Parker, true order was moral. The child must be given freedom and learn individual responsibility for the good of the group. Parker believed children are intrinsically moral and "though they may come to school with homemade selfishness they will soon learn that an altruistic motive is essential to self interest."⁴¹

Parker believed that one way to achieve true order was through the natural unification of subject matter. He opposed the separation and isolation of subject matter because it frustrated clear thinking. He believed the curriculum should be unified

"just as there is unity of action and expression in the child--a unity of mind, body, and soul."⁴²

Parker and Dewey also felt that learning truly becomes alive through expression. Dewey said that the "human aspect emerges with the use of ideas in action and that ideas only occur with language. Further, language is only possible where there is social life with shared communication."⁴³ He went on to discuss the fact that children are born language less. "All distinctions of things and qualities, together with the names we give them and the uses to which we put them, must be worked out after we get here. All that is human is learned."⁴⁴

Parker made the analogy of knowledge expressed as knowledge made nutritious. He saw no point to unexpressed knowledge referring to it as stagnant, incomplete, and useless. His concern was the amount of nutrition generated by children in schools. "It is safe to say most children are starved in school for lack of knowledge made nutritious by expression."⁴⁵

Parker, Steiner, and Zirbes discussed the mental learning in childhood in relation to the physical learning. Parker observed that a child learns to walk and talk by simple practice without any instruction. He noted that this process of learning was not painful to the child or tiring to others; it was actually an amusement to both.⁴⁶ Steiner saw child development proceed in a series of metamorphoses: "The whole human being is completely transformed with every step forward in his emergent

evolution."⁴⁷ Steiner believed that along with physical changes at birth, the second dentition and puberty, psychic changes take place that change the child's inner life. For example, during the early primary grades the child is imitative and imaginative. Between 10 and 11 years of age, the child's imaginative capacity becomes abstract capacity. The child can form and understand abstract concepts.

Steiner also observed a connection between finger-movement, speech, and thinking. He suggested that possibly the nimble-fingered child could articulate and think clearly and dexterously. The clumsy-handed child might also be both clumsy-tongued and -headed.⁴⁸

Zirbes wrote,

All normal infants learn to turn, creep, and walk. Nobody thinks of subjecting babies to formal lessons in muscle flexing. She suggested experience and assurance contribute to skill, coordinating, and readiness. The more challenging the experience, the more mature the response.⁴⁹

Zirbes did not discuss muscle coordination and a relation to thinking skills, but she did believe that "vigorous, large muscle activities are a prerequisite for later emphasis on finer coordinations."⁵⁰ The importance of learning through rather than before experience pervaded the thinking of childhood, as defined by these five educators. To them children were children, and that state, not one of little adults, should be prized and utilized. Their natural imaginations should be freed and

strengthened. This must, however, be done gradually, carefully, and developmentally.

The Treatment of Childhood

Parker's treatment of childhood was toward the child, through the senses, and with discipline. His theory of concentration was that all effort center on the child.⁵¹ Subject matter becomes the means by which the child learns to interpret the world. The teacher's function is to help the child adjust to his environment. Since children are social beings, they learn best by experience, impressions, and expressions. They must learn to do their own thinking in a flexible and changing environment.⁵²

Parker envisioned the teacher as a scientist bringing all other knowledge to bear on the central issue: the child. The teacher must know each child perfectly in mind, body, and soul.⁵³ This demanded the fullest measure of cooperation between the home and the school.

Parker called for an

. . . emancipation of the child from the domination of a superior, restraining will. The freedom of the natural exercise of spontaneous power meant for the teacher an opportunity to study the growing mind of the child, to unite and sympathize with the child's spirit, and to dwell in the child's world.⁵⁴

Parker felt that the artistic and the physical elements were an important part of the triune nature of the child.⁵⁵ For example, he believed that every child not only could but should

learn to draw. He believed there was power and love in thought expressed through the hands. In 1889 he wrote, "There is no training that will help a child be strong and healthy and good so much as some useful employment in which he can spend his energy."⁵⁶ However, he was critical of the methods used to teach art. In 1895 he called up the best authorities in educational psychology to denounce

. . . flat copying as flat, stale, and unprofitable. It stultifies the mind. It is far better for the child to have some motive for work. He should feel what he does. When he handles clay, a brush, or a pencil, he should be struggling to realize and to externalize an image seen from within.⁵⁷

Parker wanted children to be happy but he never advocated that they do what ever they liked, whenever they liked. He promoted self control and maintained that without it there could never been true freedom. He said children must learn to share but that the system of rewarding for success and punishing for failure was actually developing selfish people who were never satisfied and used others for their own advancement.⁵⁸ He wanted teachers to create an atmosphere of altruism, freedom, and responsibility but not by putting partisan ideas in their students. Above all Parker wanted them to act and think for themselves. For example, in Carrolltown where Parker taught in the 1850s, when the children saw a need for a library, they formed a committee and launched a campaign.⁵⁹

Parker spent a number of years growing up on a farm after his father died. Years later upon reflection, he realized that was a good preparation for his career as a teacher, and that it was especially conducive for elementary education. He realized that on a farm a child is made responsible for something important and he learns good work habits while surrounded by a simple environment. He pointed out that study does not apply to book learning only.

Parker must have taken that upbringing and influence with him when he went to Carrolltown in 1859. His first assignment for his pupils was to clear out the school grounds and to brighten up the area. He wanted the children to learn cooperation and responsibility and perhaps have fun while doing so. He taught spelling and grammar as he was expected but he also worked to make school the children's own town meeting.⁶⁰

When Parker became superintendent in Quincy, Massachusetts, he expected a great deal from the teachers. He asked them to question their own teaching: What were they teaching? Why? Was it working? Did they do enough for their students? Did they do too much? Were they forcing their students to do things before they were ready? Were they repressing students' need to express themselves?

One of the problems Parker attacked was quantity versus quality education. He named as the key to success in Quincy "quality of intellection. Spontaneous activity through interest, through apperception, apperception through natural correlation."⁶¹

Parker left no specific rules or directions for the treatment of children. His desire was to have each individual, both student and teacher, think and feel for himself and to realize himself and his potentialities. Rather than quoting him, Parker would have his followers face each new challenge and act on it using judgments and intuition.

Dewey and Parker were in Chicago at the same time fighting for similar changes in education, and there is much agreement in their work. Dewey called the reform movement a revolution and likened it to Copernicus' discovery and the shift of the center of the universe from the earth to the sun. In School and Society and Democracy and Education, he explained this change. The shift from subject matter to the child involved four principles. The first was the new focus of the attention of the teacher from subject matter to the nature, needs, and growth of the child. The second was the new definition of education as a process of experiencing. Dewey concluded that if education is a process of experience, then the schools must provide opportunities for children to learn by doing, to learn by experience. In addition, the work of the school ought to be judged by the growth of the child which can be done by observing how well he meets new situations and the kinds of new interests he develops. Dewey defined thinking as the ability to draw on past experience, logic, and new information in facing new problems, which he called forked road situations. He wanted the schools to provide ways for students to learn how to cope with challenging problems. The third principle is the

doctrine of interest and effort. Dewey believed that the best learning occurs when the child identifies with that which is to be learned. The curriculum must be internal to the learner. It should not only be preparation for the future, but also for the enjoyment of the moment. Finally, the fourth principle is that the school is a social institution and as such part of the total social process. Dewey's concern was to help children prepare for their place in the industrial society. Beyond that, he called education the agency for social reconstruction.⁶²

Dewey believed that teachers and the curriculum are responsible for determining the interests of the child and using those natural interests to guide and promote the child's education. He attacked subject matter organized to suit the logic of adults. He said it should be allied to suit the logic of children's natural interests. He argued that since children have natural interests which motivate them, these should be utilized in the schools. Teachers should study each child's history, capacity, environment, tastes, and needs.

This is not to say that Dewey promoted pandering or self-indulging. Using the child's natural interests as motivation was to lead to a "systematic study of differentiated subject matter."⁶³ Dewey also realized that not all natural interests are necessarily desirable. So he said that teachers should urge a child in the direction of desirable interests. He believed that in order for a child to move in the direction of what is desirable, two conditions must hold: (a) the child must have

within his control some effective means of determining his direction and (b) the child must have some notion of what is desirable to guide his selection.⁶⁴ It, therefore, is the function of the school to "use the energies naturally arising from the interests of the child to help him grow in desirable directions."⁶⁵

All of the educators in this study felt strongly about the need to know well each individual student that they cite examples of problems inherent in a system that does not know its children. Parker described a partially blind and deaf boy who was made to feel dull and stupid so "he covered himself, like a pachyderm, with a skin of profound indifference."⁶⁶ Dewey found girls who were thought dull but were tested and discovered partially deaf.⁶⁷ Steiner tutored a backward boy who could not read, write, or concentrate. After two years of intense individualized effort, the boy was able to attend school. Steiner tutored him through secondary school, and, eventually, the boy went to medical school and became a doctor. Mearns encountered a boy so insecure that he purposely submitted a nonsense poem which the class took seriously and loved. Mearns and the other students had to do a lot of convincing before the child realized he had actually written a good poem. Zirbes related a tale of a young first grader who knew how to read but was not allowed to use a book in school because she had not mastered the sounds and blends on the wall chart.

Since Dewey advocated the motivation of children based on their individual interests, he was sometimes misunderstood in

terms of classroom discipline. He was not an advocate of the "let them express themselves and give them complete and unrestrained freedom of action and speech for only then they will grow" philosophy.⁶⁹

While he was an advocate of discipline, he was not in favor of obtaining it through forcing a need for teacher approval or a fear of failure. Dewey said it was not totally bad if a student realizes that if he does not break the rules he will be considered good and will be liked. The problem is when winning the teacher's approval becomes a child's primary aim. Dewey also criticized competition as a means of discipline. Since the children in a class all do the same work, they are automatically pitted against each other through comparison and rank. In these situations the weak students lose the sense of their own abilities and the strong students take pride not in their abilities but in the winning.⁷⁰ For Dewey the best motivator and provider of automatic discipline was through inquiry. Students should be stimulated to thoughtful and carefully directed inquiry.

Finally, Dewey wanted all students to develop all of their senses to the fullest. He suggested study begin with the use of the hands, with involvement to gain experience. For example, carefully planned courses of study can lead from cooking to the study of chemistry; from sewing to history and geography; or from carpentry to calculation. In Schools for Tomorrow, he wrote that it is "as important for academically oriented college-bound students to become acquainted with tools, materials, and

industrial realities as for students bound for labor in industry to be exposed to science, history, and literature."⁷¹

Steiner's proposals for the treatment of childhood are directed toward teachers and address the major issue: a developmental curriculum for the whole child. The curriculum is child centered (though Steiner does not use that phrase) and attempts to develop the motoric, artistic, and academic skills while fostering the uniqueness of each child.⁷²

Steiner wanted to consider the whole child: spirit, soul, and body. One of the best ways to engage the whole child is through art which is both knowledge and play. Steiner felt that facts are heightened and revealed by beauty. The major requirement of his teachers was that they be artists and that everything they do and present be in an artistic manner.⁷³ The teacher must "discover life and movement, color, magic, and warm human interest in every phase of reality he offers his pupils. He must be as sensitive as a musician to the tone of the class."⁷⁴

As was mentioned earlier, Steiner believed that in general children could be categorized by temperament. He suggested the possibility that teachers might use the temperaments of the children as a classroom strategy. For example, phlegmatic children could be seated near the front of the room close to teacher activity. Choleric children could be in the back of the room where they might be the least disruptive to others. Melancholics could be in the middle so that cross-room activities can draw them out. The sanguine could sit along the wall; since

they seem to be the most normal, they may act as buffers where one group touches another. The desired result of this sort of seating chart would be a mirror effect. Hopefully, sitting with children of the same temperament will allow them to see themselves and perhaps begin to develop other sides of their nature. Also, hot-tempered choleric can fight among themselves with people who fight back rather than hitting melancholics who will whine rather than returning the blow.

Steiner also suggested observing the temperaments for group discussions. It is safer to begin with a sanguine who will be eager, interested, and aware of what's going on. Choleric are better behaved when they are active so one should be called forward for demonstrating or solving a problem. By this time the melancholics will have been thinking about what is going on and may be cajoled gently into making a comment or answering a question. The phlegmatics sometimes need more than front row seats to bring them from dream land. Sometimes dropping a book awakens them. At other times the teacher should pretend dull indifference toward them and the surprise and uncertainty may catch their attention.

The worst reaction to a choleric outburst is any rage on the part of the teacher. The angry child feeds on anger. It is better to wait for a long, substantial, peaceful discussion. Mearns had the same sensitivity toward the individual child's feelings. He suggested a sure method for a confidential talk between the teacher and student begin with both looking out the

window and banging their feet on the floor.⁷⁵ Choleric also enjoy reading stories about strong, brave heroes while melancholics would rather read about people who have many problems but who face them with strength and character.

Steiner warned parents and teachers that they have temperament characteristics and that these can have a detrimental effect on children. For example, a choleric teacher can frighten, a phlegmatic teacher can bore, a melancholic teacher can suffocate, and the sanguine teacher can exhaust his students.⁷⁶ Steiner tempered these as merely possibilities and certainly not standard methods to be employed in any classroom. He believed it more important that teachers come to know their students well.

The teacher has the responsibility to teach children in such a way that they will like learning. "Waldorf children do not do what they like, but they are so taught that they enjoy what they do."⁷⁷ Steiner wrote in A Modern Art of Education, "It simply will not do to educate pupils in such a way that when they leave school to enter life, they can only criticize the senselessness of all they find there."⁷⁸ Instead, the aim of Waldorf education is to fit the student for life, to teach him how to know himself and to have the confidence and the inspiration to pursue the quest for knowledge, which is the only real business of man.⁷⁹

Adults have a great responsibility in their relationships with children. "Parents and teachers know very well that if they shy away from debate, they are sunk, they forfeit respect."⁸⁰

Many adolescents have an uncanny nose for hypocrisy: one rule for teenagers, one rule for adults. They have a great capacity to respect integrity. They have a deep interest in entering into the point of view of others and comparing it with their own. Consequently, they are disappointed when adults won't allow it. Steiner believed that a

. . . child who does not imitate thoroughly in his first seven years will not be able to develop an adequate capacity for freedom as an adult. The child who does not experience real authority in his second seven years will not develop an adequate capacity for equality as an adult. And the child who does not experience people in whom ideas live in ideals in adolescence will not develop an adequate capacity for fraternity as an adult.⁸¹

Finally, Steiner advocated a developmental curriculum. He was bothered by the apparent rush to age young people. He said a child is not a small man or woman and should not be treated as such: ". . . reasoned with, preached to, filled with intellectual knowledge by adults and expected to grow up in the image of his parents and teachers."⁸² Possibly this is because most adults don't know any other way. They have forgotten what childhood is. Harwood wrote in his The Way of a Child: An Introduction to the Work of Rudolf Steiner that the "reason why we are in such a hurry today to make children little intellectuals is perhaps that we hardly conceive of any other form of consciousness."⁸³

Instead, studies should develop with and support normal growth. As the child changes, the curriculum should change. For example, studies should begin with pictures and stories to coincide with the child's imaginative, initiative period. It is

incorrect and uncomfortable to introduce abstract concepts prematurely. This can turn the child cold and critical. He becomes an old man before his time.⁸⁴

Mearns' major concern in the area of childhood treatment was the free and creative spirit of expression. In many ways he gave more credit to children than to adults. In his book Creative Youth, Mearns wrote "age has constantly belittled youth."⁸⁵ He observed that children have an intense, savage desire to tell the truth. When they try, however, first adults laugh as if what the children are saying is strange and comic; then, they reason firmly. When that fails, they order the truth stopped.⁸⁶ For example, some mothers prefer their children socially proper rather than truthful. He also observed parents overwhelming their children with questions. "Where have you been, dearie? What did you do, dearie? What did you have to eat, dearie? Such questions make children rave. It is love like that that would make liars of us all."⁸⁷

Mearns wanted greater freedom of expression for children. He believed that was essential for learning and growth. He criticized adults for depriving children of valuable experiences in self-expression. This deprivation stems from criticism. Because most people fear judgment, especially artists and children, an unwarranted or painful criticism can cause regression or, at the least, slow growth. Of course, ultimately the child must be shown the difference between his good and bad products, but this comes after trust has been built between the writer and

his critic. The child can lose complete faith in his own ability from disapproval.⁸⁸

In Creative Power Mearns wrote of a student's paper: "It was the clipped, colloquial idiom of youth; hot, prejudiced, rebellious, ungrammatical, and impolite--it was beautifully fit to convey genuine feeling." He mourned the fact that many teachers would not have approved.⁸⁹ Mearns did not advocate poor writing. He encouraged more writing. In order to build a child's trust in his own abilities, he had to have time in a totally permissive atmosphere.⁹⁰

Mearns did not suggest total chaos or a relaxation of all rules for behavior or writing. But he believed that self-confidence must be developed before force and criticism are employed. Children used to give unquestioned obedience, Mearns wrote in Parents Magazine, but no more. Still, deep down, they are willing to do the decent thing and this must be cultivated. Children welcome leadership and recognize an understanding and non-tyrannous leader. When it is necessary, adults must impose their will. Weakness is actually harmful and insubordination is often a symptom of a cause far remote from observable behavior.⁹¹ In an article entitled "Educating the Whole Child," Mearns commented that he knew that children were "wasteful, liars, faithless, jealous, hateful, selfish, and silly," but those characteristics should be dealt with by cultivating resourcefulness, independence, and self-control.⁹²

Mearns believed parents and teachers need to know their children very well. They need to understand the complexities of how children grow. They also need to observe their children closely when they are off guard at picnics, games, visits to public places, and parties.

Like Parker, Dewey, and Steiner, Mearns believed that it is important to expose children to multiple activities. He suggested parents should want their children in the scouts as much as having them receive good grades in school.

Mearns believed that free expression professionally guided leads to physical and mental health growth and to receptivity to learning. Serious consideration of creative ability brings the child practical knowledge of the workings of his own mind.⁹³ But the creative spirit rarely develops because children are imitative and are not given enough encouragement. As soon as a child begins to speak, he attempts a language of literature. Of course, it is his literature and it is unique. But adults constantly striving for conventional literature either suppress or laugh at the child.⁹⁴

In Creative Youth, the story of Mearns' experiments in creativity at the Lincoln School, Teachers' College, Columbia University, Mearns offered three principles of creative writing. Poetic expression is a primal instinct. Once poetic insight is obtained it is never lost. No matter how bad the writing is, invite more. He ended his story with, "Poets have always been

free spirits; creative youth, therefore, never, never, never shall be slaves--even to time."⁹⁵

In class Mearns never demanded writing but he always got it from every student--eventually. He said it was not enough to discern a gift in a student but it was necessary to entice it out over and over. The most timid child has something he has written, and when the atmosphere is right he'll share it. Sometimes it is a fellow student who discovers a poet.

Mearns did have all of his students writing poetry, and much of it was published either in classroom publications or in Creative Youth. He wasn't necessarily encouraging his students to become poets or writers of other genres. He wanted them to think of creativity and the arts as covering all aspects of life.

Zirbes was concerned also with all aspects of life in all levels of childhood. Her treatment of childhood is divided into three areas: early childhood, the developmental levels of childhood, and the socialization of childhood. Zirbes was very concerned about early childhood--the first six years. She felt that while there was a tremendous amount of work to be done in the schools, the neglect of early childhood was as serious a problem because problems in early childhood cause social disorders later.

In "The Challenge of Children's Needs," she wrote that psycho-biological research has shown there is profound significance in the nature of early infancy. The proper guidance can reduce anxiety, foster self-respect, develop self-direction, improve social competence, and encourage fine inter-personal

relations.⁹⁶ She believed that those responsible for later guidance need more insight into the needs and problems of infancy and early development. For example, warm human nature and acceptance are prime essentials to basic security. An insecure child withdraws when challenged. A regressive child shrinks or cries when he meets a stranger. He lets others do what he should do for himself. This behavior is caused by early forcing, illness, fatigue, sense deprivation, excess babying, or inconsistent guidance. She suggested this regressive behavior could be overcome by providing the child with continuing of social experiences designed to expand the child's outlook and deepen his insights.⁹⁷

Zirbes felt that everyone needs to achieve an increasing measure of responsibility and self direction from dependent infancy to childhood on to adolescence and through adulthood. Learning must be meaningful, cumulative, flexible, and carry over from one stage to another and from one situation to another. Children should learn to be adaptable and flexible and not habit-bound.

Zirbes worked against dependent and habitual behavior. Knowledge by itself has no validity unless it is used. Students must learn to use what they learn and to act for themselves. In order for this to occur, teachers have to plan a gradual and developmental withdrawal from their students. Teachers should always play a guiding role but not an over-protective hovering one. The problem that develops in an over-structured, rule-heavy

situation is that children actually become dependent on the rules. They trust them too much and that is, according to Zirbes, dangerous to feel safe simply because they are following the rules.

In order to enhance independence and self-direction, teachers need to learn as much as possible about the potentialities of each child and then help him move toward his highest level of achievement. And that is certainly the advocacy of the other educators in this study: know each individual child as well as possible and develop the course of study so that each child can move toward his highest level of achievement. All of the educators in this study recommended small classes as a practical method of such developmental movement. Zirbes suggested the teacher attempt to determine activities that would be interesting and vital for all of the students, and then spend part of the time studying them.⁹⁸ Parker asked the teacher to become a scientist and while observing take notes for later reference and comparison. Mearns spent as much time as possible with students both in and out of school. When he was observing he never spoke. Soon the children overlooked his presence and behaved naturally. When Steiner tutored the young boy who was unable even to attend school he initially devoted much time to learn as much as possible about the child: body, mind, and spirit.

Zirbes believed that the road to social maturity was paved with experiences that challenge the social potentialities of the child. These experiences must meet the needs of each level. If a

child misses the opportunity for self-help development and is later challenged or new social relationships are initiated, he will resort to regressive behavior. Proper social development requires wise guidance within the essential social context provided by the home, the school, the neighborhood and community.⁹⁹

Finally, in Zirbes' treatment of childhood, she dealt with socialization. Zirbes published seven social findings she felt influenced curriculum: (a) prejudices are learned and can be unlearned; (b) rejection and lack of social acceptance are conducive to anti-social behavior; (c) the emphasis on competitive motivation favors the ablest student while adding to the failure and frustration of the less able; (d) dynamic urges find independent outlets when denied; (e) shy, withdrawn, insecure, inhibited, non-expressive children generally develop more serious cases of personality maladjustment; (f) the emotional immaturity of many adults complicates the lives of their dependents and associates; and (f) an unrelieved sense of failure, guilt, and insignificance undermines mental health.¹⁰⁰ Zirbes' connection was that a developmental curriculum that knows each child and is adjusted to meet his needs can prevent these findings. She saw why these developments occurred and she fought for change and forward adjustment to correct them. For example, she saw children coloring and filling in, and she was reminded of the "twig bending" and "mind molding" processes of stereotyping

personalities and shunting creative potentialities by training which exacts conformity.¹⁰¹

Education should not be training; it should teach individual choice, flexibility, and adjustment. Children are too frequently controlled by habit because it is easier. Instead, children need warm human nature, social acceptance, self-respect, and self-confidence.

Zirbes published a number of admonitions in the Journal of Childhood Education. She wrote that it was not enough to fix blame, pass moral judgment, administer punishment, and restore or maintain peace. Parents and teachers must go further and understand everything possible about each child. For example, Carl was late for school one day and was made to go before the attendance officer. This badly shamed Carl. Now his mother doesn't understand why he is ready for school so early and why he speaks about bad dreams.¹⁰²

Zirbes suggested that teachers become the understanding guides who involve students in experiences that will widen their outlook, enrich meanings, channel energies, and develop their potential. They should establish conditions that favor the personal well-being and social welfare of the students. Teachers must deal constructively with prejudice, egotism, maladjustment, and anti-social aggression.¹⁰³ They ought to challenge students to try new ideas rather than accept others. Students can be lead to consider alternatives, to move freely instead of being habit bound, engage in exploration, select creative actions, and

integrate their ideas into a form of communication. All of this should be done through intrinsic motivation.¹⁰⁴

Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes all felt that children should be happy and they should be loved. They should be treated humanely and with sympathy. They should be treated as what they are: children with the present and the future in mind. They should be encouraged to communicate who, what, and where they are so that the teacher can understand the foundation in order to build upon it.

Childhood Capabilities

Mearns was able to observe children not only through their daily activities but also through the private, intimate means of personal, reflective, creative writing. As was mentioned previously, Mearns never forced his students to write and yet, given time, they all always did. Over time, Mearns developed certain positive ideas and attitudes toward the capabilities of children. These can be divided into three categories: general reactions to the capabilities of children, the creative capabilities, and the expressive capabilities of children. In general, Mearns had faith in children and in their ability to care, to learn, and to create. He wrote that he had "faith in the native desire of childhood to learn."¹⁰⁵ By the same token he cautioned that children can lose faith in their own ability from disapproving social pressure.

Mearns believed that children are inherently tolerant and appreciative of themselves and others regardless of differences. Zirbes maintained that prejudice is learned and can be unlearned. But again Mearns cautioned that "unless nurtured and exercised, the good in us dies early."¹⁰⁶ Mearns took a close look at successful children and observed four key approaches to that success: (a) it was something they enjoyed, (b) it was something easily done, (c) in the beginning it was something everyone else thought was silly, or (d) no one recognized it was something worth being done.¹⁰⁷ Adults can learn, he suggested, from children. By four or five, children know how to think, learn, appreciate, construct; be decent, resourceful, and persistent. Adults are guilty of stepping in too soon because, according to adult standards, children look awkward, ugly, or rough.

On the creative capabilities of children, Mearns admitted that few children are geniuses but all children possess certain gifts that with the proper guidance and circumstances become their own special talents. Mearns believed that each child did have something special within him and that it was the responsibility of adults to allow it or help it come out and develop. He wrote, "In a conversation with a remedial student I felt the pulse of something living within him that will not be denied."¹⁰⁸ Mearns warned that this ability must be evoked and developed before it is too late. A child artist is actually any child who produces something out of his own life, experiences, and interests. Mearns found that the child artists also excelled in other areas of the

three Rs and also in leadership, initiative, and resourcefulness. In spite of this and especially in the initial stages, parents and teachers would do well to remember that most children are fearful of showing a uniqueness or special endowment.

Mearns believed that expression in all forms is an important instrument of personality growth. Among the various modes, writing is very personal and very powerful. In Creative Power Mearns wrote that "children's art at its best is always a confession. It admits one to the privacy of the child's world, to his personal thinking and feeling. A child's hunger for expression is always a revelation of deep and urgent needs."¹⁰⁹ It is for this reason that teachers must be gentle.

Students can learn the creative spirit. They may not ever be poets but they can possess the spirit of poetry. Children seem to have an instinct for the right word, for compact expression, for deft placing of words and phrases in emphatic positions. They appear to have a feeling for an irregular rhythmic pulsation of ancient speech.¹¹⁰

As has been previously reported, Mearns knew a young boy in a writing class at the Lincoln School who purposefully submitted a bad poem for peer review. The other students liked it very much. But they were all tricked to believe his nonsense poem was good. He had submitted a dumb poem and they had liked it, so he had a private laugh. Eventually the boy admitted what he had done. The students were angry at him but they did not change their review of his poem. And he would not or could not admit it could be

anything but nonsense because that is what he had intended and that is all the time and effort he had allowed. Mearns was invited to the class and explained that sometimes the best creative effort comes when the writer does not try too hard or in what is thought of as a creative way. Also, he explained that many people do not recognize their own good work. Mearns told this story in an article entitled "The Demons of Inhibition."¹¹¹

Mearns also knew that those demons can be sent away by developing the right climate for encouragement and caring. He never ceased to be surprised and pleased by the number of students who wrote privately or how they read their poetry aloud without fear of criticism or by how much they seemed to learn about themselves.

As Mearns worked toward the dismissal of demons, Zirbes' main focus was on values. In the situations of growth through choice, Zirbes suggested that a decision made between two alternatives based on weighing values leads to more complicated value judgments which should lead to more mature concerns for human rights and democratic obligations.¹¹²

In her Guidelines to Developmental Teaching published through the Teaching Aids Laboratory at The Ohio State University, Zirbes offered a list of values- oriented goals for children. Children should learn to (a) make considered choices, (b) arrive at intelligent decisions, (c) formulate testable inferences, (d) use values as criteria in planning, (e) use values as a basis of evaluation, (f) put assumptions to a test of action, (g) engage in

non-argumentative discussions with a view to coming to some common ground, (h) outgrow prejudices, (i) arrive at responsible commitments voluntarily, (j) pursue worthy aspirations, (k) find a sound basis for trust, (l) become increasingly responsive to intrinsic motives, (m) weigh relative values, (n) appraise their own efforts fairly, (o) be fair in judgments of others, (p) outgrow childish preconceptions, and (q) achieve social maturity.¹¹³

Self-realization is a developmental process. The child uses his experiences and vicarious experiences to grow and to mature. For example, children have an amazing ability to play games with almost anything--tin cans, stones, sticks, etc. They invent roles complete with gestures, actions, and dialogue for the imaginary situation. They learn about themselves through their imagination and creativity. But children who never have the opportunity for free, stimulating play lack the zest and balance necessary to desire to achieve, mature, and grow. Rather than attempting value-oriented choices intrinsically, they will require extrinsic motivation which could, in turn, perpetuate the problem. In her book Spurs to Creative Teaching, Zirbes noted, "One lives up to one's own self image."¹¹⁴

Steiner was more concerned with what the child should and should not do given his capabilities. In his early work, Goethe's Conception of the World, Steiner wrote, "In the sphere of knowledge there are two streams today: the decadent stream which everyone admires, and other stream which contains the most fertile

seeds for the future and which everyone avoids."¹¹⁵ Steiner wished to help lead people toward the fertile seeds of the future. One way was to study the development of the child most carefully so that his capabilities at each level are taken into account. For example, when a child begins school he is not capable of abstract thought. He cannot separate himself enough from the world in order to do so. In Steiner's schools children begin with pictures and stories told and read to them. The child becomes a part of the picture and the story, hence, his imaginative stage. The child can be taught to read and write but in doing so he would be asked to use forces that are not ready to be used.

Because the child is also in an imitative stage, he can, however, learn to speak--not read--a foreign language. Children can learn very well what they are capable of learning--when they are ready for that learning. Steiner predicted problems for children who were forced to learn before the proper time--both mental and physical problems.

Finally, Steiner observed that children work harder at discovery and play than any adult works on any project. He determined that child's play comes from spontaneous, inner impulses, while adult's work comes from the needs of society. The difference in motivation, then, may account for the different levels of dedication.

Parker and Dewey discussed the capability of childhood in three major areas: growth, values (like Zirbes), and the need for a recognition of the developmental stages (as Steiner did). They

didn't describe the creativity and expressiveness of children as intimately as Mearns though their concerns are clearly as strong and as caring as all those previously reported.

Parker raised the developmental issue with a question: "What must be done to work out this child with life and soul? When is the mind ready?" He warned that failure would surely result if things are done at the wrong time. Parker believed that asking for the best always pointed toward better and that no effort should be wasted. He said the saddest thing in education is lost opportunity.¹¹⁶

Parker also felt that developmentally the reaction of the child toward his environment is very important. The child grows when he discovers that he can control his environment with his own hands and mind, and that at the same time he is dependent upon nature. The child continues to grow as he continues to develop this interdependence.

In 1885, in an article entitled "Application of Child Study in the School," Parker wrote that energy diffused very slowly from the brain and the spinal cord through the torso and the limbs to the extremities. This could be observed by the broad, curved movements of a child while walking, running, or moving his arms and hands. He suggested that deformity in a child's body could be induced by either early forcing or the manner in which a pen or pencil is held in writing or drawing. He believed there was much to be learned about the relation between a child's mind and his body, especially in the areas of fatigue, interest, and attention.

This could cause the teacher to balance work with play or physical exercise.¹¹⁷

Dewey was especially concerned with the driving force of the interests of children. He believed that interests come from needs, needs which are organic, social, and intellectual. Interests and needs are natural, in the sense that every individual experiences them. In order to control them, the child has to learn gradually how to reorganize his environment, how to choose between desirable and undesirable interests, and how to respond to the pressure of his interests. But Dewey believed the child cannot be responsible for the interests themselves.¹¹⁸ This is a developmental responsibility. For example, as a child grows, he may have a new interest that requires skills beyond those he has already acquired. In order to satisfy the new interest, he needs to acquire a new skill--one which may have bored him before. Dewey felt that though the child's experience is partial and fragmentary, it is not different from the human race which through development culminated in creating fields of knowledge and disciplined tools of thought.¹¹⁹ In general, Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes would concur that children are probably capable of more than they are asked and require less rigidity, rote learning, and imposed structure. Yet as has been mentioned and will be repeated, their students were not necessarily let do as they wished; rather, they were led to enjoy what they did. These five educators were concerned about the

detrimental effects of some more traditional schools regarding the stages of growth and values in each child.

The Role of Education and Society in Childhood

Parker was a proponent of employing education as a means toward democracy, human growth, and the continual betterment of the community. Dewey believed that school is life, not a preparation for life. Further, school should concern itself with community welfare and democracy. Steiner wanted the schools and society to prepare children to live now and in the future. The parents of his first Waldorf students wanted a better life for their children--one less culturally deprived. Mearns' major focus was on the protection of childhood. Zirbes asked the schools and society to promote literacy and decision making.

Parker was a believer in both the importance of each citizen and in democracy not only as a system of government, but also as a way of life. He felt democracy had not been fully realized at that time, so he wanted the schools to be an environment where children and youth grow up naturally in the ways of democracy. In order to prepare for a democratic way of life, Dewey wanted children educated for leadership and obedience, with skills of administration and self direction, along with the capacity to assume responsibility and obligations in industrial, business, and practical life. In fact, Dewey warned that democracy would be a farce unless individuals are trained to think for themselves, to judge independently, to be critical, to be able to detect subtle propaganda and the motives that inspire it.¹²⁰

Both Parker and Dewey believed that one role of the school and society is the strengthening of morals. Morality led to concern of the community. Parker said that the way to educate human beings is to set them to work for others. He said morality is thinking and seeking what can be done for others and that ethics is putting it into place. The child is not in school for a certain quantity of knowledge but to learn how to live and how to put his life into his community.¹²¹

Dewey said the chief moral habit is interest in the community and that in order to be personally fulfilled, the individual must be a participating member of the community, not an isolated individual. In order to do that, he would agree that the schools must help prepare the individual. But Dewey felt, as did Steiner, that schools should be a preparation for the present and not solely for the future. Dewey said that school is life not a preparation for it. Steiner asked what children are living while they are being prepared for life.

The answer led Mearns to argue for the preservation of childhood. Steiner wanted education to prepare children to experience each level of development. Mearns warned specifically against both education and society rushing children into little adulthood. He wrote that without the love of childhood "the world would lose one of the great forces that keeps it from destruction by utter selfishness."¹²²

Zirbes agreed with Parker and Dewey that education is a vehicle through which democratic concerns can reach every child or

prospective citizen. Further, education must, at the least, make literacy accessible to every child, but go beyond that making every child hungry for more knowledge. Zirbes called for greater cooperation between adults and children, between teachers and students. The basic democratic principle is that people who are to be influenced by a decision should be consulted in making that decision. Therefore, schools and society should prepare children to be capable of taking part in that process.

Postscript

Childhood is a unique, developmental, imitative, imaginative, energetic, enthusiastic period of human development not to be confused with any of the stages of adulthood. The educators here studied dealt more with what children could do rather than what they should do. They concentrated on how children can learn, how children should be treated in order to maximize learning, and if so treated of what children are capable. They did give general warnings about possible deterrents to learning and capabilities given incorrect treatment of children.

A consensus seemed to appear that the best treatment which allowed the highest capabilities and offered the most substantial learning was an in-depth knowledge of the individual child followed by suitable arrangements and adjustments. This was never intended to mean (or to be interpreted as) total freedom, total permissiveness, total chaos, or lack of substantive learning. Waldorf children, for example, do not do what they like; they

learn to like what they do. Mearns and Zirbes always involved students in curriculum planning; Parker made his schools miniature town meetings, but they (the teachers) were always at the helm, offering responsibility to the children but maintaining the necessary control and direction.

Parker and Dewey were the champions of children, but their demands were never lowered. They always demanded and wanted the best for their students and for all students. Wanting the best meant that the children grew, developed, and learned as much as possible. The children also learned that they must continue to learn--that the whole point to living was learning, developing, growing.

All five of these educators, as teachers, administrators, and teacher educators, demanded as much as could be extracted from teachers. Since they worked hard and the teachers worked hard, they believed the children then accrued a debt, not necessarily to their teachers, but to society. Education's role was to better its students. Students who gained knowledge, understanding, and values could return something to society.

The transfer then might or should be an improvement in society. As Dewey said, democracy would be a farce if its members could not think independently, judge critically, and differentiate subtle propaganda techniques. Hitler closed Steiner's Waldorf Schools in Germany. He said that German children are not to be taught to think independently; they are to be taught to work for the state. But these educators did not want some children to think; they wanted all children to participate.

Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes revered children and childhood spiritually and pragmatically. They wanted children to learn the most they could in the easiest way and in the most comfortable surroundings.

Notes

- ¹Harold Rugg and Ann Schumaker, The Child-Centered School (New York: World Book Company, 1928), 204.
- ²Laura Zirbes, Guidelines to Developmental Teaching (Columbus: The Teaching Aids Laboratory of The Ohio State University, 1959), 41.
- ³Francis W. Parker, "The Child," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1897):480.
- ⁴Hughes Mearns, Creative Power (New York: Doubleday, Doran, and Company, Inc., 1930), 251.
- ⁵Mearns, Creative Power, 234.
- ⁶Current Biography (New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1940), 570.
- ⁷E.E. White, "Remarks on W.S. Jackman," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1902):405.
- ⁸Earl J. Ogletree, "The Waldorf Schools: An Artistic Approach to Education," Journal of Suggestive-Accelerative Learning and Teaching, 5:2:(Summer, 1980):2.
- ⁹Edwin E. Slosson, "John Dewey: Teacher of Teachers," The Independent 89 (March 29, 1917):542.
- ¹⁰K.C. Mayhew and A.C. Edwards, The Dewey School (New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1936), 40.
- ¹¹Earl J. Ogletree, Waldorf Schools: A Child-Centered System (Document, 1975, ED 178 188).
- ¹²Marjorie Spock, Teaching as a Lively Art (Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press, 1985, 1980), 24.
- ¹³Spock, 59.
- ¹⁴Mearns, Creative Power, 47.
- ¹⁵Hughes Mearns, "Promoting Self-Expression," World's Work, 58:(1929):62.
- ¹⁶Parker, "The Child," 481.
- ¹⁷Parker, "The Child," 482.

- ¹⁸James J. Jordan, "Interest, Choice, and Desirability," The School Review (Summer, 1959):174.
- ¹⁹Stewart C. Easton, Rudolf Steiner: Herald of a New Epoch (Spring Valley, NY: the Anthroposophic Press, 1980), 26.
- ²⁰Arthur G. Wirth, John Dewey as Educator (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), 105.
- ²¹Spock, 8-12.
- ²²Spock, 116-119.
- ²³Francis W. Parker, "Discussion of the 'Meaning of the Maxim We Learn by Doing,'" Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1887):381.
- ²⁴Ogletree, "Waldorf Schools."
- ²⁵Rugg, 149.
- ²⁶Laura Zirbes, Focus on Values in Elementary Education (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1960), 96.
- ²⁷Hughes Mearns, Creative Youth (New York: Doubleday, Doran, and Company, 1925), 88.
- ²⁸Flora J. Cooke, "Colonel Francis W. Parker and His Influence upon Education," Progressive Education 14(1937):582.
- ²⁹Mayhew, 20.
- ³⁰Wirth, 109.
- ³¹Lelia Patridge, The Quincy Method (New York: E.L. Kellogg, 1889), 146.
- ³²Laura Zirbes, "The Emotional Climate of Schools," Educational Methods 14(1935):173.
- ³³Zirbes, "Emotional Climate," 173.
- ³⁴Patridge, 146.
- ³⁵Mayhew, 20.
- ³⁶Hughes Mearns, "What Do You Think?" Scholastic Magazine (April 17, 1937):5.

³⁷Mearns, Creative Power, 47.

³⁸Spock, 17.

³⁹Lawrence W. Kimpton, "Dewey and Progressive Education," The School Review (Summer, 1959):126.

⁴⁰Wirth, 245.

⁴¹Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, A History of the University of Chicago (Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1916), 131.

⁴²Goodspeed, 131.

⁴³Wirth, 243.

⁴⁴Ernest C. Moore, "John Dewey's Contribution to Educational Theory," School and Society 31(January 11, 1930):42.

⁴⁵Francis W. Parker, "Art in Everything," The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1900):512.

⁴⁶Charles F. Adams, Jr., "The New Departure in the Common Schools of Quincy and Other Papers on Educational Topics" (Boston, 1879), reported in The Elementary School Journal 35(March 1935):501.

⁴⁷Spock, 86.

⁴⁸Spock, 34.

⁴⁹Laura Zirbes, "Why Guidance," Childhood Education 25(1949):200.

⁵⁰Laura Zirbes, "The Emotional Implications of School Practices and Tasks," The Educational Record 16(1935):177.

⁵¹Marion Foster Washburne et al., Francis Wayland Parker: His Life and Educational Reform Work (New York: E.L. Kellogg, 1900), 130.

⁵²Jesse H. Newlon, "Democracy and Education in Our Time," Progressive Education 14(1937):7.

⁵³Francis W. Parker, "Work of the Illinois Society for Child Study," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1896):845.

⁵⁴ Jack Campbell, The Children's Crusader (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1967), 41.

⁵⁵ "The Silver Anniversary of the Quincy Movement," The School Journal (March 24, 1900):6.

⁵⁶ Francis W. Parker, "The Child," The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1889):482.

⁵⁷ Francis W. Parker, "A Discussion of John Clarke's 'The Place of Art in General Education,'" The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1895):850.

⁵⁸ F.C. Fox, "A Personal Glimpse of Colonel Parker," Progressive Education IX(January 1932):381-382.

⁵⁹ Wakefield, 16.

⁶⁰ Wakefield, 13.

⁶¹ Campbell, 1.

⁶² Jesse H. Newlon, "John Dewey's Influence in the Schools," Teachers College Record 31(December 1929):224-227.

⁶³ Arthur G. Wirth, John Dewey as Educator (New York: John Wiley and Sons), 116.

⁶⁴ Jordan, 179.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Francis W. Parker, "Application of Child Study in the School," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1885):426.

⁶⁷ Wirth, 195.

⁶⁸ A.D. Shepherd, A Scientist of the Invisible (1954, Edinburgh; Floris Books, 1983), 30.

⁶⁹ Lawrence A. Kimpton, "Dewey and Progressive Education," The School Review (Summer, 1959):127.

⁷⁰ Kimpton, 127.

⁷¹ John and Evelyn Dewey, Schools of Tomorrow (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1915), 181.

- ⁷²Ogletree, 81.
- ⁷³Spock, 41.
- ⁷⁴Spock, 59.
- ⁷⁵Hughes Mearns, Creative power (New York: Doubleday, Doran, and Company, 1930), 25.
- ⁷⁶Spock, 116-124.
- ⁷⁷Ogletree, 14.
- ⁷⁸Spock, 131.
- ⁷⁹Howard, 343.
- ⁸⁰John Davy (Ed.), Work Arising (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1975), 353.
- ⁸¹Rudolf Steiner, A Modern Art of Education (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1972), 125.
- ⁸²Easton, 259.
- ⁸³A. Cecil Harwood, The Way of a Child: An Introduction to the Work of Rudolf Steiner for Children (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1967), 144.
- ⁸⁴Spock, 87.
- ⁸⁵Hughes Mearns, Creative Youth (New York: Doubleday, Doran, and Company, 1925), 117.
- ⁸⁶Hughes Mearns, "Creative Education," The Parents' Magazine (January 1931):11.
- ⁸⁷Hughes Mearns, "Love That Fails," The Parents' Magazine (November 1934):78.
- ⁸⁸Mearns, "Creative Education," 42.
- ⁸⁹Mearns, Creative Power, 20.
- ⁹⁰Hughes Mearns, "Trust in Their Own Ability," Childhood Education 28(1951):154.
- ⁹¹Hughes Mearns, "Education Isn't What It Used to Be," The Parents' Magazine (September 1936):42.

- ⁹²Hughes Mearns, "Educating the Whole Child," The North American Review 230(1930):701.
- ⁹³Hughes Mearns, "The Demon of Inhibition," Clearinghouse 4(1930):349.
- ⁹⁴Mearns, Creative Power, 71.
- ⁹⁵Ibid., 117.
- ⁹⁶Laura Zirbes, "The Challenge of Children's Needs," Childhood Education 25(1949):417.
- ⁹⁷Laura Zirbes, "Toward Social Maturity," Childhood Education 24(1947):108.
- ⁹⁸Herbert L. Coon, A Handbook for University School Parents (Columbus: University Press, The Ohio State University, 1954), 12.
- ⁹⁹Zirbes, "Toward Social Maturity," 107.
- ¹⁰⁰Laura Zirbes, "Gaps in Curriculum Research," Education Leadership 7(1949):189.
- ¹⁰¹Laura Zirbes, "Experimenting, Interacting, Growing," Childhood Education 44(1967):24.
- ¹⁰²Laura Zirbes, "Children Need Understanding," Childhood Education 25(1949):338.
- ¹⁰³Laura Zirbes, "Why Guidance," Childhood Education 25(1949):201.
- ¹⁰⁴Laura Zirbes, "Creative Teaching for Creative Thinking and Living," Education Leadership 14(1947):20.
- ¹⁰⁵Hughes Mearns, "Salvation by Information," The North American Review 229(1939):66.
- ¹⁰⁶Hughes Mearns, "Trust in Their Own Ability," Childhood Education 28(1951):156.
- ¹⁰⁷Mearns, Creative Power, 180.
- ¹⁰⁸Mearns, Creative Power, 121.
- ¹⁰⁹Mearns, Creative Power, 88, 127.
- ¹¹⁰Mearns, "Creative Education," 43.

- 111 Mearns, "Demon of Inhibition," 347-348.
- 112 Zirbes, "Why Guidance," 198.
- 113 Laura Zirbes, Guidelines to Developmental Teaching (Columbus: The Teaching Aids Laboratory, The Ohio State University, 1959), 42.
- 114 Laura Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching (New York: G.P. Putnam & Sons, 1959), 92.
- 115 Easton, 48.
- 116 Flora J. Cooke, "The Social Philosophy of Francis W. Parker," Progressive Education 14(1937):381.
- 117 Francis W. Parker, "Application of Child Study in the School," The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1985):425.
- 118 Jordan, 117.
- 119 Wirth, 60.
- 120 Francis W. Parker, "Discussion of the Relationship of Froebel and Herbart," The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1985):549.
- 121 John Dewey, "Some Aspects of Modern Education," School and Society 34(October 31, 1931):584.
- 122 Mearns, "Love That Fails," 17.

CHAPTER III

LANGUAGE/LITERACY

Introduction

In 1949, Zirbes wrote about one of the most influential curriculum issues of that time: recurrent failures in beginning reading.¹ Seventy-five years earlier, Charles Adams discovered that while the students of Quincy could read the words of the examination pages for which they had prepared, they seemed to have no real understanding of what they had read. The acquisition of language was a keen concern of the educators in this study. It is of interest, therefore, to compare the attitudes and recommendations over the nearly 100 year span of their educational eras of the five educators in this study.

Zirbes suggested that educators should re-examine the current reading programs for nine reasons: (a) information learned through recent studies of children's growth and development (which Parker, Dewey, and Steiner did not have); (b) new insight in the reading process; (c) the large juvenile reading public; (d) the ease and inexpense of purchasing children's books; (e) the increase in the number of libraries; (f) the new methods now known

about the teaching of reading; (g) the belief that all classes should, in a sense, teach reading; (h) adult education that had led parents to accepting a more modern approach; and (i) education in general that had led to a more intelligent and informed citizenry.²

Zirbes proposed a program of purposeful reading. Children would have rich and varied experiences through their reading. They would develop strong motives toward permanent interests in reading. Every reading experience they had should be significant and contribute to a wholeness of learning. Zirbes was opposed to formal instruction based on extrinsic motivation which inevitably lead to stress on deferred values and reduced reading satisfactions.³

Like Zirbes in the 1930s and 1940s, in 1895 Francis Parker spoke out against directing attention to mere forms of expression and making children practice these forms without the faintest idea of their meaning. He opposed the exercise of the motor centers of the brain without relation to the thought centers--a process he said Dr. John Dewey called "mind disintegration." Parker proposed a method of skill building that would bring about the unity of the actions of the mind and body. This was to be done by having all exercises connected to the image or concept to be expressed or revealed. The exercises or drills were to be a part of and lead directly to the desired outcome. The child's motivation was to be built on intrinsic and educative thought. For example, pupils could be led to study nature, geography, or history through

artistic expression followed and maintained by a unity of all expressions.⁵

For Dewey the study of language was not simply logical expression of thought. It was a social instrument, a device for communication, a tool used by one person in order to share his feelings and thoughts with others. Dewey opposed the study of language as a means of merely transferring information or a means for showing off what had been learned. In his "Pedagogic Creed," he said, "If education is life and all of life has scientific, artistic, cultural, and language-communication aspects, then progress will not come in a succession of studies, but in the development of new attitudes toward and in experience."⁶

Language must be purposeful for Zirbes, whole for Parker, social for Dewey. For Mearns, language spoke through the heart. He made language beautiful and intelligible through the thrilling use of the spoken word. He believed there were at least two aspects necessary in all learning: creativity and incorporation. So he read to his students and talked about implications and hidden meanings and shadings of inflections and emphases that were made to color facts, events, and descriptions. He said he began with what he had: "ignorant, underdeveloped, immature adolescents uninterested in fine writing." Gradually, he developed their interest. They began to read to each other. Slowly, the conviction dawned on them that they, too, could be critical. They, too, could form their own judgments of writing. In 1928 Rugg and Shumaker reported in The Child Centered School that

before the end of eighth grade, true, independent thinking about literary worth was taking place.⁷

Parker and Steiner wrote about a triune nature of man: mind, body, and spirit. Mearns wrote also in favor of "self expression through painting, construction, and the language arts as effective instruments in developing superior personalities." For example, when a child composed in free fashion in language or color, the mind, body, and spirit coordinated as an energizing unit. This made that poem or painting the chief desirable thing. Therefore, many school tasks took on increased or special worth to the composer. Tasks such as reading, listening, research, measuring, attending to numbers, script writing, examining color combinations, selecting words, constructing in wood, metal, and cardboard, and telling stories made sense as important and necessary steps to growth. Mearns witnessed "incredible child growth through writing such as Mabel Mountsier's Singing Youth, Clair T. Eyve's Willingly to School, and Dorothy Baruch's Blimps and Such."⁸

Mearns was not such an idealist that he did not realize the forces that worked against inspiration of the creative spirit. In his book Creative Youth, he wrote

. . . in spite of our striving, lack of progress envelops us like a pestilence. If only our children would get themselves born into proper homes and stay there in between school sessions, we might be able to offer a feeble guarantee to show results. And if only they would practice what we preach.⁹

Despite his slightly cynical remarks, Mearns continued to pursue the literacy goal as did each of the five educators in this study. Chapter III is divided into four sections: Theory of Language and Literacy; Learning of Language and Literacy: Natural and Developmental; Methodology of Language and Literacy and Don'ts in Dealing with Language and Literacy. The five educators under study addressed these categories with differing degrees of emphasis. Parker was concerned about all but seemed to emphasize learning, methodology, and don'ts. Overall, Dewey did not concentrate on language and literacy to the degree that the others did. His emphasis, though, was in learning along with a discussion of literature in relation to the mechanics of language and literacy. Steiner's main focus was also on learning. Mearns' interest was on the natural, experiential, interest-directed aspect of learning language and literacy with an emphasis, of course, on writing. Finally, while Zirbes concentrated on learning, she also divided her focus between the dos and don'ts of methodology.

Theory of Language and Literacy

According to Parker, language and literacy developed through association, observation, and repetition. Ideas initially become related through the spoken word as it was connected to objects and actions. If an object was presented or an action performed as a word or words are spoken, the ideas produced were associated in one act in the mind. Parker called this the "mysterious mental

law of association."¹⁰ Under this law, words and later idioms and sentences represented ideas. After a certain number of repetitions, the word automatically recalled the idea. The repetitions were enhanced by some kind of stimulus or mental excitement that came either from within or without of the mind. Parker found the greater the stimulus, an elephant for example, the more effective the act of learning an idea and developing the ability for recollection. The "mysterious mental law" might, however, have governed behavior more than learning.

In the late 1800s in the Quincy Schools, Parker lectured and discussed his theory that all activity, including thinking, was doing. Observation of an object in a state of consciousness was doing. Each repetition of an observation was doing. But repetition was not enough. The state of consciousness had to be aroused. This could be done with symbols and oral language. So by the age of five years, children had acquired ideas in their relations, had associated spoken words with these ideas, and had associated idioms with thoughts or related ideas.¹¹

Next, it was time to transfer the learning of the spoken word to the learning of the written word ". . . so that the child may get thought through the eye as he has done through the ear."¹² According to Parker, the process of learning to read was to consist of learning to use the written word precisely as he used the spoken word. As he has learned the vocabulary of spoken language, he must learn the vocabulary of written language. The mental stimulation necessary to arouse the state of consciousness

could come from the symbols found in books. To Parker, reading was thinking by means of words. Thinking was the mind's mode of action and action properly directed and motivated was good because it led to growth. And it was the teacher's job to bring out all-sided growth.

Parker differentiated between reading and study. While reading was thinking, study demanded an intensity of thought which was clearer and more complete. It was this intenseness that gave strength and led to growth.

In her major work Spurs to Creative Teaching, Zirbes discussed how reading was related to child development. She explained that if a child pursued an interest in animals, for example, by reading, he would undoubtedly see that he could learn about other things through reading. Consequently, the child would develop new interests. On the other hand, the child would not develop new interests without the initial interest.

Zirbes said that learning was the natural, normal integration of (a) a familiar experience; (b) familiar, spontaneous speech patterns; (c) new ways of using language to satisfy social interaction to strengthen associations; (d) dramatic play; and (e) free, original creative expressions.¹³ The creative teacher's responsibility was to relate aspects of communication as functional adjustments that challenged on-going experiences and strengthened associations that tied in with earlier, more familiar language use so that there were sources of insight and inference that encourage effort.¹⁴ In other words, as the child was

learning, the teacher reinforced both the learning and the child by presenting information and experiences that were based on or were similar to that which the child already knew or had experienced. Learning then became a stimulation of new information along with the satisfaction of familiar information.

Zirbes believed that the combination of the interaction of language in doing, talking, cueing, playing out, picturing, and catching on resulted in, related to, and was conducive to vital creative language. She felt that learning language was based on development and experience. Children should share first hand experiences with others. Language was learned through sharing or communicating experiences. She believed that language art was the creative use of language for conveying, gathering, and expressing meanings derived in first hand shared experiences. While both Parker and Zirbes seemed to approach language acquisition with association, at least Zirbes' was more inclined to base the approach on past and on-going experiences of the children. Parker seemed to ignore the social aspect and seemed to come close to drilling the children in their object association.

As students continue to experience and share the meanings of their experience, the level of their language developed. It was important, Zirbes said, that at the beginning, before the child could write, that the child's own language be used when he dictated a story of an experience. But gradually the child's language skills would improve not as much through mechanics as through creativity and intrinsic motivation. As he became more

interested in his communication of his experiences with others and compared his with others, a finer coordination of his language abilities would develop.

According to Zirbes, initial learning was through the senses followed by association, all of which should have been facilitated by insightful guidance. The creative teacher should have discovered, reinforced, and strengthened each child's on-going associations. The key here was association--the connection between one thing and another, between one idea and another, between one experience and another. Isolating anything, take words for example, from context made it harder to identify.

Zirbes said a child learned to read in a similar fashion to the way he learned to use a fork. It was not necessary to have many skills. She began with the manual skills and the neural development stage he had reached. What was necessary was that the child had an awareness of forks and what they were for by his association with people who used them. Similarly, the child knew about reading and what books were for by associating with people who read. Next, the child must have wanted to identify with people who use forks, he must have wanted food, and the fork must have been at hand.

The same, of course, held true for reading. The child must have identified with people who read and have seen himself as one of them. He must have been hungry for the information contained in books and the books must have been at hand. Then the taste of the satisfaction of getting meaning from print should have

encouraged him to try to obtain more. At this beginning stage, the immediate concern should not have been with the acquisition of skills, but the acquisition of meaning from print without having to wait for someone to read it. The child appreciated encouraging guidance and cueing but not domineering assumption of the task of retrieving meaning from print. In other words, the child liked help but needed and wanted to do this on his own. The whole motivation upon which the struggle was built was in acquiring the ability to read independently.

This independent acquisition was to be developed in experience stages not by unrelated skills drills. Zirbes believed that language would develop creatively in the course of vital experience rather than mechanical, piecemeal learning which was neither creative nor developmental. She felt that learning began with a curiosity and if that curiosity was directed, channeled, and inspired, learning continued. She wrote, "We do not follow children's interests, we build their interests. We develop interests in reading, and reading develops new interests. Learning and guidance are creatively developmental."¹⁵ Neither Parker nor Zirbes, actually none of the five, offered any clear and concrete explanation of a theory of language acquisition, at least not in their published work. Parker and Zirbes wrote a great deal about interest and association in the realm of literacy but seemed to neglect what was behind or upon what interest and association were based. Something seemed to be missing from their

discussions; and the question is, was it there at all? or were they holding back?

The Learning of Language and Literacy

This section on The Learning of Language and Literacy will be sub-divided into two areas: (a) Natural, Experiential, Interest; and (b) Developmental. As was noted in the introduction of Chapter III, all of the educators under study concentrated on the topic of "Learning." Parker and Mearns seemed most intent on the "Natural, Experiential, Interest" aspects. Dewey appeared evenly divided among the two. Steiner and Zirbes were far more outspoken on Developmental aspects.

Natural, Experiential, Interest

Parker believed that children should learn to read as they learned to talk, under the immediate spur of trying to find out something they wanted to know, as in silent reading, or in trying to explain something they wanted to tell and someone wanted to hear, as in oral reading. Parker felt that reading should be the means of growth and development rather than the dead process of word getting. He said every avenue to the child's soul should be kept open and in use and that all modes of expression had differing and vital relations to his growth and all around development.¹⁶

In 1879 Charles Adams explained Parker's Quincy methods in an article entitled, "The New Departure in the Common Schools of

Quincy and Other Papers on Educational Topics." He wrote that the simple, comprehensible processes of nature were to be observed in teaching and learning. For example, children learned to read, write, and cipher as they learned to swim, skate, and play ball. Reading and writing were the basis for the new system in Quincy. These were acquired only through practice. The practice was not isolated drill; it was natural and connected. Under the old system, for example, everything was taught separately: reading, writing, spelling, grammar, arithmetic, geography, and history.¹⁷

Under the new system, reading and writing were learned through the natural demands of the study of geography, science, and history. The need for written expression was stressed in almost every lesson. In fact, since Parker believed that various types of expression developed the whole being, he felt that art should be considered an important element of learning. He once suggested that, "If all modes of expression were continually used to intensify thought, every child would acquire, in varying degrees, satisfaction, proficiency in modeling, drawing, and painting."¹⁸

At Quincy Parker instituted the word method which meant that in the teaching of reading a whole word or idea was stressed rather than meaningless parts. This, he believed, was a more natural way to teach reading based on the child's experience and interest. Parker abolished both the ABCs and technical grammar in the early grades. Children would learn whole words rather than parts as they learned to speak, and they could learn the grammar later after they had developed a proficiency in speaking and

writing. Students would learn the grammar when they developed the need and interest for such technicalities. The rules of grammar were replaced by exercises and drill in constructing sentences, letter writing, and short compositions. All of the writing of the children was designed to describe activities that were real and meaningful to their own experience. Words of their own vocabulary were stressed. The spelling of their own words and then new words was taught through the exercise of writing. Correct spelling was developed by the acquisition of mental pictures of the whole word and what it represented.¹⁹

Parker instituted these methods which became known as the Quincy Methods, and he explained them to teachers at a summer institute on Martha's Vineyard. As previously reported, the first summer his audience was quite sparse, but a year later teachers and administrators from all over the United States and Nova Scotia came to hear about the Quincy Methods. Parker began with an explanation of how a child learned to talk. First, the child acquired ideas from the external world by means of his senses. Next, he developed thoughts--that is, he came to realize these ideas in relation to him, his fellow students, and the world around him. Third, he associated the spoken word with these ideas. Next, he associated the idioms and forms of sentences in order to express his thoughts. Finally, he learned to utter these words and idioms in order to express his thoughts. Then, according to Parker, the child learned to read by associating ideas with spoken words he had practiced talking for five to six

years with written words. Parker noted sadly how schools ignore the natural voice of the child and worked on correcting it in such a worthless and painful manner. He said the emphasis, inflection, and melody of most children's voices could rarely be improved. Unfortunately, the beauty and strength of what the child had already gained was entirely ignored, and a new and very painful process of oral expression was initiated.²⁰ Parker was vehemently opposed to recitation and reading in place. He believed they were both purposeless in an educative sense and harmful in a psychological and sociological way. "What is the use of oral reading? The thought of the reading may or may not be in the child's mind, his half-groaning utterances never reveal the fact."²¹

Parker believed that the spoken word was acquired by repeated acts of association but that the number of the repetitions depended on the stimulus of the act. Therefore, the fundamental rule for teaching a child to read was the most direct route of the acts of associations of words with their appropriate ideas. The best way was the actual association just as he learned to speak and hear. There was no stimulus, at least not a positive stimulus, in the printed word to the child. Actually, it repelled the child rather than attracted him. He desired to read independently, but that desire became dimmed when overwhelmed by too many unknown printed words. Hence, Parker's opposition to even beginning textbooks until true readiness was established.

Instead, Parker presented a favorite object to the child and the printed word. The child's consciousness was filled with interest for the object but left just enough room for the new form--the printed word. "On the other hand," Parker said, "try to fill the child's mind with the word itself and you'll fill his soul with disgust."²² Since the spoken word was learned as a whole and it was more complex and more difficult to learn the written word, it, too, was learned as a whole. Between two and five objects were worked with until the child actively associated the new printed words and the ideas without the actual object. This was based on both the interest and the experience of the child. The child held the object and wrote its name. He sketched it on the board. He saw pictures of the object. He had conversations with the teacher and told stories about the object and his experience with it.

The major hurdle in learning to read, according to Parker, was the first few words. A major hindrance in jumping the hurdle was any attempt to analyze or synthesize those first few words. The major help was the stimulus or excitement of the act of association. "The vividness of the idea and the mental picture in the consciousness of the child, along with the appropriate word, determines the result."²³

Parker placed much of the responsibility for the stimulation of the acts of association on the teacher. It seemed to him that the "great duty of the teachers of this age is first to know all the great things that have been discovered by teachers and the

thinkers of the past and reconcile them into a science of teaching."²⁴ His science of teaching was not the rote memorization but a natural methodology based on the experience and interest of the child. For example, in teaching a child to read, the first words to be used should be selected from those oral words the child already knew. Parker believed the idea must always be acquired before the word could be. He maintained that

. . . education may be said to consist, first, of enlarging the range of ideas and, second, relating these ideas in various ways. The value of words depends wholly on the value of the idea they recall. Selecting vocabulary should be slowly and thoroughly taught so that repetitions of a word entirely suffice to put the word within automatic use of the child.²⁵

Parker believed that it was far more important to teach 20 words well than 200 imperfectly. The first thing was to begin with the favorite words of the child. The next step was to arrange the words in phonic order with short (vowel) sounds first. This intensified the law of analogy upon which the phonic method was founded. However, the phonic order should not be followed at the expense of the interest of the child. The first words should be the names of common objects such as fan, cap, hat, mat, rat, but, bag, rag, flag, hen, egg, nest, bell, fish, dish, pig, rabbit, ship, dog, doll, top, fox, box, cup, tub, mug, jug, nut. Also the words introduced should be words that will be found in the first reader or book the child will read. Parker felt, however, that no first reader extant furnished enough repetition for a thorough learning of words.

Another method Parker advocated was the small group approach. After the vocabulary was carefully selected and the teacher chose 15-20 objects, the pupils were divided in groups of five to six according to mental strength. Parker said to begin with the brightest group, but not to tell them they were. Here Parker reminded the teachers that it was important for the pupils to feel at home in the classroom and to trust the teacher. He realized that children learned easier, faster, and better in such an atmosphere. To continue, the teacher held up an object and wrote the word on the board. Then he said, "Bring me a _____," while pointing to the board. Next, he showed a new object and wrote its name on the board. The teacher followed this plan for 10-15 words. While Parker advocated child interest and denounced mandated rote drill, some of his methods seem remarkably automated. Perhaps this could be attributed to his military training or the way in which he had been taught or an indication of the dominance of the times in which he taught despite his innovative practices.

Next, following Parker's belief in acts of repetitious association, he had the teacher hold up an object and the pupil pointed to the word on the board. Then the teacher pointed to the word on the board and the pupils picked up the object. Finally, the pupils pointed and read the word without the object. He felt the word-object recognition should be repeated until the children knew them well, but he also realized that the children's interest

and, therefore, attention could be held only so long at each task, and he cautioned teachers to be sensitive to this problem. So Parker, on the one hand, was sensitive to children's attention and interest spans, but, on the other, seemed to be continuing the drill work under a new name.

Dewey was interested in language and literacy from the social point as a communication device for the exchange and discussion of information rather than a mere transmitter of acquired facts. He also opposed the traditional rote memorization methods which brought results such as Adams discovered in Quincy. He said that the "universal diffusion of cheap reading material and the democratization of literacy meant that there could be no more exclusive attention to mere book knowledge. Children must acquire the capacity for self direction, leadership, and independent judgment."²⁶ Dewey believed that oral communication was the first goal. The children talked about themselves, their projects, and their activities. Rather than formal training and drill, they were coached informally in diction, enunciation, and projection. Dewey felt that inhibitions would be eradicated by frequent opportunity. The children were given the opportunity and encouraged to discuss their feelings and their experiences with the other children and their teachers all through the school day.

Dewey did not promote the formal study of reading and writing as early in the child's schooling as did Parker. He suggested, rather, the formal study begin when the child had to have these skills to get on with his learning, possibly at age eight or nine.

He believed that the child had his own interests and questions. If the school provided for sensory-motor pursuits and a range of exploratory activities, the child would have no difficulty taking an interest in reading, writing, and numbers. For example, at the laboratory school at the University of Chicago, the Deweys provided many opportunities for group activities and projects that promoted the children's interest in learning. For example, in the classroom, the children engaged in creative play and explored the various mediums of expression, they raised questions, they engaged in simple dramatic reenactments, they communicated their ideas in stories and discussions, and they extended their experiences through planned excursions. The learning would gradually necessitate reading, writing, or mathematical skills.²⁷

Mearn's feelings about the learning of language and literacy were strongest in the area of the Natural, the Experiential, and the Interest of the child. He believed children had their own natural, rhythmic, and poetic speech pattern which should, if properly developed, transfer to their writing. Further, he felt that children formed the substance of what they wanted to say through their existence and their experiences. Mearns said the idea came first, then the form.

In Creative Power, Mearns wrote that

. . . we must be the thing we read before we can appreciate it or have others appreciate our reading of it No man can write until he knows what he is writing about and has lived it until it becomes a part of him.²⁸

He believed that children had and developed a native language which had more quality than many adults realized. He saw a

natural poetic quality that surfaced and was often quickly stifled by well-meaning adults who tried to make well-meaning little adults. Actually, Mearns saw self-expression as a means of growth. Every one has something to say, he thought, and they should not only be allowed but encouraged to express themselves naturally. Though, as he wrote in Creative Youth, "poetry, an outward expression of instinctive insight, must be summoned from the vast deep of our mysterious selves; therefore, it cannot even by summoned, it can only be permitted."²⁹

Still, Mearns called the natural writing of children an "important phase of the emergence of the creative life." He said such writing has "rhythmic cadence, a sense for the right word, and an uncanny right placing for just the intended emphasis." He went on to describe the "signs of the authentic language of youth: the freshness of phrase and idea; the nimble mastery of words and rhyme; and the music of poetic speech."³⁰

Fifty years after Charles Quincy Adams published his explanation and discussion of Parker's Quincy Methods, Zirbes published her belief in purposeful reading. There were many similarities which was interesting, considering the time in between the publications. Zirbes had been trained in a normal school and had experience teaching in two schools prior to her studies at Teachers' College, Columbia, where she received her doctorate in education. Both educators warned about the negative results of incorrect early reading instruction. Parker commented on the length of time needed to undue the wrong. Zirbes wrote the

"adult non-reader was an educational product and a social problem."³¹ They both believed that this result was unnecessary and detrimental. Zirbes suggested that if it were necessary to choose between the consideration of abilities and purposes, the choice should be for purposes. She wrote that

. . . abilities are bound to grow when purposeful reading is practiced, whereas a disintegration of desirable attitudes is a common accompaniment to an over-emphasis on abilities especially when it is not related to intrinsic motivation. A list of reading objectives is not a list of reader's purposes.³²

She suggested, in fact, that remedial readers were often the result of teaching which failed to consider the significance of the pupils' attitudes. It was the primary emphasis on skills at the beginning that caused problems with both the effort and the attitude of the learner.

Instead, Zirbes suggested in the same article published in 1929, that students responded to reading stimuli that were like those that occurred naturally in life. She believed that a series of four to five such activities were likely to exhibit far more balance and variety than an artificial series of formal training lessons which covered the same period of time.

In 1940 Zirbes published "What Is a Modern Reading Program?" in which she listed seven steps and stages. The first was that reading was an integral phase or aspect of total language development; therefore, it was necessary to begin at the child's level, not a set level. She suggested that the teacher use the oral language and experience of the child to tell his story which

was then written down, probably by the teacher. Zirbes believed that the child's intelligence apprehended and identified the oral account with the actual experience and with the written account. The child needed to see the process as a whole not as separate letters or phonograms. His recognition of sight words was a phase of his development. He realized that his experience and his communication converted to recorded language and back to oral language. The motivation developed from within because it was his story.

Second, reading was always a matter of meaning, not word drill and word recognition without contextual meaning. According to Zirbes, drill without context delayed the process of learning to read and subordinated contextual thinking and meaning in favor of mechanics. She elaborated:

. . . contextual recurrence aids in the functional acquisition of a working nucleus of sight vocabulary. Through contextual use, derivations, words with similar endings, synonyms, and antonyms may be used to set off a process of accurate visual discrimination and provide a variation which expends learning rather than deadens it as repetition does.³³

The third factor in the modern reading process was the reader's purpose and immediate desire to discover. Zirbes wanted the teacher to take the responsibility for providing materials and guidance which would energize and engage the reader while at the same time providing materials that were appropriate to the differing levels of reading ability. Her fourth point reinforced the third. Zirbes believed that children learned to read by

reading and that good and bad habits were established during the process. Her recommendation was that the teacher provide good, easy materials, not readers pre-determined for grade levels. The latter caused the poor readers nothing but frustration, and coordinating instruction only made it worse. Zirbes followed that success breeds improved thinking, so she encouraged teachers to provide opportunities for it as often as possible. One suggestion for avoiding frustration and failure was to totally avoid the oral reading situation whereby each child, in turn around the room, read aloud. All of the educators in this study were against it.

Fifth, Zirbes observed that reading abilities were related to the use, the purpose of reading. Reading and purpose called for specific adaptations that must eventually be sensed by the reader. She noted that, of course, some reading was more difficult than another and the reader must learn to determine how to deal with the level of difficulty. She gave examples of two extremes, The Saturday Evening Post and John Dewey, and she quipped that some people deal with the second level of difficulty by not reading Dewey. The sixth point in the program was that breadth and variety in reading led to the enrichment of and an abiding attitude toward reading. Zirbes maintained that modern reading programs had to utilize the availability of good reading material to supplement the readers. Book collections and libraries were becoming more available and acceptable. Here, though, she called for guidance regarding book selection in the direction of developing "broader tasks and maturing interests." She said that

provision for individual interests and needs was extremely important to offset mass instruction and common reading requirements. The seventh and final point was the contribution of a modern reading program to the "development of personalities and the further free and discriminating use of reading in life. The stages of individual reading development of the students served as indicators of appropriate materials and guidance needed for the child's further development as a reader."³⁴

The five educators in this study agreed that reading ability was a complex composite of many abilities. Parker and Zirbes concurred that reading could be learned in a natural manner such as swimming, skating, walking or using a fork. They also believed that learning to read should be based on the experience and interest of the child. Parker developed his word association method on childhood experiences and interests, but it somehow also had to fit into the first reader the children were to use. Also, his word association methodology seemed somewhat akin to a drill. The Deweys based their early language learning on group experience within and without the classroom. Steiner remained somewhat silent on this particular aspect. Mearns discussed how interest and experience should be allowed to flow into the writing of children. Finally, Zirbes suggested a seven point modern reading program based on purpose and accessibility of reading material distributed under the watchful guidance of the teacher.

Developmental

Parker believed in developmental steps as a part of the learning process. Further, he felt a lack of knowledge and understanding of the capabilities of each level was actually detrimental to the learning process. Patridge, in her 1889 report of Parker's Quincy Methods, quoted him as saying,

When teachers fully comprehended that education is the generation of power, they will know better how to adapt the steps of progress to the mind's ability. Haste makes terrible waste when it consists in taxing a child's strength in undue degree.³⁵

It was the haste and waste that Parker was trying to change. His new methods recognized the need for individuality rather than uniformity. He found that slow children accelerated with attention to their individual needs at their current levels rather than the uniform approach which caused them to flounder rather than go forward. He discovered that timid children were stimulated by kindness and a homelike atmosphere in the classroom. Of Parker's innovations, Goodspeed wrote in 1916, ". . . children with defective minds were treated as physicians treated chronic diseases. Their weak powers were constantly strengthened by special activities."³⁶

Parker, apparently was not completely opposed to a phonics approach or aspect in a reading program. In fact, he advocated phonics after many whole words were known. He said that the separate parts of a written word could be associated with separate articulate sounds, so that difficulties in acts of association

would become less and less. This was so that new words could be pronounced and known at sight. Parker cautioned against over use of phonics to the point where children could skillfully pronounce a word without knowing the word or its meaning. He believed that a word was only known when it recalled its appropriate idea. As the child pronounced the word, he must have the idea behind the word in order to make meaning; otherwise, there was no understanding.

Parker established a systematic, developmental approach to a phonics methodology. First, the teacher trained the child to recognize words when they were pronounced slowly. Next, the teacher trained the child to pronounce the words himself slowly by imitating the teachers' voice. After a few words were taught, the teacher gave each articulate sound as she made the character that represented it. Finally, the child began to pronounce slowly without suggestions from the teacher the words she wrote on the board. Exercises of this type were incorporated into the total reading program.

Parker also advocated a sentence approach to beginning reading development. He began with a simple sentence like, "This is a fan." The procedure was to change gradually all of the words in the sentence. For example, he changed this to that and placed the fan or whatever object was being used at a little distance. He changed that to here, there, these, those, where. Next, the teacher changed to exclamatory sentences such as, "Oh, what a pretty fan!" As more words were learned, the teacher wrote

direction on the board and had the children read them silently and comply--such as "stand up" and "sit down." Finally, the teacher wrote a little story on the board and drew sections of an illustrative picture to arouse the curiosity of the children. Parker believed that the object, word, sentence, script, and phonic methods all together though not equally formed one true method of teaching reading. Each was used in its own time and place and proper proportion to arouse and strengthen all the faculties of the mind, not just one.³⁷

Dewey believed that there were parallels between the way learning developed and the evolution of civilized experience. In the case of mathematics, for example, the hunter had to count his game and the herder had to count his flocks. They had to measure territory. They had to keep track of the changes of the seasons and the movements of the sun and moon. Dewey felt that each child had four impulses on which to build: (a) expressive, (b) constructive, (c) investigative, and (d) social.³⁸ The child had a need to express himself in activity and to share the results of the activity. Dewey realized that the best time to teach the child the skills of communication was when he was in the greatest need. Dewey, therefore, did not begin school with reading and writing. He began with the first two impulses: the expressive and the constructive. Using the occupations at the center, children worked on projects and activities that would gradually but ultimately lead them to need and desire reading, writing, and mathematical skills. While reading and writing were not

advocated, language was never ignored. The children were informally helped in diction, enunciation, and projection. The activities in which the children were engaged were those of creative play, construction, exploration, questioning, field trips, simple dramatic reenactments and communication, and discussion of ideas in stories.

Steiner's curriculum was designed to follow the development of civilization. The organization was in relation to the development of the individual. Consequently, the children learned to write before they learned to read. Then they learned to read what they had written. Steiner wanted each child to experience, whenever possible, what he was learning. For example, students wrote and illustrated special notebooks in lieu of textbooks. In them they wrote examples of what they had learned rather than received teacher/textbook prepared worksheets. They dramatized their plays and the classics. These experiences were designed to help the student understand the subject better by actually experiencing it prior to understanding it.³⁹

In the Waldorf kindergarten and first grade, language studies were a part of all studies. They played too basic a role to be isolated. Students heard and told stories, fairy tales, songs, and letters during the main block lesson. They hear poetic recitations in the morning assembly. Spoken words formed the core of all their language experience. In second grade they moved from fairy tales to fables and legends, as they moved from their imaginative stage to their imitative. The legends gave them

impressions of people striving after high ideals. They also began to need realistic stories as they became more aware of the world around them. They began to learn the difference between doing words, naming words, and describing words.

In third grade they heard, read, and wrote stories and poems from the Bible. This was their first actual introduction to history which they re-told and illustrated in their notebooks. In fourth grade they read the Irish, Icelandic, and Scandanavian sagas. They wrote experience narratives. At this time, about nine years of age, the children felt some degree of isolation from the world. Steiner thought that some ways to bridge the distance between the child and his world was through letter writing. The letter writing developed formal communication between the child and others.⁴⁰

By the age of 10, the child was developing a strong sense of personality, so it was important to teach him to respect others. The Greek epics and legends were read and discussed. In written and oral work the emphasis was the difference between the child's opinion and experiences and those of others.

Steiner organized his curriculum on what he believed to be the developmental needs of children. While his teachings gave a great deal of individual attention and care to each child, this school was far more structured than any of those with which the other educators under study were associated. Steiner felt it was the purpose of the Waldorf schools to teach the children to be independent and sensitive. He realized that children had to

experience certain things as children in order to be capable as adults to impart purpose and direction in their lives.⁴¹ Still, while learning independence and sensitivity, the children had to learn and perform under rather rigid standards. While there seemed to be no question that the Waldorf curriculum was substantially thought out, it also seemed inflexible. Once Steiner had made these curricular determinations, it seemed as if the children, then, had to fit the mold.

Since much of Mearns' teaching was with high school students, he did not emphasize the initial language study. He did believe, however, that children would have no difficulty with literature if they were given the chance to develop their own native gifts in language. Also, he drew the conclusion that his poets at the Lincoln School were a serious illustration that higher grades of artistic achievements were possible than commonly permitted in schools.⁴² Mearns would like to have attempted his creativity experiment in the public schools, but he never got the opportunity. He strongly believed that students were capable of far more in terms of a creative aspect of their writing. This was reinforced when teachers from all over the country wrote to him describing the delightful and unexpected results they received after they tried some of Mearns techniques and suggestions. Mearns was a proponent of careful and conscientious development of a child's capabilities.

Zirbes described the development of language/literacy skills in terms of both the child and civilization. Zirbes observed

children informally and functionally using their eyes and ears to connect speech patterns with direct experiences. She saw that children seemed to learn vocal responses by intuition. They seemed to develop a pattern as they listened to those around them and as they began to play their part. As they communicated their needs and expressed satisfaction when those needs were met, they entered a two-way process of communication. Thus far in the child's development, Zirbes observed no need or use for writing. In fact, in the development of civilization, writing evolved through the primal urge to record human experience and preserve the stories of man's adventures.⁴³

In her major work Spurs to Creative Teaching, Zirbes discussed the influence of cultural values in relation to the invention of the human language. She wrote that what led to actual speech had been previously formed and influenced by the group and their surroundings. Primitive marks and signs, patterned drum beats and smoke signals, calls and grunts, cries and tone patterns, gestures, rituals, incantations, and dance movements all led to speech. This was followed by the development of the visual symbol system: pictorial and graphic records and communications in ideograms. Since these had to be decoded and there was a limited number of scribes and scholars capable of doing so, the development of an alphabet--a reduced number of symbols which stood for sounds rather than ideas--was inevitable. Zirbes went on to note that the processes of writing and copying by hand had to be transcended before reading and writing could be widely used.

The human need for communication forced the development of literacy from the invention of type set by hand to the printing process, duplication, the telephone, telegraphy, the radio and television, distribution of books, libraries, and home delivery of newspapers and magazines.⁴⁴

Zirbes made a seven-point case for developmental teaching based not only on the development of human civilization but also upon the development of the child. First, she asked, "How do babies learn to turn over?" Second, "How do babies learn to suck?" Third, she closely observed the development from hunching, creeping, and toddling to walking without formal instruction. She realized that parents and others could encourage the child, but in the end what was required was individual concentration and effort. Fourth, "How does experience play a part in the process of the birth cry to babbling to speech?" Fifth, Zirbes observed that young children used modifiers long before they learned anything about parts of speech. Sixth, since it seemed apparent that some things were learned without being taught, we should discover how they were learned. Seventh, "What would the difference in outcome or process be between a child who learns to eat for himself by eating with his family at meal times and a child who learns by verbal instruction on how to eat properly?"⁴⁵ Zirbes strongly believed that very early in the child's development learning and influence on future learning were constantly taking place. She spoke out and wrote often and persuasively about the importance of early childhood development. She warned that as a society, we

wait until it was too late. She often cited as an example the army testing in World War I. Both learning and physical disabilities were discovered that Zirbes said should have been noted and corrected years before. She wrote in "Priorities in Childhood Education" that the "whole matter of early language development was so contingent on social conditioning and susceptible wise guidance that every toddler should have its benefits."⁴⁶

Developmentally, Zirbes said, most children were aware of and used reading before they were taught to read. And too soon, the negative effects of poor reading skills were felt. For example, first graders found many uses for reading throughout their homes and communities. Second and third graders valued reference material before they were formally introduced. According to Zirbes, reading in school should begin when children read what they dictated to their teacher about their trips, their science experiments, their pets and so on. This reading occurred long before the use of books. Books should be introduced individually or in small groups when the teacher determined they could be used successfully. The key here was teacher-determination of success. For too soon, inferiority feelings developed about reading ability which was damaging to self-respect.

By developmental learning, Parker seemed to mean degree of difficulty and number of items to be learned. He continued to maintain that everything to be learned should appeal to the child's interests. Dewey's concept of developmental learning was

based on the social needs of growing and maturing children. He began with what he presumed to be of most interest to the children and built on that as their need to know and accomplish more grew. Steiner made the determination of the developmental stages--imaginative to imitative--and saw that the curriculum followed suit.. Children moved from fairy tales to fables and legends and gradually to a degree of realism. Mearns was concerned with the development and maturity of each child and the effect such growth would have on the child's work. Zirbes was interested in finding a way to connect early childhood development with educational techniques. She seemed to realize that there was much to be learned about development and how children learn before they were formally instructed.

The Methodology of Language and Literacy

In general, two words aptly describe the methodology of the five educators in this study: experience and stories. All five advocated and made use of the experiences of the children and stories told and re-told in the teaching of reading. Since they believed that a good place to begin was with what interested the child, they asked the children to tell stories about their own experiences. These became short, beginning stories which the teacher wrote down. The children learned to read their own stories based on their experiences and made up with their own words. The other re-occurring motif in their methodological beliefs was methodical, substantial lessons. They were convinced

if reading were taught very well at the beginning regardless of the time it took or the actual number of words and rules learned, it would not continue to haunt teachers and children for so long.

Mearns described a good teacher as one who asked for pictured and dramatic expanding of an abstract statement or a summary of the child's own experience. He suggested that an amateur (teacher) treated reading as a substitute for reading. This way reading became detached and mechanical and the reader became bored and disinterested. Also, in Creative Youth, he wrote that "higher appreciation follows dramatization."⁴⁷ In his classrooms at the Lincoln School, his students enjoyed both high drama and substantial appreciation of their own work and that of others.

In Steiner's Waldorf Schools, the teachers told stories and then episodes of the story were illustrated by a series of pictures on the board which the children then copied into their notebooks. Children were encouraged to select with care the colors they used in copying from the teachers' drawings. Color was an important element in Waldorf lessons as art was throughout the lessons in Parker's school. Both men realized the importance of integrating art in the curriculum. The class then composed a sentence or verse to accompany each picture. This they also copied into their notebooks. They attempted to develop a poetic sense through careful and determined word choice. The result was that children had little difficulty reading their own sentences that were written with such care and they learned the words and the sentence structure without conscious effort.⁴⁸ Support for

story use was also rather substantial. They provided "material for verbal and written recapitulation, practice in speaking clearly, remembering, expressing coherently, recreating a particular turn of a phrase, and enriching vocabulary."⁴⁹

Parker was a proponent of the slow start as a way to ensure a strong one. He didn't want the children to read carelessly or to guess at the words. But he did want them to desire to learn new words and to love reading. This was another reason why he preferred beginning slowly with no pressure on the learners. Parker said that phonics work, in the form of slow pronunciation, could begin early but sounds were not associated with letters at first. Separate sounds were practiced until the child said them correctly and easily. As new words were introduced, the teacher used them in many different and short sentences. He suggested teachers change just one word so that children could be successful readers every time. It was important that the children always realized the idea behind the words. The teacher did not go on until every child had grasped that. Of course, very interesting or exciting ideas were more easily grasped and remembered.

The teacher pronounced the words very slowly and the children imitated the teacher's pronunciation. Then the children slowly pronounced any words they knew, but the teacher corrected any mispronunciations and the children repeated the words until they were correct. Parker allowed the teachers to use the sounds from a good sound chart, such as Monroe or Appleton's, but he preferred they did not use the chart with the children. He suggested they

practice these preliminary exercises beginning with the easiest and lasting between five and ten minutes a session.

When the students were ready, they began reading very easy books. Parker preferred having several first readers--"they are very cheap and you can induce your committee to buy them providing you do good work"⁵⁰--so that if the child stumbled over a difficult sentence, he switched to another easy reader. Parker called it immense economy in going slowly at first. He believed that if the primary work were done properly, there would be no need to teach reading as reading after the fourth year.

Parker said there were basically two types of reading exercises: reading new words on the board and reading new material. But the child was not to read aloud until he had the idea of the sentence. If he had a long sentence, he was to read to understand the thought, close the book, and express the thought aloud. By the second year of reading instruction, the child should read a whole story and write one, two, and three things he remembered from it. Or he wrote several sentences on slips of paper about the story and arranged them in correct order and then copied them on his slates. (Just about the only time Parker got into trouble in Quincy was when he ordered beautiful new slates for the children. The parents raised a ruckus because they didn't want to pay for them. It was one of the few times he backed down.)

Parker wanted reading and composition taught together. The teacher dictated a story and the children wrote the story and read

what they wrote and read what their fellow students had written. In dictating Parker admonished the teacher to use his best voice but to read the sentence only once. He wanted the children to learn to listen as well as to read and write.

Parker warned the teachers that children came to school amazed and fearful of the strange new surroundings. Children had enough difficulty becoming accustomed to all that was around them to say nothing of all the learning that was expected. Teachers began the work immediately, but slowly and cautiously. Children were encouraged to use their own language and to talk freely at first. Corrections were done by using the mistake in other sentences and with practice and with patience. "A mean teacher," Parker warned, "will ruin everything."⁵¹

Both Parker writing in 1889 and Zirbes in 1959 expressed a strong preference toward personal experience as a beginning to reading. Neither began with a book. Instead, both began with the ideas of the children. Zirbes promoted the use of oral language accounts of a group's experience recorded by the teacher in large, clear manuscript form on the board or on a large sheet of paper placed where it could be seen and referred to. Then the teacher guided the group in observing whole sentences or lines in the story until they became associated with the part of the experience to which they referred. Next, the children either dramatized or illustrated parts of the experience and associated sentences or lines from the written story. Gradually, the sentences and lines were associated with the visual clues. Then phrases or striking

or recurring words began to be associated with what they convey. The children realize that lines began at the left, and they look for ideas by moving their eyes along left to right and back to the next lower line. Thus, the concept of reading was learned before letters, syllables, and words were recognized as elements in the process. Zirbes believed this approach developed visual coordination; but since it involved no forced attention, it caused no pressure or strain.

After this basic concept was developed by experience reading, the children were ready for very easy, simple books with good pictures that took the place of first-hand experience in suggesting what the lines told. Zirbes agreed with Parker's belief that the emphasis should be on meanings and ideas rather than on sounds or word recognition. Like Parker, Zirbes also found a place for phonics work, but that was later, after the quest for meaning had been well launched. She also maintained that this process of obtaining meaning from print should result in quite a "stock of words seen in so many contexts and in so many settings, they should be easily recognized in any context."⁵²

Zirbes used the phrase "extensive reading" to explain that "wherever children can read, they need to have a chance to read to learn, to read to find out--and to enjoy it."⁵³ She gave several examples of extensive reading experiences. In a first grade the social studies curriculum covered the home and the neighborhood. The teacher read a number of beautifully illustrated books about family life and neighborhood activities. They talked about how

theirs compared to the books. The books were then made available along with very easy books on the same topics. The children read them to each other and took them home to discuss them with their parents and brothers and sisters.

A third grade class went for a neighborhood walk and became interested in how houses were built and the variety of materials used. They returned to their classroom and generated a list of questions they would like answered. They visited a lumber yard and a brick kiln. One of the student's fathers was a builder, so he came to class to help answer some of the questions. The teacher then provided a wide variety of easy reading and well illustrated books on homes in other times and other lands. The students made picture books of their own with illustrations of different houses and explanations about each one. Finally, they entertained several other classes with an exhibit on homes.

Zirbes reported on a fourth grade that decided to take up a study of pioneers in the Midwest. The idea was sparked by a discussion of Indian names of rivers, counties, towns, and cities. They moved from a field trip, seeing a movie, much reading, to the presentation of an original pioneer play in which the passing of the Indians and the prevalence of Indian names contributed to the plot.⁵⁴

These examples were of classes that did not use a textbook to cover the material. Zirbes also gave several examples of classes that used extensive reading to enliven and embellish textbooks that were used. One sixth grade class commented on a sentence in

their geography text, "There are many national parks and national forests." The children wanted to know more than that, so they gathered tourist folders and booklets, maps, National Geographic and Holiday magazines, and government pamphlets. They ended their study by making a large map of the United States with the locations of many of the national parks and forests.⁵⁵

Between 1919 and 1929, Zirbes surveyed educators and developed an inventory of reading activities which she and many leading educators of the times deemed helpful and appropriate. It was entitled "Inventory of Reading Activities of a Progressive Program Compiled from Recommendations of Representative Progressive Leadership." It covered first through sixth grade in four categories: (a) activities based on content units more than one paragraph in length; (b) activities based on unrelated paragraphs or sentences; (c) activities based chiefly on phrases, words, or phonic elements; and (d) activities involving the use of the table of contents, index, etc. These lists grew longer as the grades grew higher. There was a wide variety of activities that teachers could adapt for use in their classrooms. Many of the activities were acceptably progressive. In the first category, "Activities based on content units more than one paragraph in length," for example, she listed dramatizing rhymes, drawing pictures to illustrate an experience, reproducing a story read silently, reading to get material for projects, reading meaning from pictures, inventing titles, retelling famous stories, reading between lines and interpreting in terms of past experiences,

dramatizing for grade assembly, and guessing what may happen next in a story. For category two, "Activities based on unrelated paragraphs or sentences," she listed following directions written on blackboard, pantomiming sentences read silently, rearranging lines of a rhyme, visualizing situations in arithmetic problems, reading to be able to direct games, paraphrasing, and pantomiming sentences and directions read silently. In category three, "Activities based chiefly on phrases, words, or phonic elements," suggestions included making and using signs in correlation with building projects, printing signs with price and sign markers, and talking about words occurring in geography content. In the final category, "Activities involving the use of the table of contents, index, etc.," Zirbes listed using table of contents to find reading matter in books, using marginal headings to locate factors, and using the local library to find material. These were examples of activities that seemed appropriate to the progressive thoughts expressed in this study. These are methods Parker, Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns would have suggested. They appear to provide and or cause appropriate learning without the weights of textbook, drill, or rote memorization.

But there were a number of activities on this list that seemed to be from a more rigid, less flexible, more classroom, less real world orientation. For example, in category one, taking tests on silent reading, reading silently under time pressure, making tests (This researcher is amazed Zirbes would include or condone anything to do with tests as she believed tests to be extrinsic

motivators, and she was a strong proponent of intrinsic motivation as a key to current and life-long learning), selecting appropriate topical headings for paragraphs, finding central thought in limited time, memorizing material read, and taking standard oral reading tests. Category two followed a phonic approach which Parker, Dewey, and Zirbes seemed to indicate would follow later in a reading program, yet she included activities such as analyzing long words into syllables, listing words according to phonetic rules or groups, and interpreting the pronunciation of words through the use of diacritical marks. She concluded this inventory by stating that ". . . if reading ability was truly a complex composite of many specific abilities, as investigations lead us to conclude, if we learn by doing, then a well balanced variety of reading activities will result in a wide range of abilities."⁵⁶ By well-balanced, she seemed to mean both experience-based, developmental- and teacher-centered, rules-orientated. When discussing specific classroom techniques, Zirbes, Parker, and others tend to mention techniques and activities that do not actually fit the totally child-centered approach they offered in more general and/or theoretical statements.

Both Zirbes and Parker discussed remediation. They felt, of course, that if reading were taught properly to begin with, there should be no need but realistically they realized this could never be. As Parker explained his principles and methods of teaching beginning reading, he suspected that those in the audience were

questioning what should be done with the children who have been taught by an incorrect method. He suggested that even two to three weeks of incorrect teaching would scar the mind of the child forever. His definition of a wrong method was a thoughtless prescription of alphabet, phonic, phonetic, and word recognition drill. He described these readers as "those who struggle with each particular word in a painful way, and drawl out the sentences as if there were no beautiful pictures behind them. Who have been led through a dreary waste of empty words in a harsh, unnatural manner."⁵⁷ He charged that elocutionists "reap a rich harvest from the bad teaching in primary schools."⁵⁸ He described the change in children's voices from natural, easy pleasant tones to harsh, unnatural utterances. Zirbes described what she observed to be the results of incorrect methods of teaching reading: speech disorders, dislike of school, aversion to reading, feelings of inferiority, and anxiety--all side effects to be avoided.⁵⁹

Both Parker and Zirbes advocated certain methods of reading instruction which they believed promoted the maximum success in student achievement, but they realized that remediation would be necessary for a variety of reasons. Zirbes said that it was not enough to treat the symptoms; it was necessary to treat the fundamental causes. She favored a look at the possibility of a common causal factor--a direct relationship between certain common remedial problems and certain prevalent teaching or training procedures and curricular expectations which would seem to call for a curricular adjustment. She and other educators of her time

had advanced from Parker's era to the consideration that a relationship could exist among the resulting problems, the teaching methods, and the students.

Parker suggested having the students begin with the easiest possible, interesting, and dramatic reading. He would abandon oral reading for a while and lead the children to see the idea, the thought behind the words. That was the key: leading pupils to get the thought or mentally seeing the picture. The teacher was to ask the child many questions to direct him toward the thought behind the words. For example,

Five little peas in a pod; they were green and the pod was green, so they thought all the world was green, and that was the way it should be.

Questions

1. Where were the peas?
2. How many peas were there?
3. What color were the peas?
4. What color was the pod?
5. Because⁶⁰ they were green, what did they think?

These questions may have led some of the children to see the idea or the thought behind the words, but they probably did not play upon the child's experience or interest.

Zirbes also suggested using materials that reduced or prevented frustration and failure. She said that mere segregation of poor learners along with more drill work was of no aid. She wanted students properly diagnosed and individually treated. She

said smaller classes for beginning readers was actually a long-range economy. She also advocated continued research of the learning process for the improvement of the conditions and outcomes of learning. For example, tension and coercive measures increased reading problems, close eye work involved inordinate demands on immature muscles, and eye strain led to stress. If these conditions existed, they should have been altered or adjusted. Tension, stress, and strain should have been lowered, avoided, or removed from schooling. Zirbes and Parker, with the greatest amount of time between them, shared several beginning reading techniques though there was an observable change in Zirbes' stance toward both children and instruction. Parker, Mearns, and Zirbes advocated lessons based on the experiences of the children. All of the educators used stories--a wide variety of short, interesting stories--to grasp the interest of the children. Through the stories they learned new words, phrases, and the ideas behind the sentences. Zirbes was the proponent for further study of child development along with small classes so that the teacher could observe closely any relation between teaching techniques and activities and results. Steiner's teachers used fairy tales and fables for beginning storytelling and reading rather than child dictated stories, but the children did copy them into their notebooks and illustrate them. Mearns advocated both. The key was that the students were interested and that they should learn easier and faster.

Dewey and Steiner suggested literature study begin with fairy tales, folk tales, fables, and mythology. Parker agreed and called mythology the beginnings of anthropology, history, science, religion, and art.⁶¹ Parker, Dewey, and Steiner included the Bible in the early part of the literature segment of their curricula. Parker approached teaching the Bible as any piece of literature. For example, he used The Gospel of Mark to show students purpose, relationships, and comparisons.⁶²

Dewey differed from the other educators in this study in that he saw literature as a social institution only rather than an in-depth reflection of the unconscious fears, anxieties, and guilts--"the personal encounters with the 'dark night of the soul.'"⁶³ He viewed it as a reflection of society's past in order to maintain continuity and keep the society on track. Rather than reflecting on the depths of man's experience, Dewey preferred to search for ways to improve society. He would teach literature through history and science. Therefore, mythology would be taught through ancient Greek history. In fact, whenever possible in both Steiner and Dewey's curriculum, literature would be integrated. For example, when students studied Caesar's Commentaries in Latin, they would also read Shakespeare's Julius Caesar.

Mearns and Zirbes were concerned with the quality of the literature children read. Mearns was pleased that the Lincoln School had "made poetry one of the manly sports." He said the library "helped to take poetry out of the classroom and save it

from the drying and freezing process which goes by the name of education."⁶⁴

Mearns wanted children to learn to judge for themselves rather than simply accept specifics pointed out as what the experts say. "Remember," he wrote in Creative Youth, "the critics hated Huck Finn."⁶⁵ He said books should be viewed as passports to regions of equals and betters. He wanted students to be able to see the differences in the quality of literature--good, tasteful literature.

Zirbes questioned, "Was there something wrong about a culture which finds more fault with schools and the teaching of reading than with the conscienceless exploitation of childhood and youth by producers, purveyors, and promoters of inane and pervasive comics, mystery stories, movies, and broadcasts?" She said, "Shoddy commercialism needs to be curbed--much more than modern instruction in reading needs criticism."⁶⁶

Don'ts in Language/Literacy Learning

Throughout the writing and speaking Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes did on the subject of literacy, they seemed in agreement on what they were against. Some were of a specific nature: "Don't use a spelling book on top of all the words learned in history, geography, arithmetic, and natural science." Some were of a more general nature: "Don't accept that words have some mysterious power." Overall, they warned against superficial learning which they actually wouldn't call learning at

all--perhaps superficial fact finding followed by fact forgetting. None of them actually published a separate list of what not to do, yet there were these admonishments spaced throughout their articles and books.

Don't

- accept that words have some mysterious power
- believe that memorizing rules and definitions and acquiring a mass of disconnected facts will produce useful learning
- use books that are second hand, artificial, and aristocratic
- over-emphasize correct emphasis and inflection. This destroys the child's natural, beautiful power of expression which was full of melody and harmony
- give the thought before the child was able to get it on his own

Don't

- train children to imitate anyone's voice
- force memorization of word parts before the whole word was known
- place too much emphasis on punctuation in early instruction

- associate the written word with the spoken word without the idea of the word
- teach emphasis, inflection, and pauses by imitation
- use a spelling book on top of all the words learned in history, geography, arithmetic, and natural science

Don't

- teach grammar until it was absolutely necessary
- neglect to supply pure and interesting literature for this leads children to read trashy literature which was an unwholesome and vicious tendency
- encourage copying. Push students to collect from their own experiences
- emphasize form over ideas
- allow children to write badly copied, hackneyed phrasing and silly platitudes

Don't

- suggest what should be written
- wait for inspiration
- encourage imitation
- use traditional school-selected literature because it was strictly from the point of what an adult thinks was proper
- teach doggerel rhymes and set phrases
- allow a bookish emphasis on word recognition

- allow an isolation from the functional development of oral language in and through group experience

Don't

- use McGuffey-type readers
- apply too much pressure during early reading instruction
- list words in isolation--maybe don't do anything in isolation
- allow the oral reading rate of students to set the pace for the class
- make rules, categories, systematic lessons, or lists
- expect spell down tests to carry over in writing
- memorize history facts
- teach the elements first, the hows next, and then expect to see the sense in it.

This list of what it was better not to do spans 100 years of educational experiences. The message seemed to have remained on a cogent target: the student and what he really knew not what he superficially regurgitated. These teachers wanted the students to have the idea rather than be handed information. They wanted to begin learning and to base learning on the interests and experiences of the child. The essential mechanical elements necessary to progress should come when necessary. Their views seemed to be dependent upon the eventual evolution of the child. They placed great faith in the development of the child from within rather than from external causes such as teacher-selected

textbooks and activities and language rules. Steiner's curriculum was mandated, but done so supposedly with the child's developmental level and growth potential in mind. But in many ways all of their curricula were ultimately mandated. These teachers were more aware of and concerned with the sensitivity of their responsibility.

Summary

Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes based their reading instruction on the experiences of children. In teaching individual words, phrases, sentences, or short stories, their approach was either to ask their students to make up their own stories or to use stories that should appeal to the developmental level of the students. Their major complaint about instruction was that while drill work, memorization, out-of-context work, and oral reading possibly developed good pronunciation of words and phrases, it did not necessarily lead to comprehension or understanding. The five educators under study believed that children learned much at home prior to entering school and that that should be the knowledge base upon which more knowledge would be built. In some sense they were patterning their beliefs of literacy instruction and development upon their own early experiences in learning to read, but not necessarily having done so in school. Their goal was not only a literate society, but one obtained in a less painful manner.

Parker seemed to be deeply concerned that children realized and understood the idea behind the word they learned. He strove to have that permeate reading instruction despite the many drills and busy work assignments he also advocated. Dewey saw all forms of language as social instruments for use in communication; therefore, when the individual was ready to communicate, he would also be ready to learn the language. Steiner believed language should be learned through experience and in an integrative manner. Children should learn to read what they had written, and all language instruction should permeate the entire curriculum. Mearns felt and observed that children could come to appreciate the beauty of language developmentally. Zirbes, armed with what had been learned and developed regarding reading and reading instruction, proposed new methods and attitudes based on purposeful reading. Every reading experience was to have been significant to have led to a wholeness of learning.

Collectively, they believed that language learning had to be meaningful to the whole child. Despite certain practices, they may have permitted or promoted, they were against isolated drill and memorization.. To them, there was little point to pronunciation without meaning or to practice without interrelatedness. They wanted to instill in children the desire for continual learning, and they had to commence with a strong language background.

Notes

- ¹Laura Zirbes, "Gaps in Curriculum Research," Education Leadership, 28(1952):190.
- ²Laura Zirbes, "What is a Modern Reading Program?" Education Methods 20(1949):151.
- ³Laura Zirbes, "Purposeful Reading," Education Research Bulletin 8(1929):104.
- ⁴F.W. Parker, "Discussion of John Clarke's 'The Place of Art in General Education,'" Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1895):849.
- ⁵F.W. Parker, "Discussion of John Clarke's 'The Place of Art in General Education,'" 849.
- ⁶John Dewey, "My Pedagogic Creed," The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1935):15.
- ⁷Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, The Child-Centered School (New York: World Book Co., 1928):251.
- ⁸Hughes Mearns, "Language Artists in the Primary Grades," Childhood Education 12(1963):180.
- ⁹Hughes Mearns, Creative Youth (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., 1925):120.
- ¹⁰Lelia Patridge, The Quincy Methods (New York: E.L. Kellogg & Co., 1889):330.
- ¹¹Patridge, 30.
- ¹²Ibid.
- ¹³Laura Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1960):134.
- ¹⁴Ibid.
- ¹⁵Ibid., 169.
- ¹⁶Jesse H. Newlon, "Democracy & Education in Our Time," Progressive Education 14(1937):7.

¹⁷Charles F. Adams, Jr., "The New Departure in the Common School of Quincy & Other Papers on Educational Topics," Boston 1879 report in The Elementary School Journal 35(1935):503.

¹⁸Helen M. Hefferan, "Colonel Francis Wayland Parker," Chicago Schools Journal 18(1936):8.

¹⁹Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, A History of the University of Chicago (Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1916):48, 81.

²⁰Patridge, 28.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid., 32.

²³Ibid., 35.

²⁴Ibid., 54.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Merle Curtis, The Social Ideas of American Educators (New Jersey: Pageant Books, Inc., 1959):523.

²⁷Arthur G. Wirth, John Dewey as Educator (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966):162, 163.

²⁸Hughes Mearns, Creative Power (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., Inc., 1930):203, 268.

²⁹Mearns, Creative Youth, 28.

³⁰Hughes Mearns, "The Authentic Language of Childhood," Progressive Education 6(1929):292.

³¹Zirbes, "Purposeful Reading," 97.

³²Ibid.

³³Zirbes, "What Is a Modern Reading Program?" 154.

³⁴Ibid., 155.

³⁵Patridge, 82.

³⁶Goodspeed, 82.

³⁷Patridge, 53.

³⁸Francis W. Parker, "The Report of the Committee of Ten--Its Use for the Improvement of Teachers Now at Work in the Schools," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1894):339.

³⁹Earl J. Ogletree, Waldorf Schools: A Child-Centered System (Document, 1975, ED 178 188).

⁴⁰Marjorie Spock, Teaching as a Lively Art (Hudson, New York: The Anthroposophic Press, 1985):67.

⁴¹Henry Barnes, "An Introduction to Waldorf Education," Teachers College Record 81(1980):325.

⁴²Mearns, Creative Youth, 117.

⁴³Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching, 138.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 126.

⁴⁵Laura Zirbes, Focus on Values in Elementary Education (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1960):21.

⁴⁶Laura Zirbes, "Priorities in Childhood Education," Progressive Education 20(1943):104.

⁴⁷Mearns, Creative Power, 203.

⁴⁸Spock, 26.

⁴⁹George Rist and Peter Schneider, Integrating Vocational and General Education: A Rudolf Steiner School, 45.

⁵⁰Patridge, 66.

⁵¹Ibid., 80.

⁵²Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching, 162.

⁵³Ibid., 176.

⁵⁴Ibid., 181.

⁵⁵Laura Zirbes, Comparative Studies of Current Practice in Reading (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928):16-23.

⁵⁶Ibid., 23.

⁵⁷ Lelia Patridge (reported), Parker, Francis W., Notes on Talks on Teaching (New York: E.L. Kellogg & Co., 1883. (Authorized facsimile by micro-xerography by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1967):67.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 67.

⁵⁹ Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching, 135.

⁶⁰ Patridge, Notes on Talks on Teaching, 68.

⁶¹ F.C. Fox, "A Personal Glimpse of Colonel Parker," Progressive education 9(1932):382.

⁶² Goodspeed, 54.

⁶³ Wirth, 279.

⁶⁴ Mearns, Creative Youth, 105.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching, 316.

CHAPTER IV

ACADEMIC AND SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

In this chapter I will discuss the views of Francis Parker, John Dewey, Rudolf Steiner, Hughes Mearns, and Laura Zirbes on three categories of academic discipline: basic, mental, and integrative. I will then show their attitudes toward school discipline. Dewey was the most prolific of the five on the subject of academic and school discipline, writing roughly double the amount of the others. Parker wrote the least but was not without opinion in both areas. Of the five subtopics, the one of most interest was integrative aspects of academic discipline which is not surprising. Parker, Mearns, and Zirbes seemed more concerned with school discipline, while Dewey and Steiner concentrated on academic discipline.

To the five educators in this study, academic and school discipline was a category which encompassed not only what to teach, but also how and why. They discussed basic academic discipline--that is, what education is all about--the purpose and procedure; mental academic discipline-- what humans are capable of learning and doing and how to advance the furthest with each individual; and the integrative approach--how everything fits

together and why that is better than specialization, separation, and categorization. Throughout the discussion of academic discipline, they explored ways to provide the best motivational circumstances possible to evoke appropriate actions conducive to learning. Here, too, as in Chapter III, they discussed or rather warned against what they considered to be ill-advised approaches. Mearns was extremely interested in providing motivation and pleasant and conducive surroundings for students in order to help them learn and to help them want to learn. He devoted half of his writings to this issue. Yet he only entered the teaching profession--in the beginning--in order to earn enough money to survive financially in the theatre.

Academic Discipline

Basic

To Dewey the very basis of academic discipline was growth: physical, intellectual, and moral. All of the educators in this study combined the three as equally important, emphasizing the necessity for physical education as part of the academic and school curriculum. Dewey said that the aims of academic discipline were centered on the development of the individuality of the child. He suggested that the chief criterion of evaluating those aims was "does the education produce a constant tendency toward growth? Does it draw out potential capacities of the children?"¹ For Dewey if education produced no growth, if it were either stagnant or regressive, then it was less than useless.

Dewey was a proponent of inquiry and problem solving as a means toward both growth and education. He believed that every emphasis on problem solving in or out of the classroom incorporated the use of both skills and knowledge which had been learned. Beyond that he saw problem solving as a process which continually transformed those acquired habits more effectively. He called it "more effective adjustiveness." Zirbes called it "forward adjustment." The basis of learning did not stop with transmittal and acceptance of information. It continued with performance and improvement.

Dewey was fortunate during his early years at the University of Chicago that both the university and the city were interested in pedagogical theory and practice and that they were concerned about the improvement of the public schools. President Harper and many of the faculty (and Harper had managed to entice some of the nation's best) were actively pursuing the upgrading of the teaching profession. Consequently, this interest gave Dewey access to the schools' faculties and teachers' associations. That kind of audience inspired and stimulated his work. Because of this stimulation, Dewey studied the developmental capabilities of children. He found that he didn't quite agree with that ontogeny recapitulated phylogeny (the stages of the development of the individual roughly correspond to the stages through which the human race evolved). Dewey preferred to study the child rather than study the epoch and then transfer the results to the child.

Mayhew reported in The Dewey School that through his studies Dewey discovered three growth stages along with transitions. Stage One was from four-to-six-year olds. Stage Two was the nine- and ten-year olds followed by a transition period of the eleven- and twelve-year olds. The third stage of growth was from thirteen to fifteen years of age. Once Dewey discovered a learning pattern he determined the kinds of things that should be taught at the different levels.

Groups One and Two (the four-to-five year olds) were mainly occupied with the household occupations. Mayhew reported in The Dewey School, for example, the daily program of these first two groups was beginning at 9:00 a.m. with handwork followed by songs and stories and then marching and games such as Follow the Leader. After a snack they had dramatic play and rhymes. Through the study of the occupations the children learned that "orderly self-direction is essential for group work."² Dewey believed that much could be learned through a study of the occupations: household such as sewing, cooking, and cleaning; and social such as farming, woodwork, and shop work, though these were to be studied within the confines of the classroom rather than, for example, on a farm or in a home.

Group Three (the six-year olds) studied end products via their sources as origins. They progressed from mimic to consideration of others; they traced food to their sources and finished carvings to their original forms or states. Through this kind of study the

why and the how began to stir. Their daily activities included spinning, weaving, cooking, shop-work, modeling, dramatic plays, conversations, story telling, and discussions. These activities were fundamental and typical, but they were related to and recapitulated similar previous actions. Each activity was enriching and enlarging toward more and more definite purposes and plans which were all conscious of the social relations.³ For example, group four studied progress through invention and discovery. They studied how primitive man and his occupations led to geology, chemistry, physics, biology, and geography. Dewey's plan for developmental group learning was to move from the most simplistic and home-like to the more complex and worldly. This group learning, however, appeared to be more teacher-directed than Mearns' who followed by allowing students a strong degree of input on curriculum.

Dewey was more interested in the experience of the group learning than the subject matter. His primary concern was with subject matter as a "special mode of personal experience, rather than with it as a body of wrought out facts and scientifically related principles."⁴ For example, in "The Psychological Aspect of a School Curriculum," he wrote:

Geography is not only a set of facts and principles which may be classified and discussed by themselves, it is also a way in which some actual individual feels and thinks about the world. It must be the latter before it can be the former. Only when an individual has passed through a certain amount of experience which he vitally realized on his own account is he prepared to take an objective and logical point of view,

capable of standing off and analyzing the facts
and principles involved.⁵

To Dewey the subject matter in textbooks was the logically organized end products of inquiry. This, in itself, was fine but it cheated the students of insights into the process of inquiry that went before it. For example, geology may be taught by giving a list of materials containing the so-called right answers. But geologists may have been inspired to create their science by an inquiry regarding fish fossils on the rocks of a mountain.

So, according to Dewey, teachers had to be students of both their subject matter and their pupils. They had to know both so well that they were able to show the children the process of inquiry that may have inspired and been followed in order to develop the knowledge within the subject area. Children saw not only the end product but the cause of the question at the beginning and the process that led to the final knowledge. Ideally, students experienced at least a part of that process so that they were led to "share a sense of the discovery of the creators of the knowledge."⁶ The teacher's goal was to present material and activities in such a way that the abstract meanings of knowledge actually became a functioning part of the child's experience. In this way the child saw the end product and understood the process of inquiry which lead to that product. This, according to Dewey, led to greater understanding of the knowledge deemed necessary to impart.

Another suggestion Dewey had for teachers was to know the subject matter so well--"must be abundant to the point of overflow so that his mind can be free to observe student reaction."⁷ Dewey felt that if the teacher did not have to worry about what to say so that it came naturally, then he could concentrate on his students' reactions--"bodily expressions of the mental condition: puzzlement, boredom, mastery, dawn of an idea, feigned attention, tendency to show off or to dominate the discussion because of egotism."⁸ Then the teacher could take appropriate action to re-direct attention to the appropriate place.

Steiner believed not only that the teachers must be extremely well versed in the subject matter--in the hiring of teachers for his first Waldorf School in Stuttgart, Germany he preferred artisans to credentialed teachers--but also that they plan to devote three hours preparation for each half hour of a lesson. He believed that if the teacher were so well prepared, then he could teach in three to four lessons what might, under different circumstances, take half a year. Parker, too, believed in demanding preparation for each lesson. He would spend the entire evening and half the night preparing for the lessons of the following day. These educators believed (and practiced that belief) that an extremely well-prepared teacher was essential to the teaching (and the delivery) of the system.

Finally, on the basis of academic discipline, Dewey spoke out on cultural aristocratic education versus industrial education.

To Dewey, "intelligence is activity; it is a verb, not a noun. The test of its presence is doing, not having."⁹ Education should be in and of "discerning of relationships and using continuities in anticipation of outcomes. It should assist one to work by aims thoughtfully extracted from surrounding conditions in order to order those conditions. A good life is constant improvement, not repetition."¹⁰ Dewey believed that good schools should teach and encourage students to learn eagerly and constantly.

Dewey criticized what he called cultural or aristocratic education which he said survived because people were led to believe that pure knowledge was more important than applied knowledge. He complained that this pure or cultural knowledge makes "one feel superior to fellows through possession of an observer's knowledge which they (their fellows) do not possess; though we have not been trained to do anything with it save contemplate our own superiority."¹¹ Dewey returned to the purpose of American education which was, according to him, to promote social and cultural democracy. He wanted education to further the knowledge and control of the individual. He wanted the schools to bring "intellectual culture within the reach of the masses to help break the feudally inherited barriers separating the vast majority who toil with their hands from the few who enjoy the more creative activities of the mind and spirit."¹² In Democracy and Education, Dewey wrote that education should be organized so that children are doing something--"natural active tendencies shall be fully

enlisted"--and that that something requires "observation, the acquisition of information, and the use of a constructive imagination."¹³ Dewey believed this was necessary to improve social conditions.

The improvement of social conditions was the same reason that Emil Mott decided education was necessary first for his factory workers, then for the children of his factory workers and beyond. He approached Rudolf Steiner because Steiner's educational philosophy seemed to provide an appropriate avenue. Steiner, like Dewey, believed that manual work was an important aspect of education. Foremost, Steiner felt that "our highest endeavor must be to develop free human beings who are able of themselves to impart purpose and direction to their lives."¹⁴ This was what drove the Nazis to close the Waldorf Schools in Germany. The government said that the purpose of education was to develop citizens for the state, not to develop individuals who could think for themselves.

The basis of academic discipline in the Waldorf Schools was that which united the movement. It was the "education itself which is a unique blend of the individual, the local atmosphere, and what is universally human."¹⁵ While the curriculum followed the development of the civilization of mankind, Steiner organized it in relation to the development of the individual. He did not dwell on the stages of civilization as Dewey had warned against. Nor did Steiner approve of the concept of "the more the better,

the faster the better."¹⁶ The curriculum was not individualized and self-pacing but a careful selection considered appropriate to the stage of the development of the child but only after the ground work had been laid to fit the experience of the imagination of the child. In Steiner's plan, the child progressed from level to level. The teacher helped him to progress. He did not necessarily wait until he arrived.

As Mearns wrote "at the proper time authorities come in but always after experience has made authorities understandable."¹⁷ Both Mearns and Steiner would agree there was not much gained from a totally permissive, unstructured schooling. They never advocated that though they were sometimes criticized for it. Mearns defined the basis of academic discipline--the minimum essentials--as attitudes and skills. To him it was the responsibility of the teacher to develop and to provide the proper atmosphere in which both those essentials should grow. For example, he wrote that "creative activity comes from a pulsing stream of inconsequential thoughts and feelings."¹⁸ The teacher had to be able to realize and understand the difference between the beginnings of creativity and aimless meanderings. The teacher had to make the children believe everyday occurrences were alive, dramatic, and interesting. Also, the teacher had to help the student to become aware of the difference between his real self and his superimposed self. Mearns once warned students to defer and keep silent with most elders. He urged diplomacy in

expressing views that differed from those that prevailed. He was not opposed to personal view point; he opposed folly and worthless martyrdom. He wanted students to study themselves and find out what was best for them. He was realistic in his awareness that all authoritarian figures did not approach the subject from his point of view.

Despite his cautions, Mearns wrote in Creative Power that it was a "rare rebel who refuses to give up his gift of seeing, thinking, and feeling as a child."¹⁹ Consequently, he offered more cautions and suggestions--this time in a different direction. He said that shame and coercion worked against creativity. Teachers had to teach children to be inventive rather than imitative so that they could progress, see, and solve their own problems. They needed to learn how and to learn to want to work together, but the struggle for achievement hardened people and brought out the worst in them. He quipped, "The World War I was won in composition and penmanship drills of the public schools of yesteryear. Courage? For training in courage there is nothing like it."²⁰ Mearns believed that taste was a matter of normal growth and that it could not be changed without danger--certainly to one, perhaps to both parties. He referred to Lowell, president of Harvard, who said that children needed to learn resourcefulness more than knowledge. They needed to learn to recognize problems before they could begin to solve them. Mearns supported his suggestions and cautions with two examples: (a) "progressive

children have a better understanding of how to use facts,"²¹ and (b) "students who are low in 'school facts' know more about equally important things of the world than their instructors."²² From what Mearns wrote, he was more inclined toward a student-centered curriculum than was Steiner. Both purported to want what was best for the student, but the difference seemed to be that Steiner made the determination and then proceeded to have it taught in a humane, student-centered manner while Mearns appeared to allow and encourage students to develop their own resourcefulness.

Zirbes was also interested in the promotion of independence and responsibility. She suggested one way to promote these traits would be to provide "legitimate social service outlets which would challenge and dignify adolescence."²³ All five educators in this study thought through the individual classroom and school to society beyond. To them education in general and academic discipline in particular was not only in aid of the child but of society as a whole. Zirbes believed as did Dewey that scientific inquiry could be incorporated as a basis for academic studies which could lead to creative and imaginative feeling and forming, again both in and out of the classroom. This followed the lines of Lowell's notion that children need to be resourceful first. An inquiry method could help children to realize the problem exists and lead them toward a solution.

If teachers followed an inquiry method, they would discover that creative teaching could not be reduced to a pattern or formula, to specific know how or set methods. This may have accounted for the fact that none of the five educators in this study left any specific plan to be followed in the classroom. As has been pointed out, they put the child first and therefore academic and school discipline required alterations from class to class. In Guidelines to Developmental Teaching, Zirbes wrote that instruction could fail unless it entered into conceptual behavior. Teachers had to know the children so that they could work to bring the idea behind that which was to be taught to them. Zirbes offered a caution of her own, "There is an urgency because unmet needs of young children complicate later growth, living, and learning."²⁴ For example, Zirbes felt that for children who deviated widely from central tendencies in endowment and achievement--for the gifted and the underachiever--traditional, structured, or rigid educational methods did not work. For these children a creative education was essential. The basis for academic discipline was set and, according to the five educators under study, essential. On this topic they seemed more intense, almost a pleading voice for the child. I will now discuss their understanding of the mind of the child upon which they built the structure of their schools.

Mental

Parker promoted the object method of teaching reading because he believed in the "cultivation of the perceptive faculties before the exercising of reasoning powers."²⁵ To Parker the learner had to understand the idea behind the object, the printed word, or the lesson in order for any of it to make any lasting sense.

Consequently, Parker would have his teachers ask these questions daily:

What particular mental power is developed by this study? What for oral spelling? Is it good for the imagination? Does it enable the child to pass into the unknown? What does it do for the child's perception? Reason? Logic? What has a multiplication table to do with mental growth?²⁶

Even if the teachers did not literally ask these questions daily, at least they had them in mind as they planned their lessons and as they taught. Parker thought that the classroom was one good place where mind met mind. He encouraged interaction among students. Though many of today's teachers would disagree, Parker felt a "class of fifty was none too large. Forty-nine pupils help one--one helps forty-nine."²⁷

Also Parker was a firm believer of the sound body/sound mind school. In 1895 he wrote in an article entitled "The New Department," "All physical training should be concentrated on a healthy, strong, active brain, which means a sound body. The results of physical training should be looked for in the skill of thought-expression."²⁸ All five educators under study believed in combining physical and mental activity. Parker would have taken

his pupils to the farm to learn, but he settled for the school yard and surrounding lands. Dewey and Zirbes had their pupils up and about, in and out of different classrooms all day. Steiner's students built and fashioned articles of wood, clay, and other materials, kept gardens, took part in physical education classes, and practiced eurythmy, a unique combination of poetry and body movement.

To Dewey, thinking was a combination of what was done and its consequences. So learning had to be connected to activity. Dewey connected activity to morals. He argued against the separation of learning from action because it "cuts off the inner disposition and motive--the conscious personal factor--from deeds as if they were purely physical and outer."²⁹ Dewey wanted learning to be accompanied by continuous activities or occupations. He transformed the school into a miniature community where pupils participated in social activities typical both in school activities and community actions. For Dewey the preparation of the individual to serve himself and society was paramount. He called for an end to the old order of education: "no more ancient versus modern language, scientific versus humanistic." He said "education should affect equally the disposition and the power of the individual and his social callings."³⁰ In order to accomplish this, Dewey used inquiry. This was his own riding method of education. Inquiry was primary; it came before the nature of what was known and the nature of the knower. As Lowell said, "See the

problem then discover how to solve it." Dewey explained why it was difficult to implement inquiry as a method of education and way of life. "In inquiry, theory and practice, the universal and the particular are drawn together. Social inquiry is a threat to all who think they have a stake in the going social order exactly as it is."³¹

The methods Dewey fought against promoted memorization, drill, and the separation of learning from activity. He said these approaches promoted negative attitudes toward learning and they were wasteful. The child's mind was dulled by premature, unrelated drill. Time was wasted on format techniques which were important but prevented a more positive introduction into subject matter. He said 60-80% of time in elementary school was drill work--which was meaningless and ineffective--while the time should have been used to introduce more substantial intellectual content. He wanted lessons to harmonize capacity (growth of mind) and experience. Then teachers could determine the effectiveness of these lessons by observing whether they lead the children to resolution. That is, through the process of inquiry did they see the problem and ultimately set out to solve it?

Though his wording differed, Steiner wanted the same sense of direction imparted to his students. He said, "Our highest endeavor must be to develop free human beings who are able of themselves to impart purpose and direction to their lives."³²

Steiner agreed with Parker and Dewey that conceptual knowledge was

obtained by sense observation. Throughout the curriculum of the Waldorf Schools, he encouraged the stimulation and use of the five senses. For example, he emphasized the importance of color in many areas of lessons, not only in art lessons. Both discussion and use of color were carried on throughout the day. But Steiner also believed in a knowledge that was experienced inwardly, independent of the senses. He believed he had this knowledge from his youth, but he rarely spoke of it for fear of misunderstanding or ridicule. In his autobiography, The Story of My Life, he wrote,

My sense assures me of the reality of what is observed so long as I observe it. Not so when I unite myself through ideal spiritual knowledge with beings or events of the spiritual world. Here there enters into the single perception, the direct experience of the status of the thing of which I am aware continuing beyond the duration of the observation. For instance, if one experiences the human ego as the inner being most fundamentally one's own, then one knows in the perceiving experience that his ego was before the life in the physical body and will be after this. What one experiences thus in the ego reveals this directly, just as the rose reveals its redness in the art of our becoming aware.³³

Steiner did not literally or objectively or obviously include or impose his spiritualism in the Waldorf curriculum; nonetheless, its influence must have permeated his thinking and its design.

To Mearns intelligence was the ability to face facts and to recognize distinctions. He wanted his students to "create their own philosophy, to make their own psychology which would lead them to a world of awe, wonder, delight, and patient observation of the

behavior of others and of themselves."³⁴ If this were done carefully, students would become aware of their secret disagreement with the general opinion of those around them. This would be the creative self at work. Of course, Mearns warned to let it out carefully. The curriculum of the school had to be student centered (the child first, the subject second) so that the child would begin to believe in his potentialities. He would be encouraged in his crude attempts at his dormant creative arts. Then with the help of the teacher and his fellow students, he would slowly raise his standards and become more skillful. For example, Mearns wanted his students to become able critics of their own work which should then lead to self-improvement and progress. He wrote,

I do not want students to be concerned with the textbook evaluation of worthies but how to judge the worth of the worthies themselves. Certainly, we know rulers and conquerors are overrated and many classics in literary and graphic arts are kept ³⁵alive solely by artificial pedagogic respiration.

Mearns wanted his students to be able to see the problem. He did not want their minds cluttered with the remembered facts, popular prejudices, and exam data but with meaning. Without it, he warned, they become unhealthy, unthinking animals. In describing students who had been encouraged to find and free their own creativity, he wrote, "Their minds had been freed; they were, consequently, clearer than their more learned elders of the air of the petty prejudice of taste."³⁶

Zirbes continued Mearns' campaign against strict classroom controls on students' behavior and on their thinking. She wrote that there was a need to question the

. . . assumption that continuities of associations with hard taskmasters, autocratic disciplinarians, and coldly efficient devotees of regimentation, repression, and routine are good for children and youth. This negates interactions among peer groups in a free society. Those who put a high faith in such disciplines do not trust themselves to live with youth more freely.³⁷

In her article "Clear the Way for Learning," she compiled lists of conditions which promoted and stultified learning (see next page).

Zirbes concluded that certain methodologies and classroom beliefs such as teacher-imposed control and repression combined with rote, isolated drill work, though practiced in many classrooms, actually blocked learning while student involvement in student-directed inquiry followed by observation and experimentation actually promoted learning.

Integrative

In order to best reach the mind of the child with the basis of academic discipline, Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes all favored an integrated curriculum and opposed separations and divisions of the contents of the disciplines. Parker's theory of concentration unified content into a central subject which conformed to the unity found in nature and was central to the child's experience. Parker explained that since the child's education had actually begun long before he entered school, the

CONDITIONS³⁸

BLOCK LEARNING	FAVOR LEARNING
o anxiety	o security
o immaturity	o confidence
o physical factors	o life relatedness
o individual idiosyncrasies	o active vivid sense experience
o mental confusion	o attitude-insight-skill work together
o deprivations of meager social background	o consideration of learners' needs
o lack of interest	o inquiry
o meaningless rote work	o observation
o isolated learning	o experimentation
o abstractions and generalizations at beginning	o inference
o separate skill from use	o spontaneity
o instructional materials too programmed	
o extrinsic incentive and pressure	
o imposed control	
o répression	

curriculum should be built on what the child had already begun to learn. The central subject should focus on the natural environment of the child. The motivation, then, should be inherent because of the child's natural curiosity about the world around him. So, in pursuit of this interest, inorganic sciences should be studied with the organic sciences since life sciences were dependent upon them. The study of life sciences could be followed from botany to zoology. The study of man, anthropology, was based on the complexities of social relationships which was called ethnology. The study of man's spiritual struggles along with the evolution of chemistry, physics, and physiology was called history, but they were all taught as an organic, inseparable, interdependent unit. Nature had no separate classifications; therefore, its study could not be done in isolated segments. The central subject was also united through the study of form and number which were found in everything in nature. There was also unity in the method of learning which was knowledge acquired through the senses.

Parker believed that the processes of mental and physical learning--the modes of attention and expression--should be developed simultaneously with the central subject. He said one mode can't be taught without the other. For example, reading (attention) and writing (expression) should be taught in coordination with the central subject. Actually, Parker saw this integrative curriculum as an economical use of school time. He

said that "geography without history or art for art's sake is like analysis gone to seed. Such isolation of subjects was the method aristocrats used to keep the people from thinking."³⁹

What Parker was doing was reversing the textbook form of the quest for knowledge which was to proceed from rules and definitions to problems. When he wanted his students to find answers to questions about the earth, he took them out to see it. The children made sketches and mud models of what they saw; and, since the landscapes and sea of Quincy contained most forms of land and water, the "imaginary constructs of the unseen world were better learned through physical surroundings than through the unconnected mass of statistics and facts found in geography books."⁴⁰

Parker said that less emphasis should be placed on the military and political events in the study of history and more on social relationships. Students should realize and understand the prejudice, bigotry, and dogmatism. Students should learn to see the problem. Parker said that history was, at best, a partial record of mankind. It had to be supplemented with ethnology, anthropology, archeology, philosophy, myths, nature studies, and, of course--Parker's favorite--geography. He could even relate psychology to science by having the pupils examine a sheep's brain. Parker would have taught everything from a farm if he could. He also managed to teach geography and reading comprehension techniques such as purpose, relationships, and

comparisons by using the Bible. In May 1869 he lectured at the Sabbath School. He read verses from the Bible and then asked members of the audience to close their books and tell him what facts stuck out in their memories. Then he asked about the positions of Jerusalem and Jericho, the purpose of Jesus' journey, and a comparison of the blind man Bartimaeus and sinners blinded with wickedness.

Parker believed that if lessons consisted of logical premises, sequences, and conclusions, then the thought should evolve logically in a pupil's mind. If that was so, his oral and written expression should be as well. Parker wanted students to be trained into the "highest art of composition" but that, too, was integrative. Students should write often about the subjects they were studying. For example, in geography there were many descriptions to be written: hills, valleys, plains, coastlines, rivers, and springs. For natural science pupils described trees, plants, flowers, vegetation, and animals. In history there were fascinating stories to relate. Parker complained that the "cutting lash of tradition turns the grand study of history into dry, stupid, rote learning of pages, numbers, dates, and meaningless generalizations."⁴¹

Within his integrative curriculum, Parker's favorite was the study--not in textbooks--of geography. To Parker geography was the study of the stage (the earth) and the actors (the people).
The

. . . first work of geography is to build into the mind by means of imagination the stage. To teach by the map alone which does not take the student beyond representation of that which is represented is manifestly wrong. Instead, the first steps in geography should give the child the means to imagine that which he cannot see. Begin with the forms around you. Take the children out into the fields and valleys. Return to the school room. Let them describe orally what they have seen. Mold it and draw it. Describe it in writing. Teach distance by actual measurement-- boundaries by fences, drainage by gutter and the flow of water after a rain. Find springs and discover how water comes out of the ground. Have pupils bring in different kinds of earth: gravel, sand, clay, loam. This will provide practice in the three great means of expression: concrete, drawing, and language.⁴²

In all, Parker deplored the fact that isolated drill in traditional American schools demanded such a large proportion of time.

Like Parker, Dewey deplored the fact that areas of study were taught as isolated bodies of fact. He said that while teachers often evaluate the product (the pupil), they did not do so to their criteria or their procedures. Teachers did not stop and analyze why and how often enough or at all. Also like Parker, Dewey felt that the more the separation and isolation of content, the more elitist the curriculum became. In opposition to that, Dewey and his wife instituted what they called the occupations into the curriculum. Dewey experimented using them as a basis for integrative learning based on the "epistemological thesis that human intellectual life developed in relation to the needs and opportunities for action."⁴³ He began with the basic occupations

for human survival: gardening, cooking, textile work, and carpentry. In 1902 in an article entitled "Interpretation of the Savage Mind," Dewey wrote, "Occupations determine the fundamental modes of activity and hence control the formations and use of habits. 'Apperceptive masses' and associational traits of necessity conform to the dominant activities. The occupations determine the chief modes of satisfaction, the standards of success and failure."⁴⁴

Dewey rationalized the inclusion of the occupations in his curriculum in his lecture for the first course in pedagogy. He said the occupations afforded children the opportunity to relate learning activities of the school with experience outside and to be involved in activities with which they were already familiar. The occupations represented the "fundamental process and instruments by which society has made itself what it is in the subordination of nature to human ends--basic activities that dealt with universal human needs such as food, shelter, and clothing."⁴⁵ These practices allowed children to utilize natural instincts or impulses: constructive, investigative, experimental, social, and expressive. For example, they begin with simple and basic physical coordination and move on to technical skills with tools. Also the children enjoy sharing and communicating their experiences.

In School and Society, Dewey wrote,

The fundamental point in the psychology of an occupation is that it maintains a balance between the intellectual and the practical phases of experience. As an occupation it is active or motor; it finds expression through the physical organs: the eyes, hands, etc. But it also involves continual observation of materials and continued planning and reflection in order that the practical or executive side may be successfully carried on. It differs from a trade because its end is in the growth that comes from the continual interplay of ideas and their embodiment in action, not in external utility.⁴⁶

Dewey maintained a continuum from this first stage of study through the more advanced stages. He continued with the motor-expressive activities and added new materials so that the pupils could understand and feel the conditions they were studying. For example, rather than study history chronologically, Dewey had the children study units that showed the intellectual and technical advances that developed as man took control of his environment--a unit on the exploration of Chicago. They studied the scientific aspects of the colonists' making soap and candles, spinning wheels and looms. These historical aspects were introduced in the first stage so that the children could realize and understand what causes societies to become what they become. Then, their questions--Where does it come from? Where does it go? How does it work?--lead to more and more advanced study.

The six-year olds:	food, fibers, wood, metal as part of cooking, sewing, and carpentry from raw material to finished product farming, weaving, mining, lumbering; analysis of each role played in preparing materials for use
--------------------	---

- The seven-year olds: history of evolutionary development of civilization--investigate occupations from simple origins to present complex state
- imagine how to face hostile environment without civilized conveniences
- innovations and inventions developed in prehistoric times
- The eight-year olds: migration, exploration, discovery
- phoenicians (traders rather than farmers or hunters)
- origins of letters and numbers
- enhancement reading, writing, mathematical skills
- great explorers--Prince Henry the Navigator, Magellan, Marco Polo, Columbus
- The nine/ten-year olds: exploration and conquest of America
- strategic geographical location of Chicago and consequences in lives of inhabitants
- role of fur trade

Whenever possible the mode of these lessons was play--an active, constructive involvement with materials. Dewey had adopted the principle of indirect learning. "Attention is not upon the idea of learning, but upon the accomplishing of a real and intrinsic purpose. Much energy is expended and the child is intent upon the project at hand with no conscious effort or attention."⁴² Two additional points about this course of study are that the faculty made a serious effort to coordinate studies

through the integration of, for example, history and science. The other is that Dewey did not like or use textbooks. He did use biographies, but he feared they left too individual a conception of history. "We need also to know how the social forces were at work and expressing themselves through these individuals."⁴⁸

Steiner also encouraged faculty cohesiveness and discouraged textbook use. Much of the philosophy of Steiner's academic discipline coincided with both Parker and Dewey. They were in favor of active participation by the students in their learning and opposed to rote drill work and memorization of facts in isolation. They also placed student learning on developmental levels of increasing complexity. Of course, there were areas of difference and areas Steiner emphasized. Color, for example, played an important role in the Waldorf curriculum. Steiner was a student of Goethe and in Goethe's study of color which he called *Deeds of Light*. Goethe saw color as movement, gesture, and a dynamic element. Steiner believed that children experience color in a dynamic way, so it should be a part of their classroom experience. In their early paintings the children emphasize color rather than object resemblances. He found that children in early grades are free of adult fears toward drawing and painting. It must be a learned rather than natural fear. Steiner had the children draw not just with their hands and eyes but with their whole bodies. They moved on lines drawn on the floor in order to feel the difference between the flow of curves and the rigidity of straight lines.

The main block lesson which ran about two hours each morning concentrated on stories and drawing to begin and moved on to numbers and nature study, but both were studied in story form whenever possible. In social studies, again through stories, legends, and poems, the children learned about how other people live but in keeping with the theme of learning from experience they learned of others by comparing them with their own lives. Also following an integrative approach each subject connected. For example, in studying the history of the industrial revolution, the role of geography in that revolution was studied. Steiner believed the curriculum should be equally divided into a study of academics and the practical/manual arts. All children in Waldorf Schools studied music beginning with the recorder, foreign language, physical education, fine art and manual training. This was to promote the all-round expansion and individual development of each student in his thinking, feeling, and will and to lend to his maturity. The purpose was that students were able to relate what they learned in school with their own lives.

Mearns believed that creativity was the integrative thread of the school curriculum. He said that since all subjects had a creative side, the student should become an inventor, explorer, interpreter, and an appreciator of fine things. That theme permeated the curricula of the educators in this study. It was never enough for students to learn information. It was always how they reacted to it--whether they appreciated it or disregarded it

--but that they did react and relate to what they learned. There was little point to just learning it. Mearns said that the motivation necessary to learn would arise from the interrelation of subject matter areas in real life situations. In 1946 he wrote in "Creative Education in College" that the "subjects of study should be carried over into your daily life to be used over and over again as instruments of knowledge, interpretation, judgment, and taste."⁴⁹ He criticized teachers for failing to excite their students in learning by being too satisfied with an uncritical reception of what was studied. This perpetuated dependency in students and it ignored the creative aspects to learning. "The history student should become a historian and interpret the data he uncovers. The scientist must make discoveries and rather than merely studying literature--make literature."⁵⁰

Like Parker, Dewey, and Steiner, Mearns would have taken textbooks and examinations out of the schools. To Mearns, literary, dramatic, and graphic arts were the important expressions of man, not learning per se. He wanted education to be a live endeavor. And he recommended using journals to "rescue creative intellectual powers from atrophy."⁵²

Zirbes was opposed to the separation of subjects, opposed to dependence on teachers, textbooks, and examinations, and in favor of a developmental curriculum based on the experiences of the child enhanced with enriching elements. She said it was easier to learn when facts were interrelated and the connections made clear.

Isolating them made them more difficult to learn. She felt that education really only became significant when actual experience made it meaningful. It clarified meaning, developed concepts, encouraged creative expression, inquiry, and social interaction. First hand experience was the carry-over from school to the students' lives.

First hand experience included sensory, tactile, exploratory activities. Through these children learned appreciation and developed an aesthetic sense. Children in a classroom Zirbes visited showed her a lovely ceramic duck they had been given. "Oh, we aren't allowed to touch it." Zirbes said the order must have come from an "officious school bystander."

In the University School at The Ohio State University, students worked on a thematic unit which integrated many disciplines through exploration, information collection, and language experience. Typical units were on how people live, work, and play on a farm (Parker would have liked that one); how and where we get food; what makes things go; communication; the story of the Earth; the ways people live.⁵³ These combined social studies, science, music, math, geography, and art. For example, during a bake sale, the children learned to count and make change. They determined how far the pioneers travelled on the Oregon Trail. They also studied the world close to them--how Columbus protected its people and natural resources and industry in Ohio. Throughout these units and in other areas such as art, music, and

physical education, teachers provided learning opportunities that met the needs of each child at his particular stage of growth. A criticism had been levelled at this element of these schools. Some critics pointed out that the schools in this study were either private or university sponsored which afforded these teachers far greater opportunity for developmental individualization. That was, of course, true. Mearns wanted to experiment in a public school system, but he never found the appropriate opportunity.

Finally, Zirbes preferred the use of textbooks as reference rather than the major source of information. She urged students to read widely from several areas and to look for areas of agreement and disagreement rather than to put too much faith in any single source. While she allowed that textbooks may be necessary in foreign language, algebra, biology, and physics (I can see Parker, Dewey, and Steiner shaking their heads on this), she felt textbooks were only one means to learning.

Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes, though living and teaching at different times and in different places, all believed that stilted, isolated facts thrust upon voiceless children was not the way education should be. They believed, certainly, that there were important facts to be learned. Though their method of learning was sometimes criticized as empty and frivolous, this was actually far from the truth. The content of their curriculum was substantial. From Parker through Zirbes, they developed a strong

curriculum which consisted of science, math, social studies, language arts, foreign language, fine arts, the humanities, physical education, and hand crafts which included wood working and metal working. The difference was that they built the facts upon each other and taught them through the child rather than at him. The how and the why of their teaching was different, not necessarily the what. In fact, they would argue that their students actually learned more.

School Discipline

The academic discipline of their schools was basic, mental, and integrative. The school discipline was motivational. It was the task of the school and the teacher to help the child to want to learn. Parker believed that character and usefulness come first and that knowledge was only one means to that end. He said that character can only be made in freedom and knowledge which does not bear fruit in the service to others is barren knowledge and will sooner or later wither and die.⁵⁴ Parker's school began with daily assemblies during which children were encouraged to come forward and tell some new thing they had learned, so children of all grades had an idea of what others were learning. Parker began the assembly by questioning the children: "What is the great word?" "Responsibility!" "What is our motto?" "Everything to help and nothing to hinder!"⁵⁵

In her book The Quincy Methods, Patridge discussed Parker's philosophy of motivation. First, he believed that power and imagination should be developed in every step of every lesson. After conducting a lesson while the class was sitting on a hill, the teacher told them about the great mountains in the world. When they were gathered on the banks of a river, she told them about the great rivers in the world. She excited their curiosity to solve problems. Where does the water go? What if the earth were level? What's the difference between a river and a canal or a pebble and a grain of sand? Parker said the purpose of teaching that which can be seen and examined was to enable the child to imagine the unseen. When Parker taught the seasons, he marked on the floor the sunbeams. The next day at the same time the children compared the marks and the sunbeam and wondered--which was, of course, what Parker wanted.

Parker had his students study history in order to increase their powers of imagination and deduction. For the younger children, he told stories of the past or had them read easy, interesting history books such as Quackenbos' Elementary History or Mrs. Munroe's Our Country. Then they read biographies. The seventh and eighth graders were ready for salient facts of the history of the country which were arranged so that each fit together. Parker warned against trying to teach too many. He said one fact that aroused a genuine interest and love for history was better than one hundred superficially taught.

Parker complained about what he called drudgery in the classroom. It was a forced action of the mind upon that which is beyond the mental grasp of the child. It was the monotonous use of verbal memory; it was lack of variety. Finally, it was the straining of the mind on disliked subjects with a single motive: applause, rewards, diplomas. The opposite of drudgery in the classroom was real work done on real things that produced tangible results. A key element was that the work was adapted to the child's power to do it. Parker said that every struggle brings success and makes better work possible; it stimulates every activity of the mind and body. Parker warned that while the great outcry was that schools and colleges were to educate children to be above manual labor, what they were really doing was educating them to be below it. The vague, meaningless things the children learn were not adapted to real work.⁵⁶

Dewey decried the anachronistic behavior of some teachers. In math class students were not allowed to use algebra unless it was specifically an algebra class. In chemistry students were not allowed to use the word atom until half way through the term. Dewey would have none of these practices.⁵⁷ Instead, in order to facilitate the growth and the learning of pupils, Dewey suggested building on past experiences, providing relaxing activities, and sequencing the complexity of the material to be learned. As far as Dewey was concerned, traditional recitation was out; direct observation through activities requiring construction and

experimentation were in. Then he wanted teachers to present these activities in such a way that the pupils would feel the need and, therefore, want to learn the traditional skills. For example, teachers should make reading and writing more intellectual than mechanical. The actual studying of skills should be alternated with substantial study.⁵⁸

To Dewey, the ideal teacher studied the children in order to determine their capabilities in terms of psychological principles and competence in the subject matter. In his laboratory school at the University of Chicago, they tried self-contained classrooms, but Dewey was not satisfied because teachers could not know enough about all subjects. Mayhew wrote in her book The Dewey School that Dewey worried that

. . . superficial work is bound to be done in some of them, and the child, through not having a model of expert workmanship to follow, acquires careless and imperfect methods of work. Intellectual integrity and continuity in the treatment of subject matter seemed the greater⁵⁹ benefit than the hovering care of one person.

Dewey wanted to use the schools to promote democratic cooperation that would destroy class distinction. He hoped that he could help children see that as men in history had faced more complex challenges, they developed more effective social cooperation and more social institutions. He wanted to see this continue, and he saw the schools as the avenue toward such change, just as Emil Mott did in Stuttgart when he approached Steiner. Dewey criticized education's emphasis on symbols of

knowledge. He said education didn't use positive, first-hand contact with experience. Instead, it taught children to accept the accepted social pattern and not to criticize and reconstruct social life. He said, "Too much attention is paid to the acquisition of knowledge and too little to the development of responsiveness and sharing in common and pleasurable tasks."⁶⁰

Mott, an entrepreneur in post World War I Germany, feared a breakdown in the social and economic life. He believed it could not be healed by changing governments and simply substituting political systems. A fundamental cultural renewal was necessary. Mott believed it possible only through education, so he appealed to Steiner to establish a school for his workers and for their children. The motivation in the Waldorf Schools was that the curriculum was designed to consider not only intellectual but social and practical/artistic aspects which will promote perception, recognition, and consideration.⁶¹ Steiner considered the all-round expansion and individual development of each student in his thinking, feeling, and developing maturity. He wanted them to relate what they learned about the nature of the life of humanity to their own existence. Steiner wrote, "If one bears in mind the well being and inner development of the child, one will find the right way of acting pedagogically."⁶² In order to do this, he believed that teachers have to be extremely well versed in what and how they teach. Steiner believed that if a teacher mastered the material, he could teach in three to four lessons

what might otherwise take half a year. He said that "no school really succeeds in imparting so much knowledge, but this fact is generally ignored. One merely pretends that the present system is working and the curricula are set accordingly."⁶³ As stated previously, Steiner thought the teacher should prepare two to three hours for each half hour teaching.

The aim was to teach within the shortest time the maximum amount of content within the simplest means possible. In the Waldorf Schools, the curriculum went beyond science, math, language arts, and social studies to include foreign language (both Latin and Greek), music theory and appreciation, eurythmy, hand work, printing, physics, geology, minerology, astronomy, nature studies, and physical education. From his tutoring, Steiner learned to teach well and efficiently by knowing the subject so well that he could explain it substantially yet economically. Steiner wanted students to "know themselves and to have the confidence and inspiration to pursue the quest for knowledge, which is, after all, the only real business of man."⁶⁴ His motto, which Parker, Dewey, Mearns, and Zirbes, could have had as their own, was, "Waldorf children do not do what they like, but are so taught that they learn to enjoy what they do." He believed it was important to avoid stress on the student's mind and soul, not to let him feel a lesson was too difficult, but to make him want to move on to the next step. He cautioned against the strain

put on children-- "If one presents content which is unsuitable for the students, it makes them want to jump out of their skins."⁶⁵

Just a few years later, Mearns wrote an article entitled "Discipline and the Free Spirit." In it he said,

It is always the other fellow's spirit which we wish to see broken and usually for some personal gain to ourselves. To some, good behavior means silence, immobility, unthinking obedience. Discipline is a necessary restraint upon behavior for some specific good purpose. It can be good for the individual and good for the social group. Discipline without a clear purpose is suspicious.⁶⁶

Mearns liked to tell the story of teaching his first class. The word physiology was in the curriculum. He pronounced it before the class and said, "I don't believe I could even spell it." Well, the class laughed. Then a teacher walked in and asked if there were any trouble. She thought there was because she heard laughter. Mearns said that in those days some children were whipped at home for low conduct marks. So he told his class he would give them the best marks in conduct that he could. He had the best behaved students in the school. Years later in "Every Child Has a Gift," he wrote, "To bring out the best in a child you must be on his side as a defender against adult imposed customs aimed at suppressing his good natural instincts."⁶⁷ Mearns pointed out that some teachers demand behavior from children that they would never be able to maintain themselves.

Mearns certainly did not advocate chaos. He realized the need for control and discipline. He wanted to be certain the students

did also. He wanted the disciplined environment to be both imposed and self imposed. He said, "Nothing in all of a teacher's art can equal the potent effect of student peers."⁶⁸ In Mearns' classes students shared in the responsibility and initiative in planning. This did not come easily for the students or the teacher, but the results were worthwhile. Mearns was pleased with the increased maturity of his student planners as the year progressed.

When asked how he prevented chaos without the rigidity of the formal classroom, Mearns had many suggestions. The first was to "take the class with you by sheer dramatic power." When Mearns read a piece of literature to his class, there was never any doubt how moved he was by the writing. And there were never any disruptive students afoot during the reading. Another suggestion was "a sudden change of subject is always a good trick." If classes are too predictable, students can too easily predict what trouble to cause and even exactly where to cause it. Finally, Mearns offered, "When in trouble with children, tell the truth." As Steiner believed, there is nothing a child detects more quickly than the hypocrisy of an adult lying in a situation where the child is expected to be truthful.

Zirbes' response to ways to prevent classroom chaos was to enlist and encourage pupils' purposes. She promoted having students set their own purposes, and she was rewarded by observing student growth. She also suggested many discipline problems were

due to a cultural and social adjustment lag. She described it as a "melting pot" tradition that divides the generations.⁶⁹ Zirbes suggested that when students misbehave, the teacher should analyze why. Is the material boring? Are the lessons too long? Are the students working at the appropriate level?

Zirbes felt that if students set purposes and could see results before their levels of endurance and interest were reached, the classroom would be a success--"reach the highest pitch and lead most surely to success."⁷⁰ She believed that intrinsic motivation was essential to self-development, morale, and self-realization. This led to cooperation and satisfaction with group work which, in turn, led to social aspiration and identification. Zirbes warned that if a child did not feel accepted, a social feeling did not develop. Instead, the child felt excluded, unwanted, and rejected. If that continued, aspirations became anti-social and the child found solace through identification with other anti-social children.⁷¹ She also complained about grades which she called extrinsic motivation. "This practice destroys abiding interest and the integrity of expression."⁷² These were the things that Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes felt important in the motivation of students. First and foremost was the student. Second was what was important for the student to learn and how to best make it available. They believed that motivation was easily found when students saw the purpose behind the task. In fact, the task was no longer work.

In the final selection of Chapter IV, I will describe some of the actual behavioral discipline in the schools of Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes. First, Parker said much disobedience in schools was due to over-nervousness and animal spirits which he suggested may be cured by physical exercise and manual training. In 1885 he predicted that the "day is not too distant when scientists in physiological psychology and child study will have prominent places in every normal school so that trained graduates may come into work armed and equipped in this direction."⁷³

Parker questioned his teachers: Did you see it? Do you know it? Have you used it? No imitation credited and no pretense tolerated! "We must see, feel, and experience for ourselves if we would speak with authority to little children."⁷⁴ Parker once tricked a class of prospective teachers at Cook County Normal School. He threw out several literary titles and asked if anyone had read the works. The students, probably supposing that teachers should have read them, said they had. Parker plied them with questions about the works they couldn't answer. Then, in a more kindly manner, explained the importance of not pretending to know more than they did, especially in front of students. His point was that students behaved better for teachers they respected. The teacher had to have authority in order to speak with it in order to maintain it in the classroom.

Influenced by his study in Germany, Parker introduced features of kindergarten: songs and plays, blocks and colored sticks,

freedom of movement, and shortened lessons to avoid weariness. He believed the first years of school fix the whole future course in education. He wanted to make the school into a "pleasant, cheerful home where little folks play, sing, read, count objects, write, draw, and are happy."⁷⁵ His notion was that if students began school in an enjoyable situation, both the theme and the mood might penetrate and continue through the ensuring years.

The following illuminating article in a Boston-area paper called The Tribune on Thursday, January 8, 1880.

The discipline of the Quincy schools, as explained by Mr. Slade, of the Committee rather astonishes the teachers used to the old mechanical methods. "But," says an old teacher sitting upon the platform who is visiting the Quincy schools to find out what under the sun it is that people are talking about and newspapers discussing, "this is very noisy." "Precisely, madam, this is a workshop, not a funeral. You can't have a beehive without a buzz." "And," continues the critic, "that little boy in the plaid jacket whispered to the little girl in white." "Quite likely, madam; we can readily find an excuse for bright-eyed, curly-headed, rosy-cheeked little boys who will whisper to little girls in white. We once had a tendency in that direction ourselves, and we do not see any occasion for pounding him or shaking him, or standing him in the corner, or putting him in a dark closet, or even appearing to notice it at all." Teachers make a great advance in government when they learn how not to see."⁷⁶

Mearns would have enjoyed that story. Apparently, when the article was brought to his attention, Parker wrote on it--"Kind of The Tribune to give us these little suggestions (referring to the last sentence) which are quite novel." Despite his unorthodox methods, Parker was deemed effective because he passed the

educator's ultimate test: "Observers marveled that not a scratch was visible on the children's desks."⁷⁷

Dewey believed that motivation came from giving students life-related activities. Connect what students should learn to the world around them and teach them in such a way that they are actively involved. They should be doing what they are learning. One of his interests was manual training--not for the purpose of giving pupils greater manual skill or improving their chances to get a job or becoming more efficient on the job. Dewey was interested because he believed that through participation in industry students can gain a better understanding of the meaning of science and the constitution of social organisms. In the old days when most industry was carried on in the neighborhoods or households, children learned through participation and observation. Eventually, children were sent to school for "book learning" and this neighborhood-style education faded. Dewey predicted manual training in the schools would fail if it were taught as a separate entity. He said,

We must conceive of work in wood and metal, of weaving, sewing, and cooking, as methods of living and learning, not as distinct studies. We must conceive of them in their social significance, as types of processes by which society keeps itself going, as agencies for bringing home to the child some of the primal necessities of community life, and as ways in which these needs have been met by the growing insight and ingenuity of man; in short as instrumentalities through which school itself shall be made a genuine form of active community life, instead of a place set apart in which to learn lessons."⁷⁸

So Dewey taught history and science and the constitution of social organisms by having students retrace the steps of the evolution of the industrial processes. For example, they picked cotton from a boll, carded and spun it into thread, and wove it into cloth. So they learned history by actively repeating history, not by repeating the verbal version of history. Dewey wanted children to learn the history of the human race, not the history of a chosen people such as the stages of European civilization.

Dewey's students also learned history from stories which led to biographies which ultimately led to discussions of more specialized, political institutions and governmental forms--beginning with Rome and moving chronologically. In 1903 in an article entitled "The Place of Industries in Elementary Education," Dewey wrote, "Every advance in civilization widens the distance between the immaturity of the child and the comprehensive, complex, remote, and subtle conditions he needs to master."⁷⁹

In Steiner's school motivation seemed almost natural because the child was at the center of all thinking, planning and doing. All lessons and all activities were conceived and developed for the child, although not by the child. The day centered around the child. The teacher, for example, stood at the classroom door and greeted each child. They began the day with music and song. The entire class worked together rhythmically. "There is a decided effort to move from one moment to another through ceremonial and ritual procedures rather than mechanical steps alone."⁸⁰

The teachers were very well prepared again with the child in mind. In the elementary school the teachers remained with the same class for eight years if possible, if not at least three. This was to provide continuity and allow the teacher and the children to become thoroughly acquainted with each other. Then, since the teachers were so well versed in what they were to teach, their interest and power were transmitted through the lessons to their students. One of the goals was that a Waldorf teacher, for example, would never read a poem to her students; she would know it by heart. When Steiner began the Waldorf Schools, he hired artisans and craftsmen as teachers rather than state certified educators. Here, again, the belief was that if the teacher knew his subject full well and were able to convey that knowledge and understanding along with a large degree of enthusiasm, the students were bound to pay more attention to what they were learning than to any disruptive behaviors.

Mearns believed democracy could be taught through democratic behavior. Further, he believed every child had a gift but that he must use it or lose it. As a creative artist, the child must direct and control himself. In Mearns' classroom at the Lincoln School, his students were wild at the beginning because it was difficult for them to understand both individual freedom and social control. Order was eventually gained through the student council and group discussions patterned after town meetings which brought about student understanding of the individual sacrifice that must accompany social order.

In "Discipline and the Free Spirit," Mearns wrote

It is always the other fellow's spirit which we wish to see broken, and usually for some personal gain to ourselves. Good behavior [in the schools] is taken as silence, immobility, and unthinking obedience. A good disciplinarian is one who succeeds in having maximum personal comfort in the classroom. Discipline is the necessary restraint upon behavior for some specific good purpose. It is good for the individual and for the social group. But discipline without clear purpose is suspicious."⁸¹

The answer, Mearns felt, was in self-mastery. Children should be taught self-discipline for some understandable worthy end. He wrote,

Discipline means the voluntary surrender of something personal for the sake of an eventual greater personal gain. Submission relieves us of the pressure of the world. Children can learn to outwardly obey the will of another while inwardly being free, unsuspected, and at peace. They must learn control which is the essence of self-mastery."⁸³

Mearns also believed that learning would come easier and last longer through self-mastery. He said that coercion which appealed to fear was ineffective, harmful, and unnecessary. Self-mastery developed where authority was supreme but never arbitrary--where discussion and compromise were standard. He wrote, "Children hate injustice and hypocrisy. 'A Compulsory Study on the Dangers of Compulsion.' Think of it. Adults are like that. 'Training for the World.' That has been the excuse for every inequity practiced upon childhood from child labor in the coal mines to compulsory trigonometry for girls."⁸⁴ Parker was called "The Children's

Champion." In areas of Mearns' writing, another "children's champion" seemed to have surfaced.

Zirbes wrote in two interesting areas: research on discipline for freedom and freedom in the classroom. Parker didn't have a research base to support his conclusions, but he knew one day there would be such specific attention paid to educational issues. What Zirbes reported from her research supported the beliefs of Parker, Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns. Behavior that was "intimidating, penalizing, allocating blame, administering punishment, exacting unquestioning submissive compliance, suspicious, mistrustful, vindictive, stern, firm aloofness causes neuroses and insecurity and is not compatible with the personal integrity or values a free society guarantees and fosters."⁸⁵ She found that the research did not support any of these behaviors. Instead, while there must be discipline it should be

. . . helpful and friendly, foster wholesome attitudes and adjustments, initiative, choice, and self-discipline. It should be concerned with human values, foster morale, cultivate social rapport, carry over to improve living and take into account human drives, aspirations, social pressure, and tension.⁸⁶

Zirbes was also in favor of discipline that led to self-discipline, self-direction, and self-mastery but she knew coercion was not the course.

She responded to critics by explaining what freedom in the classroom did not mean. First of all, children may not simply do as they please despite the notion that in child-centered schools

that was precisely what they did. Second, there was no unrestricted individual liberty for each child. The teacher did not abdicate the position of authority. Fourth, there was no lowering of standards of order for group conduct. However, the discipline remained and was understood, accepted, and maintained by all. Zirbes explained,

Children cannot learn to recognize, face, and respect inherent limitations which situations legitimately put upon their freedom when they are systematically confused and thwarted by arbitrary and irrelevant limitations. When, in order to cure tardiness, we harass children in ways that produce tears, engender feelings of disgrace and fear, we do more harm than good. We cannot hope to stimulate constructive effort and responsible self-respect⁸⁷ by sarcasm, nagging, and harping criticism.

This was the kind of behavior, of education methodology that Parker led the battle against in the 1850s, Zirbes continued in the 1950s, and Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns combatted in the intervening years. They believed that children could become, with help and direction, self-disciplined and self-motivated. This then should make learning easier and longer lasting. They discovered that when children had an interest in and understood why they were doing what they were doing, the rest took care of itself. To these five educators academic and school discipline were automatically integrative. The two had to be connected. It was the basis of a child-centered school. The tenets remained the same, beginning with Parker but, hopefully, not ending with Zirbes. There were basic elements within academic discipline

which needed to be learned, and there was a progression from basics to more complex material. The interaction of academic and school disciplines was the developmental, integrative approach to learning what there was to be learned--no matter what it was. They discovered where the child was and where he had been. They began where he was and built on where he had been. The standards were not lower in a child-centered school; they were different. They were demanding both academically and behaviorally, but they considered everyone involved--including the children. Mearns explained, "We have sought our own comfort and called it discipline. We demanded behavior of children we would never demand of ourselves. Our thinking has been slovenly and selfish."⁸⁸ Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes worked to correct that situation.

Notes

¹Harold Rugg & Ann Shumaker, The Child-Centered School (New York: World Book Company, 1928):37.

²K. C. Mayhew & A. C. Edwards, The Dewey School (New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1936):71.

³Ibid, 94.

⁴Arthur G. Wirth, John Dewey as Educator (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966):114.

⁵John Dewey, "The Psychological Aspects of the School Curriculum," Educational Review 13(1897):359.

⁶Wirth, 61.

⁷Ibid., 62.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ernest C. Moore, "John Dewey's Contribution to Educational Theory," School and Society 31(1930):46.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (New Jersey: Pageant Books, Inc., 1959):529.

¹³John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916):160.

¹⁴Henry Barnes, "An Introduction to Waldorf Education," Teachers College Record 81(1980):325.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Hope Jenson Leichter, "A Note on Time and Education," Teachers College Record 81(1980):361.

¹⁷Hughes Mearns, Creative Youth (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Company, Inc., 1925):64.

¹⁸Hughes Mearns, Creative Power (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Company, Inc., 1930):9.

- ¹⁹ Ibid., 78.
- ²⁰ Ibid., 63.
- ²¹ Henry C. Fenn, "And What About Visitors?" Progressive Education 14(1937):175.
- ²² Mearns, Creative Power, 8.
- ²³ Laura Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959):72.
- ²⁴ Laura Zirbes, Guidelines to Developmental Teaching (Columbus: The Teaching Aids Laboratory of The Ohio State University, 1959):17.
- ²⁵ Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, A History of the University of Chicago (Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1916):47.
- ²⁶ Flora J. Cooke, "The Social Philosophy of Francis W. Parker," Progressive Education 14(1937):382.
- ²⁷ Francis W.. Parker, "Discussion of W. P. Search's 'Individualism in Mass Education,'" Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1895):408.
- ²⁸ Francis W. Parker, "The New Department," The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1895):408.
- ²⁹ Dewey, Democracy and Education, 101.
- ³⁰ John Dewey, "Current Problems in Secondary Education," The School Review ():23.
- ³¹ Jay Williams, "Dewey and the Idea of a Science of Education," The School Review (1959):188.
- ³² Barnes, "An Introduction to Waldorf Education," 325.
- ³³ Rudolf Steiner, The Story of My Life (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1954):235.
- ³⁴ Hughes Mearns, "Creative Education in College," Progressive Education 23(1946):269.
- ³⁵ Ibid., 279.
- ³⁶ Mearns, Creative Youth, 20.

- ³⁷Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching, 69.
- ³⁸Laura Zirbes, "Clear the Way for Learning," National Education Association Journal 40(1951):349.
- ³⁹Jack Campbell, The Children's Crusader (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1967):133.
- ⁴⁰Ibid., 82.
- ⁴¹Lelia Patridge, The Quincy Methods (New York: E.L. Kellogg & Co., 1889):90.
- ⁴²Ibid., 128.
- ⁴³Wirth, 127.
- ⁴⁴John Dewey, "Interpretation of the Savage Mind," Psychology Review (1902):219-220.
- ⁴⁵Wirth, 131.
- ⁴⁶John Dewey, School and Society (Chicago: University Press, 1953):131-132.
- ⁴⁷Wirth, 139.
- ⁴⁸Ibid., 144.
- ⁴⁹Mearns, "Creative Education in College," 269.
- ⁵⁰Ibid., 268.
- ⁵¹Fenn, 176.
- ⁵²Hughes Mearns, "What Do You Think?" Scholastic Magazine (1939):6.
- ⁵³Herbert L. Coon. A Handbook for University School Parents (Columbus: University Press, The Ohio State University, 1954):20.
- ⁵⁴Campbell, 32.
- ⁵⁵Helen M. Hefferan, "Colonel Francis Wayland Parker," Chicago Schools Journal (1936):7.
- ⁵⁶Patridge, 129-180.
- ⁵⁷Edwin E. Slosson, "John Dewey: Teacher of Teachers," The Independent 89(1917):542.

- ⁵⁸Wirth, 108.
- ⁵⁹Mayhew, 16.
- ⁶⁰Curti, 522.
- ⁶¹George Rist and Peter Schneider, Integrating Vocational and General Education: A rudolf Steiner School, 40.
- ⁶²Rist, 137.
- ⁶³Ibid., 123.
- ⁶⁴Alan Howard, "Education and Our Human Future," Teachers College Record 81(1980):343.
- ⁶⁵Rudolf Steiner, Soul Economy and Waldorf Education (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1986):130.
- ⁶⁶Hughes Mearns, "Discipline and the Free Spirit," Progressive Education 8(1931):634.
- ⁶⁷Hughes Mearns, "Every Child Has a Gift," The Reader's Digest (1952):21.
- ⁶⁸Mearns, Creative Youth, 91.
- ⁶⁹Laura Zirbes, "The Contribution of Research Toward Discipline for Freedom," Childhood Education 27(1951):226.
- ⁷⁰Laura Zirbes, "Priorities in Childhood Education," Progressive Education 20(1943):105.
- ⁷¹Zirbes, Guidelines to Developmental Teaching, 72.
- ⁷²Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching, 140.
- ⁷³Francis W. Parker, "Application of Child Study in the School," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1885):426.
- ⁷⁴Harry G. Good and James D. Teller, A History of American Education (New York: Macmillan Co., 1956):61.
- ⁷⁵Campbell, 81.
- ⁷⁶The Tribune, January 8, 1880, from the collection of the University of Chicago Libraries.
- ⁷⁷Campbell, 56.

⁷⁸Slosson, 542.

⁷⁹John Dewey, "The Place of Industries in Elementary Education," Elementary School Journal (1903):727.

⁸⁰Leichter, 367.

⁸¹Mearns, "Discipline and the Free Spirit," 634.

⁸²Ibid., 635.

⁸³Ibid., 636.

⁸⁴Ibid., 639.

⁸⁵Zirbes, "The Contribution of Research Toward Discipline for Freedom," 225.

⁸⁶Ibid., 228.

⁸⁷Laura Zirbes, "What Is 'Freedom' in the Classroom?" Progressive Education, 11(1934):384.

⁸⁸Mearns, "Discipline and the Free Spirit," 640.

CHAPTER V

STRUCTURE: HISTORY, PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION

The structure of the schools in this study encompassed buildings and people, curriculum and materials, ideals and goals, frustrations, disappointments, and successes. The number of blockades encountered was amazing considering the humble, well-intended pursuits of these five educators. After a successful military career and a triumphant reign in Quincy, Parker was definitely back on the battlefield while at the helm of the Cook County Normal School. Dewey and his wife resigned with resentment from the University of Chicago. Steiner's monument to Goethe and center for study was destroyed by arsonists. Hitler closed the Waldorf Schools (or at least forced them underground). After spending several years on development, Zirbes was denied the directorship of the laboratory school of the Ohio State University. But they never stopped their endeavor to provide the best education possible with children as the central focus.

I have divided this chapter into three sections: History, Purpose, and Organization. Dewey was the most prolific writer on the subject of the structure of the schools, though Parker and

Zirbes did not lag behind. Parker and Dewey lived it and wrote more than the others on the history of the schools. Mearns and Zirbes actually wrote very little on the historical point of view. Nearly half of Dewey's writing on structure was on the purpose of the structure of these child-centered schools. All of the explanations of purpose were cogent and logical and certainly answerable to their many critics. The others spent well over half of their writings on structure--that is, the literal make-up of the schools.

History

In the old days, as Foster reported in Francis Wayland Parker: His Life and Educational Reform, "Anyone who could keep school was a good teacher. And the schools were kept but the children were not taught. The system necessarily killed ambition and rendered stagnate any impulse for higher things."¹ The state normal schools were first established in 1839 by agricultural people in order to train teachers for their children. This was similar to the Waldorf Schools established in 1919 for the children of Mott's factory workers. Education was beginning to progress from a post-Civil War trend of authoritarian, standardized, precise, clocklike, routinized, aristocratic schools. The most obvious change was in awareness of child development, learner independence, and school reform. Between 1865 and 1885, ten times as many English language books on education were published as ever

before. Colleges and universities were founding chairs of pedagogics recognizing education as a science and teaching as an art.² Perhaps education changed because it was forced. Two groups emerged fighting over the schools: those who favored the status quo and those reformers who wanted schools to interact with society. Historically, public elementary schools had been for the poor--to attempt to teach them the three Rs. Those formal high schools that existed were preparatory to college. The problem then was to adjust the schools to meet the needs of all their students. Parker had studied and observed the German schools, and he found them to be very good schools, but they were not schools for all society's children or common schools. In 1894 Parker wrote, "Common schools were born of democracy, cultured and supported by democracy, and its future is founded upon the growth of democracy."³ Parker wanted a national normal school but not a common course of study. Earlier he had communicated, "Teaching is a business now; when it becomes an art it will attract great minds."⁴

In 1864 when Parker returned to Manchester the organization of the schools was ungraded and partially graded. The districts were small. Primary grades began with four-year olds. In two years the prerequisites were supposedly mastered. There was an intermediate level for those who couldn't attend regularly and children with mental and physical handicaps. The grammar school was four years. And the high school was either classical which

was college preparatory or English which was for terminal students. In 1865 Parker became the principal of North Grammar School in Manchester. He was very strict on discipline, and he ranked the students on attendance, deportment, and scholarship. He increased the time spent on physical education, good order, and morale.

In 1868 he moved to Dayton, Ohio, where two of out every three children were not in school. Parker's challenge was to make the schools serve the needs and interests of all classes of the community. Parker left Dayton for a sabbatical in Germany; and when he returned, he took the post of superintendent of the Quincy, Massachusetts, schools. There he realized the need for a common, continuous systematic plan for all the schools. He was appalled by what he observed. Children came to school after five or six years of vigorous development in nature's great methods, object teaching, and playing only to find their imagination, curiosity, and love for mental and physical activity destroyed by dull, wearisome hours of listless activity upon hard benches. He found children mouthing words mechanically, without understanding the ideas they represented. He instituted many successful changes before moving on to the Boston schools and then to Cook County Normal School--a school he grew to love the best, yet the one over which he fought the biggest battles.

Parker's rationale for moving from Quincy was always to go where he could in order to reach and help the most children. The

problems at CCNS began over budgetary matters and moved to philosophical educational differences between essentially two groups: the Parkerites and the enemies of the Parkerites. One trick from the enemy camp was unannounced, secretive testing of students--both regular and "slow" (mentally handicapped)--and the slanted newspaper publication of the results. Parker and his followers would fight back and invariably Parker's contract would be grudgingly extended for one more year. Eventually, Parker's school united with Dewey's, and both men went on their separate ways.

Dewey had his opportunity to test his ideas about children, classrooms, teaching strategies, and teacher training when he opened the laboratory school of the University of Chicago in 1896. He, too, was very successful and had devoted teachers and followers. His reputation was growing and perhaps due to his presence, both physically and personally--he appeared mild-mannered and he didn't automatically ruffle so many feathers as did Parker. His major battle arena was in the area of budget. As Parker found a financial friend in Mrs. Emmon Blaine, Dewey's economic mainstays during those early lab school days were William Kent and Charles R. Crane. They had inherited both wealth and social consciences. They were "authentic upper class liberals of the turn of the century who not only sent their children to the Dewey School, but also contributed generously, canvassed their friends for funds to tide it over, and fought when its existence

was threatened."⁵ Dewey didn't remain long after the Parker school and his were combined. There were faculty problems and political pursuits that he no longer cared to suffer. He moved to Columbia University where he began to speak and write from a more global platform. There was a brief mention of his use of the Lincoln School (where Mearns did much of his early work) to develop new theories and see how they work. "He wallowed in dramatic and artistic play until the play way became too exhausting for teachers."⁶

The pre-World War I progressive movement saw the schools as a lever of social change. The post war progressive schools recognized that each individual had uniquely creative potentialities. These were schools in which "children were encouraged freely to develop these potentialities as the best guarantees of a larger society truly devoted to human worth and excellence."⁷ In the 1920s the movement was a creative revolution which Dewey saw as the central connection to democracy. It stood for freedom, child interest, pupil initiative, creative self-expression, and personality development. The fight was against standardization, superficiality, and the commercialism of an industrial civilization. Dewey continued to be interested but was gradually becoming a critic. By 1926 he attacked the lack of adult guidance in these "avant garde schools . . . such a method is really stupid for it attempts the impossible which is always stupid and it misconceives the conditions of independent

thinking."⁸ Dewey continued to believe in a child-centered school, but some educators and schools had gone too far denigrating even the term progressive. Some schools had gone from one extreme to another. They had gone from fear-induced, mindless, rote, drill, seat work to total so-called freedom and degrees of chaos. Unfortunately, some led their classrooms to these new reforms in Dewey's name, and ultimately he was forced to speak out against them.

The post-world war period in Germany had brought a breakdown in the social and economic life. Mott and other reformers believed it was too late for any productive governmental change. They felt that the only avenue of hope was through education. Steiner's Waldorf Schools were viewed as an avenue for a fundamental cultural renewal. In the beginning Steiner had no budgetary problems. His discord developed from the ruling classes who saw too much education for the workers as a danger and from those groups who disagreed with or didn't understand Steiner's anthroposophical movement. Some actually feared the movement and worked toward Steiner's downfall. However, a few years after the successful institution of the Waldorf Schools, they went public and enrolled over a thousand students. Waldorf Schools were opened in Switzerland, Holland, England, Austria, Hungary, Norway, and Scotland. In 1928, Waldorf education came to America. This was three years after Steiner's death but he had been involved in much of the planning. In 1933 the Nazi party began harassing the

Waldorf Schools in Germany, and in 1938 the government closed them. The published reason was that the purpose of education was to develop citizens for the state, not to develop individuals who could think for themselves. Steiner said, "Our highest endeavor must be to develop free human beings who are able of themselves to impart purpose and direction to their lives."⁹

Writing in 1930, Mearns described the progressive movement as a revolt by parents against exclusive schools still teaching outdated content. The new schools were called Country Day, Park, and Experimental Schools. Mearns quoted Eugene Randolph Smith, the headmaster of Beaver Country Day in Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts.

Progressive education is a state of mind satisfied with nothing less than the best and keeps in touch with the development of educational experimentation, investigation, and philosophy, adopting for its own use such changes as seem sound, and contributing its own initiative where it can.¹⁰

In Mearns' era and indeed in many others, grammar schools were judged on the number of students who passed the high school entrance exam. Some schools were actually glad when weak students dropped out as it, at least temporarily, raised the schools' ratings. The students were not actually learning--they were cramming for the entrance exams. In the high school, the curriculum didn't allow for anything that didn't relate to the college entrance examination. The conditions seemed to have returned, provided they ever left, to the ones discovered by

Charles Adams, Jr., in the Quincy Schools prior to the arrival of F. W. Parker. Though Dewey favored manual training--not to prepare a particular group of students for their lives' work but for a more well-rounded curriculum, the schools were afraid its inclusion would lower standards. In "The High School and the 'Standard,'" Mearns quoted the author of a Latin textbook, "Put the screws on early to sift out the unfit."¹¹

Mearns spent a number of years and wrote two of his most important educational works at the Lincoln School which was founded in 1917 by the general education board with Rockefeller funds for educational experimentation. The Horace Mann School had been founded in 1887. It was taken over by Teachers' College in 1891. In 1940 Teachers' College merged the Horace Mann and Lincoln Schools despite a law suit. The court ruled that "as long as the general intent of the original grant was fulfilled [the merger could proceed]."¹² In February, 1946, both the Horace Mann and Lincoln Schools were dropped because of the deficit they were creating. "It was a private school, valuable for educational experiments and observations of methods, but Teachers' College's main interest was in the public schools."¹³

While at the Lincoln School, Harold Ordway Rugg measured and charted the abilities of every child there. He called it "salvation through fact finding."¹⁴ The school became identified with technocracy. Some questioned whether these experiments--Mearns' creativity, for example--would work in the

public schools. They called them "those dreamers from Teachers' College and especially from Lincoln School."¹⁵ As a matter of fact, they were trying to analyze if these methods would work in the real world. They (Mearns included) were hoping some public school would let them try it out. However, that never did take place.

In her book Spurs to Creative Teaching, published in 1959, Zirbes wrote that education borrowed the military autocratic methods of mass control; from factory production the emphasis on product and training for a specific task; from big business the socially disintegrative and exploitive motives that give more power to captains; from modern merchandising and marketing grading, marking, sorting, and labeling for ready handling and segregating of inferior from superior; and from medicine remediation over prevention. On larger school effect, she said that herding led to a mob spirit. It submerged individuality and initiative. The size of the schools forced conditions which demanded mechanized dismissal and regulation by bells. A police state existed rather than the development of sounder modes of social control.¹⁶

Earlier in 1934 she wrote in an article entitled "What Is Freedom in the Classroom?" that another poor practice of the schools was the "disregard for individual differences and choice by a fore-ordained curriculum that causes docile fellowship, stifles thought and inquiry, is determined to fix habits and skills, and exaggerates an emphasis on imparting knowledge."¹⁷

Zirbes recognized the inherent difficulties in reform. She realized that for every time schools make a change, someone or group complains that things aren't the way they were when they were in school: ". . . few windows to large windows to covered windows (she wrote in 1955, and they covered them up again in the late 1970s) . . . unsanitary conditions to sanitary to chemicals. She also credited the curriculum of the schools as being too reliant on the regimented European curriculum. Education, she said, should never stand still or ever assume there is no room for improvement. And definitely not stand for the assumption that schools were better in the old days. A talk with Parker would end that notion. Instead Zirbes echoed Dewey when she called for "functional approaches through direct experiences in an expanding social environment."¹⁸

Zirbes began working on the laboratory school of The Ohio State University in 1929. Elementary education was not enjoying a grand season. There were few state standards. Most teachers graduated from normal schools. Then the depression closed the kindergartens. Teacher education courses at the university were made optional when most professors refused to change. Then as new professors were hired, cooperation aided in the development of new courses of study. They received a legislative grant for a teacher training program and an eight-week elementary summer school program in a public school building near campus blossomed with Zirbes as the director. It became a laboratory for the study of

the practical implications of progressive theory. Next step was to offer three classes at the university during the school year and another summer session. Finally, the elementary laboratory school became an independent program. So Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes were each reformers in their own right. Each of them had been avid but critical students of education in their youth, and each eventually found an opportunity to develop structural and curricular changes that might eventually have an impact on the educational community. An interesting point is that their individual opportunities spanned 100 years. Each did, in fact, implement change--similar changes.

Purpose

The five educators under study had an easier time defining the purpose of the structure of their schools than they did actually describing a definitive structure for followers to latch on to and that was their intent. Since they all believed the only way to really learn was to do, they realized that future teachers could not learn by reading their words on the specific things to do, but by the ideas behind them: Parker's "theory of concentration," Dewey's "learn by doing," Steiner's "teacher as artist," Mearns' "creative spirit," and Zirbes' "purposeful guidance." Parker was convinced the needs of society should determine the work of the school. The school should be a significant form of community life. The purpose of education was the development of the human

character and intelligent social cooperation. Of course, he could easily have been speaking for all of the educators in this study. Like Horace Mann, Emit Mott, and many others, he saw the task of education as fundamental in remaking society.¹⁹ He believed education was relative to the culture in which it existed. Education grew out of the conditions and trends of a particular period, but must also be used to guide and direct that culture. In Parker's case, he believed schools should be miniature and model democracies where pupils could learn self-control and self-government. He said that schools should offer "good wholesome normal instruction, mild firm government, and the proper amount of exercise. Free schools, independence, and democracy are mutual partners."²⁰ Schools were the "means of freedom for a vast number of people whose ancestors have been degraded through long ages of ignorance and oppression."²¹ Parker also saw the need to battle the overcoming thirst for money and the desire to get something for nothing. That was in 1885. Back in 1879, he and Charles Adams proposed the Quincy experiment. They offered what they considered to be a better, more economical system of education. Adams promised "excellence and economy--neither to be subordinated to the other."²²

Parker explained that those who seek some special and peculiar method or device in the Quincy movement will never find it. He said, "Faith and ideal spirit explains all that pertains to our success whatever that success may be."²³ That faith and ideal

spirit was to drive out the sarcastic, stern, and severe form of discipline to make way for a new relation between teachers, students, and parents. They were to become more like a family with more communication and developed interests. Parker wanted students and teachers to have a mutual interest in literature and nature. He suggested a change in subject matter and a new social atmosphere. Parker believed that children had a vast thirst for knowledge and were naturally curious and eager to learn. The task was to present appropriate information in an appropriate manner always pursuing the interests of the children. Parker maintained that all activities must be well directed. Of course, he preferred subject matter to textbooks and wide reading to memory work.

According to Parker, knowledge and skill were the means, not the end of working toward the symmetrical upbuilding of the whole being or character of the child. The process involved two factors. The first was the inborn, inherited power of the mind, and the second was the environment of the mind or the subjects taught. The subjects taught were the means of mental development. Knowing both mind and means leads to growth. Method, then, was the adaptation of the means of growth to the mind to be developed. To Parker a natural method would be an exact adaptation. This would require adaptation to the varying conditions such as food, clothing, and exercise. All five of the educators were interested in the whole child and the means to reach it, but Parker, Steiner,

and Zirbes mentioned the suitability of the clothing of the children. It was to be comfortable, for example, and allow the children to move freely.

Like Parker, Dewey also saw the schools as the means of freedom. He said that freedom was not given out at birth; it had to be achieved. The way to achieve it was to present the best picture or structure of reality--the way things really were. Also like Parker, Dewey wanted to use education toward an adjustment of conditions rather than an acceptance of them. He wanted to remake existing conditions rather than remake children to fit the existing conditions. He said, "Build not the perfect society, but a better society."²⁴

Dewey cited a variety of problems with education which are echoed with remarkable consistency today. He said that education changed like clothing styles. Styles and patterns altered frequently while the basic garment remained essentially the same. That changed slowly and was more often a change in society at large. In the schools sometimes change was brought about because something a group wanted was being threatened or what they wanted to remain stable was being altered. So groups demanded something be taught in the schools to either prevent or cause an action. In 1916 Dewey wrote:

Those in favor of new burdens are organized and clamorous. The pupils, being pupils, are discreetly dumb. The mass of the public is inert, or at least inactive, and gets in its work only by an ultimate passive resistance which first moderates and then smothers in execution the schemes legitimated into existence.²⁵

The problem was that schools would respond to one interest group after another while grasping at fads to ward off criticism. Dewey also jabbed at universities for "their tiresome habit was to equate educational theory with peddling trivial techniques and spurious panaceas."²⁶ Further problems developed from the proponents of liberal and the proponents of technical studies. Students could choose from new and old modern foreign language, Latin, Greek, natural science, social science, manual arts, journalism, agriculture, forestry, engineering, and many others. In 1935 Dewey wrote that the poor combination of the old schools with the new schools gave poor results.

The old was designed for small and select classes. The numbers in high school and college have increased six-fold and more in about a generation. Only those pupils who have a strong natural bent come out with any clear idea either of their own capacities or of the world in which they are to live. The schools are adrift rather than a system.

A basic problem was to attempt a reconciliation between the demand for more education and training with the desire to conserve the values represented in the tradition of higher education. So was the role of the high school to prepare students for the university or to prepare them for the adult world. The answer in the 1890s was that preparation for the universities was the best preparation for the adult world. But in 1902, Dewey wrote in "Current Problems in Secondary Education" that the idea that preparation for college was the best preparation for life didn't work. He

offered the possibility of colleges changing to commercial and social studies technical schools as a possible solution.

Also like Parker, Dewey criticized the schools for demanding pupils spend time in the mere accumulation of information and the acquisition of mechanical forms of skills. He said that information was selected upon no particular principle, much of it because it had been taught in the past. The prime need, according to Dewey, was to learn to think, to see problems, to relate facts, and to use and enjoy ideas. That need could not be fulfilled by the

. . . wooden routine and deadly conventionality of the traditional school. In startling contrast the experimental schools offered mobility, flexibility, freshness, and a variety of modern life. They emancipated themselves from tradition and directive ideas. Experimentation is the fruit of science in the field of creative endeavor of controlled constructive invention. It is based on ideas and is the method for continuous carrying of ideas to maturity.²⁸

But there was a "painful" gap between the actual theory in psychology and that which governed school practice. So Dewey saw hope through experimentation. "The ideal of the experimental method is the spirit in which a social problem is to be approached."²⁹ Dewey wanted to make the public aware that education should not be confined to making choices among already-formulated, conflicting alternatives. Instead, it should offer the opportunity for genuine discovery.

The laboratory school was to contribute to the progress of scientific thought in education. It had to be effective to justify its existence to parents and supporters. It was created firmly on grounded theory and applicability, but it was not designed as nor could it be a quick fix for the public schools. Mayhew wrote in her book The Dewey School,

The idea of education as growth was new. Education is all one with growing. It is the result of the constant adjustment of the individual to his physical and social environment which is thus both used and modified to supply his needs and those of his social group. The school opened in January 1896 in a private dwelling with sixteen pupils and two teachers. It didn't work very well.³⁰ It was chiefly indicative of what not to do.

Dewey had criticized traditional schools for not being seriously concerned with the goal of preparing students to learn throughout life, to be capable of acting effectively in both the natural and social world with a sense of obligation to human society--past, present, and future. He also criticized the traditional schools for their isolation of the different levels borrowed from various centuries and traditions. He said the universities came from the medieval scholastic tradition, kindergarten came from the romantic, moralistic philosophy of the 18th century, and the primary grades were in response to the need to teach reading when printing was invented. And they all lack coordination.³¹ Freedom to think, to see the problem, and to discover original solutions was what he advocated. He said such freedom was to be "systematically wrought out in cooperation with

experienced teachers knowledgeable in their own traditions. Baby does not know best."³² That freedom had to be developed gradually and over time. He began his school in 1896 with that in mind, but over time the progressive schools lost sight of that gradual developmental mission. They were heading toward a disregard for subject matter and discipline. Dewey kept silent for a time while those who called themselves his followers went about on a mission of too much freedom and too little learning. Finally, in his 1928 address to the Progressive Education Association he said,

Progressive schools set store by individuality and sometimes it seems to be thought that orderly organization of subject matter is hostile to the needs of students in their individual character. But individuality is something to be developed and to be continuously attained, not something given all at once and ready made. Far from being hostile to the principle of individuality, some systematic organization of activities and subject matter is the only means for actually achieving individuality; and teachers, by virtue of their richer and fuller experience, have not only the right but the high obligation to assist students in the enterprise.

He spoke out again in 1930.

The formalism and isolation of the conventional school room had literally cried out for reform. But the point of the progressive revolt had been not to rid schools of subject matter, but rather to build a new subject matter, as well organized as the old, but having a more intimate relation to the experience of the student.

He attacked them again because while they had been successful in creativity, that was an individual and private matter. He said

the schools must give students insight into the basic forces of industrial and urban civilization.³³

The purpose of Steiner's Waldorf Schools closely resembled much of what Parker and Dewey believed and advocated. Steiner and Emil Mott saw education as the tool for the restructuring of the society. Steiner wanted to provide children with the opportunity to think for themselves as individuals and for the good of society. Every plan and every action of these schools was designed to fulfill the triune nature of the children: body, mind, and soul. Steiner was not so critical of the schools, but he had criticisms of his own schooling's lack of regard for the individual.

Mearns, however, was somewhat critical. He said the "folly of formal education was that it attempted to crowd everything into the curriculum."³⁴ Mearns said it was information education (drill and memory) versus taste education (experience, exposure, and influence). He said the source of information for the traditional classroom was not experience but books and the standard of achievement was the perfection of knowing and retaining information never encountered or used again. But the new conception of public education was the bettering of all children of all people and the business of all educators was to do something with the students they got. The Lincoln School philosophy was that integration "constitutes a direct answer to

the profound and widespread disintegrations that now exist in all areas of human experiences."³⁵

It was the integration of school life and real life that Zirbes sought for the classroom. She believed that the quality of the education a child received related to the integration of vital, developmental learning with the life of the child. In Spurs to Creative Teaching, Zirbes wrote that during the

. . . very years that children should be exposed to a congenial climate, social interaction and cooperative endeavor for the common good, they are systematically exposed to the rigors of competition, sorted into rankings and homogeneous groupings and regimented into mass action.³⁶

In 1949 she developed and published a list of facts and findings that influenced the curriculum of that time. Some of them were similar to the problems that Parker and Dewey fought against and, some of them are current today.

1. Play is only important as relief from work.
2. The arts are unimportant.
3. Habits are fixed as early as possible by a rigid process of conditioning.
4. Knowledge is acquired by rote and tested by recitation. Examinations are a real test of learning.
5. Children learn one thing at a time.
6. Certain practices are still unchallenged: oral spell-down, reading orally paragraph by paragraph in turn, regular assigned homework, formal drills of facts and tables.³⁷

Zirbes believed that a child's "appetite for knowledge is often dulled by the pedantic approach of the teacher telling

rather than helping the child to find out on his own."³⁸ She preferred the process of inquiry which she described as learning what they need to know, the ways of finding out and discovery. She wanted children to learn the process of testing propositions, judgments, ideas, and inferences. She wanted them to learn what sources were available and reliable, what past inquires have discovered, and what the unknowns were. In short, she, too, wanted children to be able to see the problem. She said that education must change and that teachers and principals must have a better understanding of the problems. The change must involve a shift from extrinsic motivation and coercive discipline and submissive obedience to guidance, intrinsic motivation, purpose, and continued self-improvement.

The Ohio State University Laboratory School was according to Zirbes, a program of action regarding the personal and social development of students. One of the methodological emphases was group work which led to and developed intrinsic satisfaction, wholehearted activity and cooperative endeavor. The purpose of the program was twofold:

1. Education at all levels has the primary responsibility for creating, preserving, and developing the values involved in a democratic way of life.
2. Teaching is a calling which demands professional preparation appropriate to³⁹ the functions of education in a democracy.

There were two guiding principles:

1. The child is of primary importance.

2. All school procedures, from making basic philosophy to the treatment of individual differences, must be the result of a common enterprise, in which interests, planning, efforts, and achievements are shared.⁴⁰

The Handbook for University School Parents published in 1954

states:

This is not a lab school where human guinea pigs are exposed to capricious experiments of theoretically minded educators. It is a laboratory situation in which we strive to demonstrate what a good school can be and how a school operates when intelligence and co-operative planning are applied to the problems of educational curriculum and method.⁴¹

The purposes of the schools of these five educators were mutual and two-fold: the improvement of society through the improvement of the child. What they desired was to gradually develop children instilled with a love of learning, a respect for themselves and others, and the courage to be independent. They wanted to develop schools that were aware of and acted in advance of community concerns. They did develop schools that placed the child and his experience at the center of their curriculum.

Organization

While in the 1950s, The Ohio State University Laboratory School Handbook reflected the concern regarding educational experimentation, back in the 1870s, according to MacConnell in New Schools for New Culture, Parker scandalized the New England scholastics with his advanced ideas such as new promotion plans,

new grading schemes, new modes of classifying pupils, supervised study, credit for quality, intermediate grades, junior high schools, and individualizing.⁴² At Quincy he sent to the background the rigid programs, the old fashioned speller and reader, the hated grammar book and copy book. He made his mark out East and moved to the Midwest where by 1892 some of his structuralizations were adopted by the Chicago Public Schools: publicly supported kindergartens, manual training, household arts, and the assembly. In his own school he and his teachers promoted the concepts of concrete activities for the needs and development of children, self-activated work, initiative and interest training, freedom with responsibility leading to moral and intellectual growth, real experience with actual materials as essential for learning, opportunities for varied expression, students treated as individuals, and social motives as the best motives for work.⁴³ Then, it is interesting, as MacConnell reported, that Parker's radical changes worked on the grade school level but not on the high school level curriculum because it was controlled by the college entrance examinations. Dewey practically ignored the high school level during this period. Mearns was a high school teacher, so while his work included the high school, it was not necessarily on a structured level--only in as much as the individual classroom was concerned. Steiner provided a structure for grades K-12.

As Charles Adams described in 1879, the essence of the new system was that there was no system. It was marked by intense individuality.

Children learned to read all together and by practice. The hours were kept diversified. Children, after all, were children. Long confinement was irksome. They had a play table and toys This system is harder on the teacher Going to school should cease to be a homesick tribulation.⁴⁴

What Adams, Parker, Dewey, and others found was that the structure was actually more important than the methods of instruction. Perhaps given their unique situations and abilities to alter structure, their methods worked in their school--Quincy, Cook County Normal, University of Chicago Lab School, Waldorf Schools, Lincoln School, and the Ohio State University Lab School. And perhaps because of the inherent difficulties in re-structuring American public school, others who attempted to incorporate these methods faced oppressive problems.

In 1854 at Parker's first school, Corser Hull School in Boscawen (now Webster), New Hampshire, the playground was divided into two parts; the level ground where the boys had their ball field and the hilly end where the girls could pick flowers and play house. The children responded well to the stimuli of activity. They borrowed tools and board from home. By the end of Parker's first year, parents wanted "that boy Parker" back. Their children had never worked so hard.⁴⁵ Corser Hull had two rooms--a ground floor room and one the floor above. It was ungraded with a special department for girls.

After the Civil War, Parker accepted the principalship of the North Grammar School in Manchester, New Hampshire. There he developed a system of ranking the students based on emulation and incentive rather than strictness and punishment. He increased the amount of time spent on physical education. To Parker good order and morale were the basic structures for academic training. He blamed the lack of a good system for the poor learning that had taken place.⁴⁶

Parker worked in the Quincy, Massachusetts, schools in the 1870s. There he advocated the use of concrete materials, observations, student expressions, drawing, modeling clay, both planned and impromptu lessons. For plant lessons, he had students plant seeds in a box. For geography he modeled hills in a sand box and illustrated erosion with water. He told the students to notice the shapes of the hills on their way to and from school. He encouraged lessons on form, color, numbers, and language. He wanted the Quincy students to become good writers, so he suggested teachers combine subjects. For example, every lesson could become a language arts lesson. He completely discarded the spelling book and said spelling could be taught through reading and writing in every lesson at all levels. For example, language lessons could be taught in beginning science. Color lessons could involve form. Number work could use both form and color. All lessons should teach good manners and morals. Finally, classrooms should have an atmosphere of cheerfulness, activity, and interest.⁴⁷

This was a typical first and second day in an early elementary school.

FIRST DAY - AFTERNOON

<u>Time</u>	<u>Last Year's Pupils</u>			<u>New Pupils</u>		
	<u>First Row</u>	<u>Second Row</u>	<u>Third Row</u>	<u>Fourth Row</u>	<u>Fifth Row</u>	<u>Sixth Row</u>
2:00- 2:05	General Exercise - Singing					
2:05- 2:20	Writing	Writing	Writing	Drawing	Drawing	Drawing
2:20- 2:35	Reading Lesson	*B.W. Sticks by 3s	B.W. Sticks by 2s	Picture Lesson	B.W. Splints	B.W. Splints
2:35- 2:50	B.W. Sticks by 4s	Reading Lesson	B.W. Sticks by 2s	B.W. Splints	Picture Lesson	B.W. Splints
2:50- 3:05	General Exercise - Singing of Motion Songs					
3:05- 3:15	B.W. Sticks	B.W. Sticks	Reading Lesson	B.W. Splints	B.W. Splints	Picture Lesson
3:15- 3:20	Examining Busy-Work - Collecting Sticks and Splints					
3:20- 3:30	General Exercise - Number Lesson					
3:30- 3:45	General Exercise - Language Lesson					
3:45- 3:50	General Exercise - Thinking Game					
3:50- 4:00	Dismissal					

*Busy Work

SECOND DAY - MORNING

<u>Time</u>	<u>Last Year's Pupils</u>			<u>New Pupils</u>		
	<u>First Row</u>	<u>Second Row</u>	<u>Third Row</u>	<u>Fourth Row</u>	<u>Fifth Row</u>	<u>Sixth Row</u>
9:00-9:10	Prayer and Singing					
9:10-9:25	Writing Sentence	Writing Sentence	Writing Sentence	Writing is	Writing is	Writing is
9:25-9:35	Number Lesson	B.W Ill. Drawing	B.W Ill. Drawing	Conver- sa. Les.	B.W. Drawing	B.W. Drawing
9:35-9:45	B.W Ill. Drawing	Number Lesson	B.W Ill. Drawing	B.W. Drawing	Conver- sa. Les.	B.W. Pegs
9:45-9:55	B.W Ill. Drawing	B.W Ill. Drawing	Number Lesson	B.W. Pegs	B.W. Pegs	Conver- sa. Les.
9:55-10:00	Teacher Examines Slates - Singing by the Pupils					
10:00-10:10	Reading Lesson	B.W. Pictures	B.W. Pictures	Elementary Lesson in Color		
10:10-10:20	B.W. Pictures	Reading Lesson	B.W. Pictures	B.W. Pictures	B.W. Pictures	B.W. Pictures
10:20-10:30	Singing and Marching					
10:30-10:45	Recess					
10:45-10:50	Singing and Cleaning Slates					
10:50-11:00	String Beads by 4s	String Beads by 3s	Reading Lesson	Conver- sation Lesson	B.W. Pegs.	B.W. Pegs.
11:00-11:10	Language Lesson	String Beads by 3s	String Beads by 2s	B.W. Pegs.	Conver- sation Lesson	B.W. Pegs.
11:10-11:20	String Beads by 4s	Language Lesson	String Beads by 2s	B.W. Pegs.	B.W. Pegs.	Conver- sation Lesson
11:20-11:25	Teacher Examines Busy Work - Singing by the Pupils					
11:25-11:40	All Draw Straight Lines					
11:40-11:50	Language Lesson					
11:50-12:00	Dismissal					

SECOND DAY - AFTERNOON

Time

1:50-2:00	Teacher Marks the Roll. Cleaning of Slates by the Children.
2:00-2:10	General Exercise. Singing "Clock," "Pony," "Sing a Song of Sixpence"
2:10-2:13	Drill in Phonics. Chart.
2:13-2:20	General Exercise. Conversation Lesson. Day of the Week, etc.
2:20-2:30	A Language Lesson from a Picture.
2:30-2:40	First Row: Writing. Copying Words from Blackboard. Second Row: Writing. Tracing on Blackboard. Third Row: A Language Lesson by the Trainer. Fourth Row: A Picture Lesson by the Teacher. Fifth Row: Shoe-pegs. Busy-Work. Sixth Row: Shoe-Pegs. Busy-Work.
2:40-2:50	General Exercise in Language. Recalling.
2:50-2:55	Running Recess.
2:55-3:05	General Exercise. A Story by the Teacher.
3:05-3:15	First Row: Number Lesson by the Trainer. Second Row: Splints. Busy-Work. Third Row: Sliced Pictures (home made). Busy-Work. Fourth Row: Shoe-pegs. Busy-Work. Fifth Row: A Picture Lesson by the Teacher. Sixth Row: Shoe-pegs. Busy-Work.
3:15-3:25	Singing "Little Miss Muffit," "Little Boy Blue."
3:25-3:35	First Row: Make a Picture of "Miss Muffit." Busy-Work. Second Row: Number Lesson by the Trainer. Third Row: Make a Picture of "Little Boy Blue." Busy-Work. Fourth Row: Shoe-pegs. Busy-Work. Fifth Row: Shoe-pegs. Busy-Work. Sixth Row: A Picture Lesson by the Teacher.
3:35-3:40	Examining Busy-Work. Collecting Materials.
3:50-4:00	Dismissal ⁴⁸

In the early 1880s, Parker assumed the principalship of the Cook County Normal School. It was a three-story brick building on twenty acres of land that had been given in perpetuity to the county by a Dr. Beck. It had twelve rooms and an assembly hall. Its purpose was to train high school graduates to teach in county schools. There were two divisions of instruction: a professional training class and a school of practice where the student teachers had experience in teaching. Mr. D. S. Wentworth, the former principal, had done good work despite the enemies of the school who were at that time opposed to county tax dollars being spent on such an enterprise. After the death of Wentworth, Mr. Champlin, the chairman of the Cook County School Board of Education, sent for Parker. Despite warnings against it, Parker accepted. This was not the first time Parker had been directly involved in teacher education. He had been supervising principal of the Normal School in Dayton, and he had instructed the Quincy teachers in regularly scheduled sessions. Also, he wanted a wider scope for training teachers, and he saw an opportunity to test his theories of teacher training by being close to children and by working with them.⁴⁹

The year 1884 brought the first Parker graduates, but Parker wanted to extend the training and make it a two-year program. He was successful almost immediately as several of the graduates agreed to remain for additional training. Miss Delia Speer (whom he had brought from Quincy) was the head of the practice school. The organization of the school called for the student teacher to

submit her lesson plans for her four to six students to the room teacher. There were generally four student teachers to each room. The room teacher submitted the plans to Miss Speer who, in turn, had a weekly meeting with Parker. Of course, Parker met regularly with the entire staff and literally demanded that they speak out about their learning and their experiences. In fact, if anyone refused to speak at these meetings, they weren't welcome to remain at CCNS. Parker believed that "speaking out sorts things out in the mind."⁵⁰

The assemblies were of major importance to the structure of each day. At them, Parker could interact with his children and the children could be exposed to the community of students. They, too, were encouraged to come forward and speak out. Applause was discouraged to avoid competition. At the assemblies students and faculty performed music and art in celebration of Christmas or spring or to commemorate Lincoln (Parker recited "Captain, O Captain" by Whitman), Washington, Longfellow, or Emerson.⁵¹

Parker maintained his interest in working directly with students, in students actually involved in the physical action of the learning, and in bringing the community and the school together in a mutual learning. Parker instituted the first elementary woodshop in the Chicago area. He was successful because he enlisted the help of the neighborhood--all of whom aided with either equipment, time, or both. He established one of the first community gardens. He persuaded mothers to accompany

the teachers and children on field trips. And despite his meager budget, Parker was able to attract expert teachers in art, music, literature, dramatics, physical training, history, and science, along with trained librarians and a museum curator. Parker had worked on developing a Parent Teachers Association earlier in his career, and he reestablished his interest. The concept was that classroom problems and concerns could be more easily resolved by enlisting the aid of parents, teachers, businessmen, and fundamentalists who refused to see farther than the three Rs.⁵²⁴

Quincy had been the culmination of what Parker had learned and experienced and the spur to his future work. He inaugurated many supported, though risky, changes. There, he dropped the set program, the speller, the reader, the grammar, and the copy book. While treating the alphabet with slight deference, "his children set upon at once to work making words and sentences."⁵³

His teachers and students learned first to think and observe, and then how to put these powers to work on required subjects. Actually, there were few required subjects. Instead the children were expected to be able to read well at sight, to write correctly, to compute sums in ordinary business transactions, to know geography from a practical point of view and to know leading events in history. The children were expected to learn how to learn--"trained facilities and senses with which to acquire such other knowledge as they might desire later on."⁵⁴ The year before Adams hired Parker, the children of the Quincy Schools could

answer only those specific questions for which they had been prepared. They could not write a simple letter or summarize the reading of a new essay. They couldn't explain or discuss science, history, or geography.

Parker accomplished this not with specific methodology--

There were no royal roads and no prescribed methods, no Quincy methods. Each teacher had to have her own methods and work with definite ends in view, learn to make her own maps, charts, etc., and be able to convince the superintendent of the necessity of every article to be purchased at the public expense.⁵⁵

The basis of the Parker method was to begin with objects in and around school: yards, fences, boxes, blocks, gardens, gutters, board and chalk, roads and fields, chairs and stools, pastures, hills, and valleys--"out of these many valuable object and language lessons may be learned."⁵⁶⁸

In her book The Quincy Methods, Patridge listed the distinguishing features of the Quincy work.

1. The joyous life of the schools and the comradeship of teacher and pupils.
2. The grouping of their pupils (in the lower grades), obtaining many of the benefits of individual teaching.
3. The skillful use of a great amount and variety of "Busy-Work."
4. Lessons in subjects not usually taught--drawing, modeling, form, color, natural history, etc.
5. The constant use of drawing as a means of expression.

6. Use of text-books as repositories of knowledge.
7. Amount and variety of Supplementary Reading.
8. Substitution of the expression of original thought on the part of the pupils for the old-fashioned memoriter recitation.
9. Carefully varied programme, *whose order was known only to the teacher.*
10. The atmosphere of happy work which encompassed teachers and pupils.
11. Disorder not worrying the teacher and wasting her time.
12. The confidence, courtesy, and respect characterizing the attitude not only of pupils to teacher, but teacher to pupils.
13. The absence of scolding, snubbing, or spying.
14. The dignity, self-possession, and lack of self-consciousness of pupils.
15. The making of the child the objective point, and not Courses of Study, examinations, or promotions.
16. The great economy, naturalness, and practicability of the devices employed.
17. The marked attention paid to the so-called dull pupils.
18. The evident growth of moral power.
19. The remarkable skill of the teachers evidencing their comprehension of underlying principles.
20. The wonderful originality and individuality of the teachers--none being imitators; the devices used varying from day to day.
21. The high ideal set before the teachers by the Superintendent, and their hearty co-operation with him in striving to attain it.

22. The absence of machinery, and the absolute freedom from any fixed or prescribed mode of work, each teacher being encouraged to invent and try any device not violating fundamental laws.
23. Examinations aimed to test the teacher's power to teach.
24. Examinations such as to test the children's power to do, not their power to memorize.⁵⁹

Patridge described this as a harmonious education which encompassed mind, body, and soul. She observed a combination of mental and physical activities, of work and play, and of the development of good habits. Her analogy was that of a garden with the teachers as gardeners seeking to learn "the divine laws which governed their development (the pupils) and watched each mind to see what helped or hindered growth."⁵⁸ That, she reported, was the goal of this new education--growth rather than simply the acquisition of skill and knowledge.

Parker and others had for some time realized the importance of children (and adults) learning to think rather than learning an amount of factual information. Parker realized that in order to practice thinking children needed situations which would challenge them to search for solutions and choose among alternatives. They needed to get out of their seats and out of their drill exercise books.

In 1935 Dewey and Tyler Dennett warned in The Forum that the education in some schools bore no very close relationship to thinking. They suggested that some people are educated and some

think. "The two categories are not identical, at best they overlap. It may be doubtful whether any new or old method will greatly modify this fact. American history is studded with names of men not educated but who could think."⁵⁹ Dewey's suggestion was that current and future practice in the schools be based on an accurate understanding of psychological principles. He envisioned a continuum between the psychological theorist, the educational theorist, and the teacher. For Dewey, the way to learn to think was through inquiry and its outcome in gathering and retention. In discussing his beliefs, Mayhew wrote in The Dewey School the "skill of reading, writing, and numbers grows out of the needs and the results of activities. Knowledge grows out of active contact with things and energies inherent in consecutive activities."⁶⁰

In seeking to explain the theory behind the structure of the Dewey School, Edwin Slosson wrote in 1917 regarding the grouping of children. He explained that both social and cooperative group work was not only important for individual freedom, but also on moral grounds. Further, Dewey believed in the theoretical conception that "human intelligence developed under social conditions and for social purposes. The mind had developed not only with respect to activity having purpose but also social activity."⁶¹

Also Dewey hoped to use educational theory to aid in determining the physical structure of a school. For example, he would employ educational theory in conjunction with the decision

on how to provide good light, heat, ventilation, sanitary facilities, educational equipment, and play space. Steiner took not only educational theory, but the knowledge and experience of his teachers into account when determining the physical structure of his schools. This, however, has usually caused prohibitive economic problems as the descriptions of these early schools should demonstrate.

Dewey's school was designed to be a community where the "mind and selves are formed to be free to have interaction with others through communication, cooperation, inquiry, and thinking."⁶² Dewey believed that the adult world was too complex for children and that the amount of knowledge was overwhelming. In order to help children, he proposed to coordinate the school's activities with the basic aspects of the world outside. He intended to organize their studies in a "framework of simplified principles and concepts that would introduce order into the welter of data." Dewey said that "schools should promote ways of learning and living that demonstrate habits of cooperation, free communication, and reflective thinking."⁶³ The theory that Dewey espoused was that values are learned better when lived than when merely talked about. The school was to be social in scholarship. They would build the school work on the experience and activities of the child directing his immediate interests to significant educative ends. But Dewey always believed that basic skills and knowledge in subject matter had to be a vital part of the school program.

In Dewey's experimental school, the idea was if children had sufficient variety of activities provided, they would like what they did and their activities would be so arranged as to result in getting knowledge and forming good habits of thought. (As in, "Waldorf children do not do as they like; they are so taught that they enjoy what they do."⁶⁴) The intellectual idea or philosophy of the school was to attempt to work out the theory that "knowledge, with respect to both sense observation and general principles, is the offshoot of activities, and practical problems arising in connection with consecutive occupations afford the means for developing interest in scientific problems for their own sake."⁶⁵ Since the school was a center for graduate study at the University of Chicago, one of their tasks was, for example, to develop a sequence of school activities appropriate for the muscle coordinations of children at different stages of growth.

Dewey's experiment began in January 1896 in a private dwelling with sixteen pupils and two teachers. It didn't work very well and, as Mayhew reported in The Dewey School, those first months were "chiefly indicative of what not to do." In Rugg's The Child-Centered School, it was described as a "neighborhood laboratory school--radical--with neither conventional school subjects nor school furniture."⁶⁶ They next opened in October of the same year at 5718 Kimbard Avenue with thirty-two pupils between the ages of six and eleven years and three teachers, one part-time music teacher, and three graduate assistants. The

curriculum consisted of science and domestic arts, literature and history, manual training and music. By January 1897 the pupil population growth (to 55) caused them to move to the South Park Club House at Rosalie Court and 57th Street. By December 1898 they had sixty pupils and sixteen teachers. In October 1898 they moved to 5412 Ellis Avenue and by the inclusion of pupils four and five years of age, the population grew to eighty-two.⁶⁷

Dewey developed new doctrines for educational reconstruction. Out of his round table staff meetings and lectures to parents came his books School and Society and The Child and Curriculum.⁶⁸ Dewey's work became more harmonized with the university as the University Laboratory School was also considered a laboratory in educational psychology with research and evaluation functions. The staff worked out "educational programs and practices consistent with the philosophical and psychological theories along with changes following examination of the work in progress."⁶⁹

At the Ellis Avenue address, the gym and shop were in the barn, the art and textile rooms were in the attic. The science labs included physics, chemistry, and biology. History and literature classes were held in three rooms. The domestic science area consisted of a large kitchen and two dining rooms. Before the tremendous growth in pupil population, the teachers were the administrators (as in the Waldorf Schools); but by 1902 there were 140 pupils, twenty-three teachers, ten graduate assistants, Dewey as director, Ella Flagg Young as supervisor of instruction, and

Alice Chipman Dewey (Mrs. John) as principal and director of the English Department. Similar to the other schools in this study, they were always in financial trouble, despite generous donations from benefactors such as Mrs. Charles R. Linn's 1896 gift of \$1200.

In 1902 the first attempt to merge Parker's Chicago Institute with Dewey's Lab School failed due to parent and teacher protest. Mayhew described Parker's school as mainly teacher training. They won a year's reprieve, but when Parker died, the Chicago Institute, the Chicago Manual Training School, the South Side Academy, and the University of Chicago Laboratory School merged to become the School of Education of the University of Chicago.⁷⁰

Dewey was named director of the school and chairman of the department, but he wasn't destined to remain in Chicago. Parker's teachers harbored resentments upon entering the merger. None of the teachers seemed pleased with Mrs. Dewey as principal, and President Harper may or may not have made promises he didn't intend to keep. In 1904 the Deweys resigned a few days apart, and Teachers' College, Columbia University, was quick to invite Dewey to join its staff. In 1959 Robert McCaul wrote in "Dewey's Chicago" he

. . . resigned and so withdrew from a situation which presented opportunities to work out bearings of his educational ideas in a form more accommodated to the realities and demands of the regular community schools. Because he was more intelligent and moderate than his later brokers and popularizers, had he stayed in Chicago, we might have received a more viable educational theory and methodology.⁷¹

The same question might have been posed regarding Steiner's work as he died but four years after the opening of the first Waldorf School in Stuttgart, Germany, in 1919. He, alone of the five educators of this study, has an international system of schools remaining though the laboratory school is still viable in the University of Chicago and the Francis W. Parker School in Chicago continues.

Despite the fact that he had strong financial backing from Emil Mott, Steiner's first school was housed in an old beer garden. One pupil was reported to have remembered still being able to smell the stale odor of beer during his lessons.⁷² The organization of the Waldorf Schools was unique. Each one was administratively autonomous and took full responsibility for its existence. In "An Introduction to Waldorf Education," Henry Barnes wrote, "What unites the movement is the education itself which is a unique blend of the individual, the local atmosphere, and what is universally human."⁷³ There were no administrators, no textbooks, no exams, and no report cards as were known in the public schools. The teachers administrated and managed the school by committees and on a rotating basis. Steiner believed the "organization and administration is best done by those who implement it. The principle of self-responsibility and participation calls for the school to be run by those immediately involved."⁷⁴ Some schools maintained a *geschäfts führung*. This was not an administrative position, but one of a business manager

who ordered what was needed by the teachers. The teachers, according to Steiner's original plan, were to meet with the architect prior to building or remodeling so that every aspect of the child's day was considered. This was not always economically feasible.

Steiner, having learned much about teaching from his years of tutoring, believed that the teacher must know the subject so well that he could concentrate on how he would teach and reach each student. To that end he was at liberty to hire artisans who knew their craft full well and then Steiner could guide them in their teaching. "The central didactic principle is to give all lessons an artistic design by emphasizing how a subject is taught rather than what."⁷⁵ Intellectual demands were always combined with hard work or physical movement. A lesson began with a "fundamental exposition and descriptive elaboration; the next day is revision of thoughts and images for discussion followed by creative writing or artistic expression."⁷⁶ Story telling was very important. "Stories provide material for verbal and written recapitulation; they provide practice in speaking clearly, remembering, expressing coherently, and re-creating a particular turn of a phrase. Stories enrich vocabulary. Students acquire a feeling for language."⁷⁷

Students did not use textbooks. They used, instead, classics and both personal and vicarious experiences. The classics used covered fairy tales to Dante and on to modern works. History was

taught at first through dramatic pictures, then from heroes of the past to live history. Geography studies were linked to the students' immediate surroundings commencing with descriptions of and the actual building of houses on a small scale to an understanding of the student's own environment, own country, the world, and on to a study of the universe and astrology. Students gained first experience with geometric forms and their variations followed by a study of laws and theorems. For the study of science, students learned a reverence for nature by experiencing those realms closest to them: animals, plants, and minerals. Students wrote and illustrated their own texts from these lessons.

The students did not take examinations as public school children did. Steiner said, "We should never want to hold official examinations."⁷⁸ He obtained authorization for the schools to hold their own learning exams so that they would be allowed to "follow the educational principles to their logical conclusions."⁷⁹ Also, Waldorf teachers did not give report cards as public school teachers knew them either. Steiner said, "There are no report cards, rather a mirror picture, a biography of progress." He would not tolerate a "white washing of less positive aspects of a child's studies."⁸⁰ Rist called them report maxims.

The typical day in a Waldorf school began with an assembly. This brought students and teachers together for a common purpose: to work and to learn together. The assembly consisted of a

variety of activities designed to awaken and concentrate the students' minds prior to the work of the day. Activities were to achieve a well-rounded balance of serious, happy, new, and familiar. Music and singing were often used. Individual classes help plan the assembly.

After the assembly children attended their main block lesson. This two to two and one-half hour lesson ran two to eight weeks. Marjorie Spock wrote in Teaching as a Lively Art that Steiner believed short classes were against human nature--that they

. . . turn healthy human beings into nervous cripples . . . that they are burdens with a crushing weight of purely external skills and lifeless knowledge . . . that they are catastrophic for a child's development as a means of breaking off of play activity followed by a crippling effect on the child's intellect.⁸¹

The two hour lesson allowed both absorption and a refreshing change when they moved on to a new lesson. The two hours were rarely too tiring as they always attempted to combine the three fold activities: a rhythmic balance among mental effort (thinking), artistic creation (feeling), and motor activity (willing).⁸² If a student seemed to "breathe a sigh of relief that the lesson is over it is an unfailing indication that the teachers planning lacked balance."⁸³ Steiner hated lessons that made children want "to jump out of their skin." Main block lessons did not consist of lecture. They were made up of plays written and enacted, painting, dancing, singing, reciting, and storytelling. The main block lesson took the greater part of the

morning and was followed by a recess and then a shorter period of instruction in a subject matter that offered a decided contrast such as foreign language, eurythmy, singing, or handwork. All students took music lessons beginning with a recorder and moving on to an instrument of their choice. These lessons were not merely for skills acquisition but a part of total balance and development.

Steiner intended that teachers remain with the same pupils from first through eighth grade. Where this was not possible, schools attempted having the teacher remain with her pupils from first through third grade. In this way the teacher knew the children and was able to build on their past experiences and to provide a better balance in the lessons.

There were specialist teachers who taught music, art, physical education, crafts, and eurythmy. Eurythmy was a special exercise in body movement which represented poetic forms of speech. Steiner and his wife developed this movement and incorporated it in their anthroposophical work prior to its addition in the Waldorf school. There was also a curative eurythmy used in rehabilitation.

Steiner and the other educators in this study were fortunate in that they were each able to develop or assist in developing a school or a school system. Mearns observed, however, that it took about five years to change a system and that school superintendents were like missionaries attempting to re-educate

the adult community. This description was much like Parker in the Quincy Schools. There he was an extraordinarily fortunate missionary because the times and the people--the adult community and specifically the leaders--were ripe for change. In a 1937 article entitled "Administration Faces New Problems," Lester Dix described the challenges of the development of the Lincoln School. He wrote that "progressive education makes teachers and administrators work together and realize each other's perspective."⁸⁴ This was, of course, what all of the schools in this study were striving for and because of their diligence it became a central focus of the schools. Dix wrote that since scheduling in a progressive, less limiting manner was such a tremendous problem, administration had actually to become everyone's concern.

Recall Steiner's "Waldorf children do not do as they please, they are taught so they like what they do." Dewey broke a long silence to criticize progressive curriculums with little or no actual substance. Parker loved little children, but he preferred them busy. In a 1930 article entitled "Educating the Whole Child," Mearns wrote "Doing what they please! What an absurdity!"⁸⁵ For him the key word was environment not lessons, but he always recognized the need for lessons. What he clearly saw was the waste when lessons did not reach the children due to the wrong environment.

In Creative Power, Mearns wrote his "Slow Miss Mandy Theory":

Slow Miss Mandy,
Her babies weren't fat,
But they always wanted what they couldn't get at;
On the very top shelf
She put the cream in the crock,
And she left the ladder handy⁸⁶
And the key in the lock.

He listed seven rules for creating a conducive and cohesive environment.

1. Never be dogmatic or superior. To sneer at taste is caddish at best and certainly futile.
2. Taste grows through stages of saturation and surfeit.
3. Always have materials at the ready.
4. Without a large library and a gifted librarian who will work with the class responding to their needs, it won't work.
5. Material necessary to lift students to the next level needn't be adult literacy.
6. An atmosphere enticing suggestions must be set, preferably by the children.
7. Never lie to a child.⁸⁷

Mearns could not tolerate double standards either between consenting adults or adults and children.

Finally, Mearns advocated a shift away from sophisticated, smart, and showy curriculums and classrooms and a move toward the simple, worthwhile, and unspectacular.⁸⁸ At the Lincoln school, teachers worked toward an integration of curriculum rather than continued distinctions and separations. For example, students learned the principles of flotation (Archimedes' Principle and

Application) in first hour math and applied the principle in second hour swim class. The teachers observed what the students ate for lunch and added nutrition to the curriculum.

In Mearns' own classes one of his first goals was to secure wide and varied experiences with all kinds of literature. He permitted without fear or rebuke the freest expressions of likes and dislikes. Gradually as he and his students became better acquainted, they formed a student committee to select the literature to be studied. One year the student committee determined that the class read twenty books. They then wrote critiques and essays on the same theme. Students wrote essays, critiques, short stories, speeches, plays, and verses. Yet Mearns never demanded and, since he was patient, he was never disappointed. Also the students at Lincoln school, like those in Waldorf schools, presented an annual play to the school and parents.

The new methods developed at the Lincoln school were in four basic categories: (a) integrated courses, (b) cooperative planning and teaching, (c) increased participation of students in the curriculum, and (d) the promotion of interpretative, expressional, and creative activities. These goals were accomplished in a variety of areas and activities. They were extremely interested in "out of classroom activities" such as field trips and physical education. Students were given time on Friday afternoon to "do" (as if they hadn't been) things such as

shopping, art projects, music practice, drama, newspapers, marionettes, and hobby clubs. They integrated English, history, art, science, and music into Western culture. The responsibility for the course was shared by both students and teachers. At one point they complained that there was simply not enough time in the school day to accomplish all they desired, and these American students and teachers considered lengthening the school day. In the content integrated curriculum were four areas: (a) cultural evolution (social understanding), (b) self and personality, (c) natural environment, and (d) art of communication, expression, and imagination.

The junior high school "scope and sequence" included (a) individual development, (b) sound basic techniques, and (c) broad orientation.

Seventh grade:	Evolution of cultures
	English
	Natural science
	Natural mathematics
	Integrated general arts
	Health and personal development
	French (elective)

Eighth grade:	Evolution of cultures
	Social studies
	English
	Art

Natural science
 Universal mathematics
 Algebraic abstractions
 General arts
 Health and personal development
 French (elective)
 Ninth grade: Evolution of cultures
 Social studies
 Science
 Household arts
 English
 Preparation for high school math
 General arts
 Health and personal development
 Dance
 Leadership
 French (elective)

The senior high school "scope and sequence" was (a) all-round adulthood: personal attitude, poise, intellectual curiosity, and self-respect; (b) sound inquiry and scholarship; and (c) social orientation by student choice in work.

Tenth-Twelfth grades: Evolution of cultures
 Health and personal development
 Biology
 Math

French

Stagecraft

Photography

International peace

School politics

Sports

Games

Dance

The tenth and eleventh graders studied the evolution of cultures from primitive man to the national cultures. The twelfth grade course was on American culture. It was designed for the best students with the hope that the "mediocre would learn as well or opt for an independent study."⁸⁹ Nonetheless, experience and integration were overriding goals of the Lincoln school.

As has been shown, Parker, Dewey, and Steiner were sincerely interested in what they called the whole or triune nature of the child--the body, the mind, and the soul. They were interested in values, morals, and the needs of the individual as he integrated with the rest of his society. Zirbes, too, was most interested in values, and she believed they could be taught in and out of the classroom. She wrote in Focus on Values in Elementary Education that the "model elementary school is based on values that were not known earlier."⁹⁰ She continued that the old idea of a model school and demonstration lessons lead to imitation; and though Parker would certainly have taken issue, she may have had a point. At any rate, she said the new idea was that the schools

demonstrate values in the process and various manners of learning. She said educators must leave room for situational thinking, value judgments, and voluntary creative involvements.⁹¹ In her summer demonstration school at The Ohio State University, the regular staff was augmented by teachers from all over the country. Hundreds of teachers took classes and workshops in which the school staff demonstrated an interaction guided by a shared concern for democratic values. While they might not have worded it just that way, Parker and Dewey would certainly have agreed.

Zirbes favored a minimum of formal instruction, didactic training, and coercive direction. Instead, children should learn in and through experience. Teachers were responsible for making learning effective, thorough-going, and scientific, but not mechanical and systematic. They prepared and developed the child's sensitivities for subject matter in life contexts. Zirbes believed that the beauty of color, line, form, and arrangement, for example, could be fostered and realized in everyday experiences. However, she warned that there was no chance for that kind of learning in classes that existed in a regimented routine restricted to exercises matching color patches to color names and filling in stencilled outlines with crumbling crayons. She said children and teachers can't link learning to the wonders of the woods, fields, and significant personal experience under a regimen of restraint, mass management, rows and lines, inhibitions and restrictions, conformity and standardization.⁹²

Zirbes believed that guidance led to continuity and consistency which, in turn, led to a stabilizing, integrative, and developmental curriculum. Her concern was for meaningful, cumulative learning and abiding interest. She encouraged teachers to foster personal responsibility by involving the children in the cultivation of foresight, judgment, purposeful action, evaluation, and intelligent retrospection.⁹³

Zirbes believed that children needed freedom from emotional stress and strain upon which she partly blamed competition. She said that competition failed to induce children to the finer values of intrinsic effort and cooperation and that while the ablest child may be spurred by competition, the less able was often discouraged. She was as critical of poor education as Steiner when she proclaimed, "If children are inert unless cheap spurs are applied the education must be poorly adjusted and conceived."⁹⁴ She also emphasized that each phase must be paced with the child's level of maturity in order to avoid emotional blocks and nervous disorganization and to reduce the "inordinate amount of repetitive drill of unrelated, unassimilated, dormant elements."⁹⁵ Again like Steiner, Zirbes recommended a definite rhythm in each school day from the playground to the bathroom to the circle for story-telling and the discussion of problems concerning the group or planning for the next day.

Like Dewey she opposed any increase in class size. She cautioned that an increase simply adds more workbook and other

seatwork material. Actually, she was vocal regarding certain seatwork popular in the early 1940s. She complained that the letter blocks, beads, sewing cards, patterns for paper construction, and expensive four-inch squares were "didactic devices of formal learning . . . stereotyped mass instruction that perpetuate the inhibition in natural play impulses, discouraged cooperative social play through which social attitudes develop, and build needless tensions and strains."⁹⁶

Instead she preferred a functionalist attitude. She considered the function of education, the resources, and the activities in the planning of a modern classroom. She realized the psychology of color and modern educational equipment such as built-in facilities for use and storage essential to effective work, order, and organization. She decried "compulsory attendance at places unfit for human habitation" and called them indefensible.⁹⁷ She wanted light, bright colors in the classrooms and corridors. Furniture flexible for a chance to "learn by doing"--centers for group activity, a reading nook, a book table, and handy, well-stocked shelves. She said that "special places contribute to developing an interest in books as a source of satisfaction."⁹⁸ She would also have a science corner with facilities for direct inquiry, observation, and experimentation in both laboratory study and the role of science in modern life. For social studies she recommended bulletin boards with current affairs: local, national, and world-wide, and community study for

social learning and first hand experience followed by classroom discussion and work. She maintained that unless school learnings were conducted in such a manner as to carry over to life, the school was not setting a conducive learning environment. Zirbes accused isolated learnings of causing "rapid forgettings, low morale, dependence on coercive pressure and extrinsic motivation . . . it encouraged individualism and aggressive, self-centered behavior."⁹⁹

Zirbes described The Ohio State University Experimental Elementary School as the following:

1. demonstration of mental hygienic values implicit in the curriculum,
2. regular provisions for study trips,
3. substitution of cooperation for competition,
4. regular regimen of rest,
5. studied avoidance of the evils of over stimulation,
6. purposeful activity,
7. socially responsible work periods,
8. free choice of art or science activities in separate blocks of time, and
9. democratic pupil cooperation in planning.¹⁰⁰

She referred to these as the "dynamics of advancement in teacher education."

More specifically, for kindergarten she encouraged guided interaction. That is, she had the children work in small groups and report to the class. The teacher had to refrain from telling

the children exactly what to do, but, rather, suggest alternative ways of working to make the most of the resources available. The teacher lead the children to see why it was necessary to set limits and come to group decisions democratically. The first graders needed weeks of working and playing together to develop a group interest. They needed to be encouraged to see a job through to completion. The second graders liked reading, counting and planning for lunch, sharing responsibility for the lunch slips, and sharing experiences in their newsletter. The third graders discussed the possibilities of a group project. The fourth graders actually discussed what to do: arithmetic, writing, reading, and then decided on four topics: (a) early man, (b) other lands, (c) airplanes, and (d) animals. Included in their study were reading, interesting jobs, writing, arithmetic, and movies, trips, and speakers. The fifth graders were interested in reading, nature studies, and writing autobiographies. The sixth graders had a more defined day. They worked from 8:00 to 8:45 four days a week and had one free day. From 9:10 to 9:30, they had music. From 10:15 to 10:45, they had physical education. The rest of the time was more flexible, and they planned it together. In the particular group she was describing, here were several behavior problems; so she warned that the group project would have to be very interesting and employ easy reading materials. In book reporting, for example, she found they enjoyed telling about their own book, but they didn't care to listen to their peers.¹⁰¹ The high school offered two types of educational experiences:

1. the study of problems and skill development and attributes important to all people in a democracy regardless of vocation (they called this the core and physical program), and
2. preparation for a specific vocation.

According to the 1954 Handbook for University School Parents, the selection policy worked toward a well-balanced mix of students. First, a student was accepted if his admission would bring a better balance to a grade group in sex, race, religion, income, social adjustment problem, and academic nature. Priority was given to siblings of currently enrolled students and children of faculty and staff. Some provision was made for help with fees in certain cases. Normally, no application was accepted for enrollment beyond the tenth grade. Like Parker's and Dewey's before her, the building was always crowded and outmoded. Originally, it was just to be used as a high school and the additional wing was never built. In the end, there were fourteen grades housed in a space planned for six.

Nonetheless, the staff experimented in the areas of (a) a desirable balance of various types of activities found in a school day, (b) a language arts program consistent with the purpose of the general education program, (c) a related arts program consistent with the general education program, and (d) further development of the core programs at both the junior and senior high levels.¹⁰² There were more planned but insufficient staffing and funding caused postponement.

The basic purpose of the school as stated in the Philosophy and Purpose of the University School published in 1948 was "to preserve and continually reinterpret and recreate the democratic way of life which made public education possible."¹⁰³ This document stated that there were two types of curricular experience that were regarded as threads of continuity that give unity to experience.

- A. Continuous curricular experience directly related to democratic values
 - 1. Develop social sensitivity
 - 2. Develop co-operativeness
 - 3. Develop the ability and zeal to utilize methods of intelligence in solving all problems of human concern
 - 4. Develop creativeness
 - 5. Develop skills in democratic living
 - 6. Interpret democracy
 - 7. Develop self-direction
- B. Continuous curricular experience implied by democratic values
 - 1. Develop communication skills and appreciations: reading, writing, speaking, music, art, language of quantity
 - 2. Develop skills in measurement and use of quantitative symbols
 - 3. Develop skills in utilizing goods and services (not only consumer goods, but radio, movies, recreation, and entertainment)
 - 4. Promote social adjustments

5. Promote health and safety
6. Develop vocational adjustments and standards
7. Develop adequate recreational outlets
8. Develop standards of personal appearance and grooming¹⁰⁴

The basic, underlying idea was that the school should be the finest illustration of democratic living. All involved should learn to live democratically by the actual process of living together. Parker and Dewey would have approved.

Parker began his teaching career in 1864, and Zirbes began her work in the Laboratory School in 1929. They had some striking similarities and some glaring differences, but throughout their work they both, along with Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns, attempted to determine the best possible program for the educational development of children. The educators in this study were more concerned with the process through which children learned, and through that process they expected the product to be substantial. They each had to fight to establish the reforms they believed in and then continue the battle to maintain them. They each amassed a number of devoted disciples who worked diligently and enthusiastically despite difficult conditions. Parker's work at Quincy and the Cook County Normal School, Dewey's at the University of Chicago Laboratory School, Steiner's Waldorf Schools, Mearns' Lincoln School, and Zirbes' Laboratory School of The Ohio State University, while each unique, exhibited certain commonalities. The structure of each was directed toward the

child, the way in which he learned, and the on-going purposes of his education. The physical and mental structure of the schools themselves and the school days promoted freedom, individuality, independence, and responsibility. This was accomplished through the teachers, the students, and the faith of the students' parents.

Notes

¹Marion Foster Washburne, et al., Francis Wayland Parker: His Life and Educational Reform Work (New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1900):48.

²F. W. Parker, "Application of Child Study in the School," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1885):418.

³F. W. Parker, "Discussion of Professor Richard Jones' 'German Methods of Using the Mother Tongue,'" Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1894):484.

⁴F. W. Parker, "Discussion After Professor Charles Dearmo's Paper on 'The German System of Normal Schools,'" Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1887):493.

⁵Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, The Child-Centered School (New York: World Book Co., 1928):277.

⁶Horace Coon, Columbia: Colossus on the Hudson (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1947):221.

⁷Lawrence A. Cremin, "John Dewey and the Progressive Education Movement," The School Review (Summer, 1959):164.

⁸Ibid., 166.

⁹Henry Barnes, "An Introduction to Waldorf Education," Teachers College Record (1980):325.

¹⁰Hughes Mearns, "Salvation by Information," The North American Review, 229(1930):71.

¹¹Hughes Mearns, "The High School and the 'Standard,'" The Independent, 73(1912):482.

¹²Coon, 224.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid., 223.

¹⁵Elmira R. Lucke, "Helping Youth Find His Larger Community," Progressive Education, 10(1937):395.

¹⁶Laura Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959):73-74.

¹⁷Laura Zirbes, "What Is Freedom in the Classroom?" Progressive Education, 11(1934):385.

¹⁸Laura Zirbes, "Our Research Responsibilities," Educational Leadership, 9(1952):487.

¹⁹W. Carson Ryan, "Editorial," Conference Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of Francis Wayland Parker, 582.

²⁰Jack Campbell, The Children's Crusader (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1967):82-83.

²¹F. W. Parker, "Application of Child Study," 482.

²²Charles F. Adams, Jr., "The New Departure in the Common Schools of Quincy and Other Papers on Educational Topics" (Boston, 1879). Reprint, The Elementary School Journal 35(1935):496.

²³"Address of Colonel Francis W. Parker," April 20, 1900, delivered in Old Stole Temple, Quincy, MA, 2.

²⁴Cremin, 170.

²⁵John Dewey, "The Schools and Social Preparedness," The New Republic, 7(1916):15.

²⁶Arthur G. Wirth, John Dewey as Educator (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966):38.

²⁷John Dewey, "The Need for Orientation," The Forum, 93(1935):333.

²⁸John Dewey, "Current Tendencies in Education," The Dial, 64(1918):289.

²⁹John Dewey, "Experiment in Education," The New Republic, 10(1917):16.

³⁰K. C. Mayhew and A. C. Edwards, The Dewey School (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1936):7.

³¹Wirth, 30.

³²Cremin, 166.

³³Ibid., 166-167.

³⁴Hughes Mearns, Creative Power (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., Inc., 1930):264.

³⁵Lester Dix, "Integration in the Lincoln School Philosophy," Teachers College Record, 37(1936):363.

³⁶Laura Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching, 71.

³⁷Laura Zirbes, "Gaps in Curriculum Research," Educational Leadership, 7(1949):190.

³⁸Laura Zirbes, Guidelines to Developmental Teaching (Columbus: The Teaching Aids Laboratory, The Ohio State University, 1959):52.

³⁹John A. Ramseyer and the Faculty of the University School, The Philosophy and Purpose of the University School (Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1948):2.

⁴⁰Herbert L. Coon, A Handbook for University School Parents (Columbus: University Press, The Ohio State University, 1954):4.

⁴¹Ibid., 6.

⁴²Rugg, 11.

⁴³Ibid., 43.

⁴⁴Adams, 500.

⁴⁵Flora J. Cooke, "Colonel Francis W. Parker and His Influence upon Education," Progressive Education, 14(1937):589.

⁴⁶Campbell, 40.

⁴⁷Harry G. Good and James D. Teller, A History of American Education (New York: Macmillan Co., 1956, 1973):207.

⁴⁸Lelia Patridge (reported), Francis W. Parker, Notes on Talks on Teaching (New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1883, authorized facsimile by micro-xerography by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, MI, 1967):42-45.

⁴⁹Helen M. Hefferan, "Colonel Francis Wayland Parker," Chicago Schools Journal, 18(1936):4.

⁵⁰Ibid., 6.

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Mrs. W. S. Hefferan, "The Social Philosophy of Colonel Francis W. Parker," Progressive Education, 14(1937):622.

- ⁵³Washburne, 19.
- ⁵⁴Ibid.
- ⁵⁵Ibid., 41.
- ⁵⁶Patridge, Notes on Talks on Teaching, 129.
- ⁵⁷Ibid., xii-xiii.
- ⁵⁸Ibid., xiii.
- ⁵⁹Tyler Dennett, "Education Cannot Lead," The Forum, 93(1936):336.
- ⁶⁰Mayhew, 5.
- ⁶¹Edwin E. Slossen, "John Dewey: Teacher of Teachers," The Independent, 89(1917):542.
- ⁶²Wirth, 124.
- ⁶³Ibid.
- ⁶⁴Earl J. Ogletree, Waldorf Schools: A Child-Centered System. Document (1975):14.
- ⁶⁵Slossen, 542.
- ⁶⁶Rugg, 38.
- ⁶⁷Mayhew, 7.
- ⁶⁸Rugg, 39.
- ⁶⁹Wirth, 188.
- ⁷⁰Mayhew, 12.
- ⁷¹Robert L. McCaul, "Dewey's Chicago," The School Review (1959):279.
- ⁷²Stewart C. Easton, Herald of a New Epoch (Spring Valley, NY: The Anthroposophic Press, 1980):187.
- ⁷³Barnes, 325.
- ⁷⁴Georg Rist and Peter Schneider, Integrating Vocational and General Education: A Rudolf Steiner School. Document (1978):30.

⁷⁵Ibid., 31.

⁷⁶Werner Glas, The Waldorf School Approach to History (The Anthroposophic Press, 1963):15.

⁷⁷Rist, 45.

⁷⁸Rudolf Steiner, A Modern Art of Education (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1972):133.

⁷⁹Rist, 21.

⁸⁰Steiner, A Modern Art of Education, 133.

⁸¹Marjorie Spock, Teaching as a Lively Art (Hudson, NY: The Anthroposophic Press, 1985):20.

⁸²Ibid., 21.

⁸³Ibid.

⁸⁴Lester Dix, "Administration Faces New Problems," Progressive Education, 14(1937):516.

⁸⁵Hughes Mearns, "Educating the Whole Child," The North American Review, 230(1930):701.

⁸⁶Mearns, Creative Power, 210.

⁸⁷Ibid., 211.

⁸⁸Ouida R. Meyer, "Leisure in the New Curriculum," Teachers College Record, 37(1936):389.

⁸⁹Lester Dix, "The Experimental High School," Teachers College Record, 38(1937):510-514.

⁹⁰Zirbes, Focus on Values, 107.

⁹¹Ibid., 64.

⁹²Laura Zirbes, "Give Beauty a Chance," Childhood Education, 25(1949):290-291.

⁹³Laura Zirbes, "The Challenge of Children's Needs," Childhood Education, 25(1949):417.

⁹⁴Zirbes, "What Is Freedom," 384.

⁹⁵Laura Zirbes, "The Emotional Climate of Schools," Educational Methods, 14(1935):171.

⁹⁶Laura Zirbes, "Equipping Today's Kindergarten," The Nation's Schools, 28(1941):46.

⁹⁷Laura Zirbes, "Modern Settings for Learning," Educational Leadership, 5(1948):354.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Ibid., 355.

¹⁰⁰Laura Zirbes, "The Dynamics of Advance in Teacher Education," Progressive Education, 16(1939):471.

¹⁰¹Zirbes, Focus on Values, 70-75.

¹⁰²Coon, 13.

¹⁰³Ramseyer, 11.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 10-11.

CHAPTER VI

STRUCTURE: TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS

Despite the set-backs and at times bitter battles among the educators in this study, Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, Zirbes, and their administrators, boards of directors, and school boards, they maintained a strong supportive base among their teachers, students, and parents. This must have been a part of the force that drove them forward. For the discussion on the people who comprised the structure, Parker, Mearns, and Zirbes wrote more on teachers than did Dewey and Steiner. Of course, Parker, Mearns, and Zirbes were actually school teachers while Dewey and Steiner could be more aptly described as teacher educators. Both Dewey and Steiner spent substantial time in that capacity with the teachers of their schools.

For educators devoted to a child-centered curriculum, it seems unusual to note that only about nine percent of their writing was directed toward children and their parents. Very few specific discussions and descriptions of students were noted. Little was mentioned of parents, yet they were always careful to communicate to parents why they employed such seemingly unorthodox

methods. And it was often parents who came to their rescue both politically and financially.

Teachers

What would a school structure be without teachers? Parker knew full well as he wrote in an 1891 article entitled "The School of the Future,"

As is the teacher, so is the school
Exalt the common school by the exaltation of the
teacher Make thoroughly educated men and
women fully capable of taking priceless treasures
of truth, revealed in this mighty century, to the
school room and put them in the souls of children.
Make them capable of undertaking the problems of
man and the destinies of humanity.¹

Parker recognized the importance of the teacher as the basis of the entire structure. In his day the average school superintendent would ask a new teacher, "Do you know arithmetic, geography, etc.?" and send him off to teach. Parker asked, "Do you know how to direct mental activity? Have you given that prolonged study?"² Parker demanded a great deal of his teachers, but no more than of himself, and he gave them much in return. He wrote,

A superintendent who doesn't allow teachers freedom is a nuisance and ought to be put out. A teacher who has no ideal, no lifting horizon, is a nuisance. I say to my teachers, "Don't follow me. Go your own way to work. Do a little well. But one thing I do demand. You shall move. Do nothing twice alike. Don't do things you have done before. If a child stood up before, have him sit down now. Whatever you do, do something different. Have no patterns. Uniformity is death. Variety is life."³

Parker demanded much but he also respected and cherished his teachers. The Parker's home was always open to his teachers, and many remained loyal and close to him all his life. So it angered him greatly when from his angle of vision school authorities took pleasure in seeing their employees cringe, even though they despised them for it.⁴ In fact, in 1872 as he was leaving Dayton, Ohio, to study in Germany, he commented, "School teacheresses must marry to get out of their misery."⁵

Though Parker advised teachers not to imitate, but to go their own ways, he was never silent on suggestions for the journey. For him the true method of teaching was an exact adaptation of the subject taught as a means of growth to the learning mind. He said if it is not, then artificial stimulation is necessary which results in "unhealthy mental action."⁶ The first thing to be done in teaching any topic was to set the stage or structure on which scene could be enacted in the child's mind. Teachers, he suggested, should mold in sand, on the molding board, or on the blackboard. He said history should not be taught from one book. Ideally, he would have each child with a different book and topic so they could all "read, discuss, add, shape, direct, dispute, and write compare this teaching that delights children at every step, trains close observation, lays the foundation for the development of the imagination with rote learning of a mass of dry, disconnected facts."⁷ In order to accomplish this, Parker wanted teachers "spurred" to find the best and most economical

methods so they have time to stress these other important elements.

Parker's major love was children, but he was not unaware of the need for classroom control. He said there were two ingredients: self-control and courage.

If you cannot govern them, they will govern you. They will study you to find your weakness. Give them something to do the first moment. Show them how skillful you are without being ostentatious. They'll soon forget their desire to badger you in the pleasure of doing. If you punish in anger, you simply enhance the difficulty.

To Parker and actually to all of the educators in this study, the best controlling device was student interest. They believed that the natural curiosity of children would stimulate learning provided the conditions were appropriate. To Parker if the teacher was not interesting to the class, the lesson was over as far as the learner was concerned. "Every time a child should attend and does not, he has not only lost the learning but has lost training in attention. Busy work is an effective device for aiding the teacher in a crowded school. But it must be interesting, require skill, and have variety.⁹ Parker wanted to reach not just the minds of his pupils. He was after total development; and in order to achieve that, the teacher had to be in control of the free interests of the child. Parker called this quality rather than quantity teaching which he said "makes the soul the focus of light, in which all rays are blended. It is the means of the richness and fullness of action for the all-sided

development of the body, mind, and soul."¹⁰ In April 1869 at the Teacher's Institute on Martha's Vineyard, Parker challenged teachers during his lecture on techniques in teaching geography to "resign when they cease to make their profession the subject of daily study."¹¹

Parker believed that teaching demanded honest, earnest investigation of the truth as found in the learning mind and the subjects taught and the courageous application of the truth when found. He said that

. . . in order to train children to know how to do, we must be able to do ourselves. We must have the skills in the techniques of school work which are 1. voice training--the voice must be clear, musical, slow pronunciations with ease and natural inflections, perfect articulation and pronunciation. Faults of tone, modulation, and manner are propagated by the teacher, as well as false syntax and incorrect pronunciation; 2. expressive reader; 3. sing well; 4. write; 5. draw/art; 6. gymnastics--train the whole body for mental action¹² depends largely upon physical conditions.

Finally, Parker felt that the time had come--this was 1885--when teachers (what he called "genuine teachers") should come together for the purpose of discovering the new directions and purposes of education. He wrote,

Shorn of all narrowing prejudices, all implicit beliefs in dogmas, many teachers today are ready to test anew the value of the old and with profound faith to surrender any predilection and move on to higher planes. Teachers of today realize that most human beings are simply specimens of arrested development and that the schools of the 20th century must work out every socialistic¹³ problem which the 19th century has presented.

Perhaps because Dewey lived so much longer than Parker, he spoke and wrote more negatively regarding the position of teachers. Richard Hofstadter wrote in Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (1963) that Dewey left no concrete curricular direction, that he said the teacher should be in charge but that he didn't say exactly of what.¹⁴ Dewey would no more tell a teacher exactly how to teach than would Parker. But they certainly told a great deal by their discussions of interest, experience, and development. Dewey said that the

. . . more the teacher is aware of the interests of the students and the factors in their experiences, the more imaginative they can be in establishing situations, raising questions, and suggesting activities that might engage the students to make sense of things themselves. This increases the chance of effectively reconstructing experience.¹⁵

For Dewey, the methods of instruction had to vary with the situation. He was in favor of small classes and the organization of subject matter into units. In his laboratory school, he had the students either present papers or oral summaries at the conclusion of each unit. He also encouraged the use of general assemblies for singing and reports, the library, field trips, laboratory experiments, maps, and movies.¹⁶ He preferred a generalist teacher over the specialist and an interdisciplinary approach.¹⁷

Dewey recognized problems both inside and outside of the system. For one he believed public school teachers should have been paid as much as university professors. He said, "It is

impossible to maintain a dichotomy between lower and higher education."¹⁸ Also, universities had to change the attitude against schools of education. He reported that to most universities "education is not really a subject, and even if it is, it is not considered a discipline."¹⁹

Like Parker, Dewey was also critical of poor school administrations. He explained that it is easier to be docile, directed, and controlled than to be insubordinate or original. He said the scales are weighted in favor of habituation and against reflective thought. In a 1918 edition of The Dial, he wrote,

Routine is so easy as to be natural and initiative so difficult as to require the severe art of discipline but the sociological antithesis of the individual and the social has invaded educational thought and is employed by pedagogues to defend unintelligent convention, unexamined tradition, and to feed the irritable vanity of that petty tyrant, the educational administrator, who learns by the study of new sociological pedagogy that exercise of his personal authority is in reality an exemplar of the great problem of sociology--the "social control" of the unregenerate, unsocialized individual. This thoughtless sociology does something, however, even more harmful than the rationalization of mere personal authority. It serves to justify the laziness, the intellectual inertia of the educational routineer (the teacher).²⁰

The justifications are that (a) it is easier to rely on textbooks, (b) textbooks embody the intellectual heritage of the race, (c) originality in teaching has socially disastrous consequences, (d) it is better to follow the line of least resistance, (e) it is better to deal with students on an external and perfunctory level, and (f) there is danger in catering to individuality.²¹

Later Dewey blamed the system rather than teachers. Writing for The Forum in 1935, both Dewey and Dennett complained that it was not the fault of the teachers, but the system that students were not learning how to think. Dewey said that teachers had to obey administrators and school boards. He warned that the problems in the schools were reflections of the problems in society and that they were perpetuating those conditions. He wrote the "schools must have a definite share in the evolution of a reconstructed social order."²² This was the same plea of Emil Mott in 1919 in Germany. In a companion article, Dennett wrote that

Schools are never better than the taxpayers, the parents, and the government. More often the handicap or corruption of high purpose flows from just plain ignorance and bigotry. The would-be statesman rants in one breath about the evils of holding companies and high rates and in the next breath charges some poor teacher with disloyalty to the constitution of the United States because he ventures to make an objective study of the rates under government ownership.²³

Steiner didn't address the issue of poor teachers and bad administrators. He didn't really discuss German education at large, but contained his comments strictly to Waldorf schools. When he began his work, he made an agreement with both Mott and the state that he could work without interference. So when he interviewed teachers, he was more concerned with their knowledge of the subject and practical applicability than credentials. He wanted them to know their subjects so thoroughly that they could concentrate on methods. Steiner trained them before they began

teaching, and then during their teaching they had weekly meetings and often went to see Steiner at the Goetheaneam. He also visited the schools as often as he could. Steiner wanted the teachers to be the planners, the arrangers, and the coordinators. He also wanted the students to see the teachers adjusting, learning, and acquiring the ability for life-long learning.

Mearns, too, chose not to elaborate on the problems of the teaching profession. His discussion of teachers as a part of the structure of education was based on what they should be and suggestions on what they should do. He began by admitting that "there will be an external conflict between those who want to teach the use of a tool by unmotivated drill directed toward mechanical proficiency and those who believe the tool is best taught through motivated applications in life situations."²⁴ Mearns described the old system as perfect order, mass attention to the workings of the teacher's "peculiar adult mind." The teacher was the master, the student was the servant, and the weapons were the punishments and the rewards. But the teacher was, in turn, subservient to the administration. The teacher knew the textbook, which he accepted without question although some of it was false, but not living knowledge. Mearns said the new education (which sounds to me much like Parker and Dewey) found the teacher interested in the growth of the child and full of surprises and trials and errors.²⁵ But either way, be they "subject matter teachers or child interest teachers with no notion

of outcomes beyond the hour or the semester, they are ineffective and dangerous."²⁶

Mearns felt that the best way to become a good teacher and to teach the child interest methods was, rather than reading a book, the observation of a good teacher. He, too, refused to state point by point instructions on good teaching. But he did suggest these methods called for a new type of learning which in turn called for more information about self and children. He had learned through his own experience as an adult attempting to enter the children's world that it required "silence and self-effacement."²⁷

Mearns taught writing and believed that in order to teach writing one should be a writer or at the least understand the process. He quipped, "Successful writers speak seldom of heir English classes."²⁸ In the external conflict Mearns was in the group who believed the tool was best taught through motivated applications in life situations. Grammar, for example. Composition was not simply an exercise in writing English correctly. It should be the desire to say something. "The student with something to say realizes his adequacy with his skill and desires to learn grammar. The rules are taught as needed."²⁹⁶

Mearns and his fellow teachers at the Lincoln school had little faith in the power of the traditional curriculum to meet the demands of the large proportions of students. They preferred what they called improved methods such as self-education, cooperative groups, informal teacher-student relations, unhampered

intellectual honesty, and natural personal freedom. In Creative Power, he wrote, "Teachers must furnish the right world to work in and have a clear vision of the ultimate educational outcomes for their students. They must know what they are driving at professionally."³⁰ One of the things they need to do at the beginning is develop minimum skills in their students as soon as possible so that the students can feel a sense of satisfaction and so that students can learn to work alone and have the confidence to ask questions. He further suggested that teachers give students tasks within their power to perform and enjoy with which Steiner, Dewey, and Parker would have wholeheartedly agreed. Then the teacher must be sensitive to difficulties as they progress and to approve good effort.

In Mearns' classroom the students and the teacher determined the reading and writing curriculum. He believed that he, as teacher, could not assign the writing topic. "One writes imaginatively about imaginative experiences; no one can decide in advance what they shall be. I can't tell you what to write about because I don't know what you know."³¹ And in class discussions of each other's poems, his voice (the teacher's) was but one of many. He wrote, "Neither theme nor method of treatment may come from the teacher; that is the only way if the aim is artistry."³²

In 1938 Mearns wrote in Educational Methods about the research quest his students endeavored. They selected the pilgrims to study and they began with writing spontaneously on what they

already knew and felt. This made them want to write stories and a play. They needed to know how the pilgrims dressed, worked, and spoke. They began their research with the books they had at hand. They went to the library and gathered information and brought what they found back to class. They developed a scientific zeal for accurate knowledge and that led to persistence and high ideals. The "wealth of knowledge combined with their new tools of research led to the joyous labor of a scholar."³³

Zirbes' suggestions for teachers coincided well with those of Mearns. In her Guidelines to Developmental Teaching, she offered seven general suggestions: (a) provide challenging resources and opportunities; (b) resist the impulse to infer; (c) contribute to the continuity and forward reference; (d) give the process time; (e) respect the rhythms of organic functions and indications of individuality and conditions favorable to acculturation and socialization; (f) display acceptant understanding of inept, unskilled, initial efforts; and (g) encourage and foster aspiring efforts.³⁴ She felt that the major responsibility of the teacher was to guide children to recognize their own needs. That children needed to learn to think was a recurrent theme found in the works of all the educators in this study. Zirbes realized that some skills require frequent repetition and that some are mastered the first time they are attempted. One of many ways she saw of developing the students' abilities echoes Parker, Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns. She saw the all-school event such as an assembly, play, or musical as not only a provision for dramatic and musical

expression. It also encouraged the development of creativeness, cooperativeness, self-direction, and sensitivity to the unique contributions of others.³⁵

Zirbes found that when teachers were in a quandary, they regressed to the way they were taught. All their training was forgotten. Often the problem was lack of realistic planning with alternatives for unpredictable situations. She warned that planlessness was exceedingly hazardous (as had Mearns), but that stereotyped formal plans were not the answer. Instead she offered teachers five steps to creative teaching: (a) an unsolved problem should lead to the challenge of exploratory learning, (b) self-awareness of habit bound teaching, (c) dump old devices, (d) invite cooperative student planning, and (e) enjoy a new situation.³⁶

Zirbes knew that even though there be excellent cooperation between faculties and staffs, the bottom line was that teachers decide what to teach and how. But she realized the benefits derived when basic policies and many procedures are developed by the entire staff. Therefore, all should help to plan and to understand all the grades. She was opposed, for example, to the sharp break between the elementary, junior high, and high school levels.³⁷ At The Ohio State University Lab School, the staff was the policy making group not the administration. The administration's function was to implement and interpret. The director was comparable to the chairman of a department and was

responsible for the general policy concerning the curriculum and public and professional relations. The coordinator of instruction had the mechanical run of the school. It was important that adequate clerical staff was available to free the teachers' time and give them the status of professionals. There were three groups of staff members: the grade staff, the area staff, and the grade counselors. The elementary staff worked together as a total group. They believed that teachers should work with their students for two years for similar reasons to Steiner's three-to-eight years. The teachers and students could become much better acquainted, accomplish much more, and provide continuity. Also, as in the Waldorf school, the teachers selected new teachers and administrators.³⁸

In Spurs to Creative Teaching, Zirbes wrote that "creative teaching requires a measure of insight and understanding, imagination, vision, respect for one's role, confidence in one's own potential, faith in emergent human values, and creative endeavor."³⁹ As the four educators in this study before her, Zirbes was asking a lot of teachers, but never more than she gave. Finally, she said she would like to see research on creative teaching by creative teachers. "Creative teaching is the sole source of operational data which applies to school living and learning."⁴⁰

What Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes had in common regarding the teacher was their respect. Respect that was, of

course, earned. They did not suffer lazy, planless teachers well. They demanded as much as they gave. They had all had actual teaching experience, so they were able to speak from a practical perspective as well as a theoretical one. They had great respect for teachers and realized their importance in the structure of the schools. The main and only reason, however, for the structure at all was the children.

Students

Parker had determined that the "work of the head and the skill of the hand be joined in the classroom and workshop into one comprehensive method of the harmonious development of the powers of the body, mind, and soul."⁴¹ Some of Parker's former students remembered that harmony. One wrote,

Whenever a topic in school could be legitimately strengthened by nature study, the fact was carefully taught and interwoven, never placed en bloc. In history we remember once taking a class to the shore at Wallstone. We walked and played along the beach upon which merry-makers landed so many years before. A short field lesson upon those glacier formed fields discovered to us all one reason that particular spot was chosen to be the home of that company of early "home seekers" unfortunate though the attempt at settlement was. The interesting fact here in a simple, unpretending way directly under the Colonel's direction and inspiration we began an outdoor⁴² laboratory study of geography and history.

And in an editorial written for the conference commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of F. W. Parker, a group of former students wrote,

We pupils become conscious that in a true democracy, freedom and responsibility were inexorably linked. For this reason, the irksomeness of routine, always necessary in a democracy, was easily faced. Restrictions imposed by members of the community were welcomed and judged by motives. We faced our social problems together. The Colonel and Miss Cooke pointed out the difference between justice and the uniformity of penalty. By force of their example, we saw the actions of our fellows to be judged in terms of the whole situation, whole self, and the background of the individual concerned. We sensed a clear routine and good habits released rather than inhibited powers within us--a point sometimes overlooked in other progressive schools. Only when routine becomes an end in itself does it become dangerous and constricting. The Colonel led us to the idea of world citizenship which is greater than local and is more difficult and takes more intelligence. World citizenship does not depend on ideals at home alone.. That realization is necessary, and we must see beneath the form or symbol the underlying idea--just as the Colonel used to do.⁴³

Dewey saw children growing and developing as members of a social group. He was, therefore, so interested in the appreciation of what the fundamental occupations of living--

. . . cooking, sewing, carpentry, and all principle of manual training activities may do when clarified and organized as a means par excellence, of preserving the investigative attitude and the creative ability of the growing child in social directed expression. Day by day he gains both in his skill to control situations and to direct his own activity to further and desired ends. He also gradually becomes conscious of his gain. This results in an integrated child, able to work more and more on his own initiative and under his own guidance--a child who is maturing, who is both educating and being educated, and whose education continues throughout life.⁴⁴

In the Waldorf Schools, Steiner's "highest endeavor must be to develop free human beings who are able of themselves to impart purpose and direction to their lives."⁴⁵ Further he wrote, "It simply won't do to educate pupils in such a way that when they leave school to enter life, they can only criticize the senselessness of all they find there."⁴⁶

In the Lincoln school, Mearns said the "first job of education is to train students to seek facts intelligently, organize effectively, and interpret understandingly."⁴⁷

Finally, Zirbes wrote that creative teaching "expands the child's experience when initiated by his discriminative and comparative observation It cultivates active curiosity, initiative, open mindedness, resourceful, and originality."⁴⁸

It would be too simplistic to say that these five educators wanted to make life better for their pupils and for the pupils of their pupils. Clearly what they wanted was for all students or at least as many as possible to develop as only a few had been doing. They wanted them all to learn to think for themselves, to make sound decisions, and to become active rather than passive sojourners.

Parents

Parker had been actively involved in the development of the parent-teachers association as early as 1877. Parents had complained that his innovations of manual training were fads and

frills. He and his faculty met frequently to explain to parents what, why, and how they were educating the whole child: head, hand, and heart.

Dewey was interested in bringing the school and the home closer together. He also wanted to put much responsibility on parents to keep their children in line. He frequently met with the parents of students in his lab school. He had an enormous challenge when he was forced to bring together the parents of the children from the four merged schools. He confronted them with the importance of education and called it "coeducational--parents/teachers/pupils by one another rather than with one another."⁴⁹

In the Waldorf schools, parents are interviewed as well as the children prior to acceptance in the program. Also parents played an active role in a variety of extra-curricular activities though they were not encouraged to simply drop in on classes.

In 1930 Mearns wrote that reform was up to the parents. He and the Lincoln school staff proceeded to involve parents as much as possible. They encouraged classroom visits, student demonstrations, lectures, parent-teacher socials. They offered a study course for parents to discuss education. Mearns published guiding principles, discussion questions, and situations to analyze. They also offered classes in physical education, arts, and crafts. They left the curriculum open to see what the class wanted to learn--"let each person begin where he was and follow with active interest."⁵⁰

Also at The Ohio State University Lab School, there was a strong parent council. It was described as an organization to aid and cooperate with the school. Parents were included in the planning, and there was much information that went from the school to the home and the home to the school.

Conclusions

In 1885 Parker wrote, ". . . the schools of the 20th century must work out every socialistic problem which the 19th century has presented."⁵¹ Writing in 1959 Zirbes summed up what educators such as the five under study and others had been attempting to do. Foster a coordination of values; make sure activities at the schools give everyone a sense of worth and belonging--Parker and his pupils repairing their school yard; develop a sense of continuity between school living and what goes on outside the school and before--Dewey and the occupations. Good human relations, group feeling, and personal adjustment must be fostered in and through significant life-related, shared experiences--Mearns and his creative writing class. Communication must be a two-way process. Group experience must be worth talking about and remembering--the Parker testimonials. Developmental potentialities of group experience must not be missed. Then use past experiences as resources that contribute to developing attitudes, understandings, and aspirations--both Steiner and Zirbes recommending the teachers remain with their students for at least two--at the most eight years.

Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes developed over time what they believed to be better educational ideas than those they observed around them. Their goal was to reach the whole--mind, body, and soul--of every child. They attempted to develop a structure to that end. The structure allowed the freedom to pursue individual and group interests. The development of these structures spanned 100 years. In 1916 Dewey commented on what, in a sense, they were all attempting.

Industry ceased to be an empirical, rule of thumb procedure, handed down by custom. It is now technologically based on machinery resulting from discoveries in math, physics, chemistry, bacteriology, etc. As a consequence industrial occupations have infinitely greater intellectual content and infinitely larger cultural possibilities than they used to possess. The demand for such education as will acquaint workers with scientific and social bases and bearings of their pursuits becomes imperative, since those without it inevitably sink to the role₅₂ of an appendage of the machine they operate.

Adams observed it in Quincy in the 1870s. Children went through the schools, but they weren't learning; and according to Parker they were suffering as well. Dewey and Steiner were attempting to create a new social order through the schools. To Dewey the structure of the American public schools, as they were then and now, does not allow students much opportunity to think. Parker called it quantity versus quality education.

Again Dewey summarized the basis upon which all five educators in this study seemed to stand. From Philosophy and Civilization, published in 1930, he wrote,

Associated or conjoint behavior is a universal characteristic of all existences. Knowledge is in terms of related objects and . . . relations as the nerve of science correlates with the association among all things The qualities of things associated are displayed only in association since in interactions alone are potentialities released and actualized.

He was describing, as it seems, Parker, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes would, the "whole fabric of civilized knowledge as a natural emergent, which grew out of a man's special form of interaction with the physical, organic, and mental phenomena of the world."⁵³

Notes

- ¹Francis W. Parker, "The Schools of the Future," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1891):87.
- ²Marion Foster Washburne et al., Francis Wayland Parker; His Life and Educational Reform Work (New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1900):48.
- ³F. W. Parker, "Discussion," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1881):50.
- ⁴Jack Campbell, The Children's Crusader (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1967):90.
- ⁵Ibid., 63.
- ⁶Lelia Patridge (reported), Francis W. Parker, Notes on Talks on Teaching (New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1983; authorized facsimile by micro-xerography by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, MI, 1967):170.
- ⁷Ibid., 132, 147.
- ⁸Ibid., 163.
- ⁹Lelia Patridge, The Quincy Methods (New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1889):4.
- ¹⁰F. W. Parker, "The Report of the Commission of Ten--Its Use for the Improvement of Teachers Now at Work in the Schools," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1894):447.
- ¹¹Campbell, 52.
- ¹²Patridge, Notes on Talks, 23.
- ¹³F. W. Parker, "Application of Child Study in the School," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1885):422.
- ¹⁴Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, (1963):375.
- ¹⁵Arthur G. Wirth, John Dewey as Educator (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966):38.

¹⁶Chauncey Samuel Boucher, The Chicago College Plan (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935):268.

¹⁷K. C. Mayhew and A. C. Edwards, The Dewey School (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1936):7.

¹⁸Seymour Sarason, Schooling in America: Scapegoat and Salvation (New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1983):50.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 48.

²⁰John Dewey, "Education and Social Direction," The Dial, 64(1918):334.

²¹*Ibid.*, 334.

²²John Dewey, "The Need for Orientation," The Forum, 93(1935):335.

²³Tyler Dennett, "Education Cannot Lead," The Forum, 93(1936):336.

²⁴Henry C. Fenn, "And What about Visitors?" Progressive Education, 14(1937):179.

²⁵Hughes Mearns, "Educating the Whole Child," The North American Review, 230(1930):701.

²⁶Hughes Mearns, Creative Power (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., Inc., 1930):264.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 236.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 274.

²⁹Fenn, 1979.

³⁰Mearns, Creative Power, 248.

³¹Hughes Mearns, Creative Youth (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., Inc., 1925):35.

³²*Ibid.*, 36.

³³Hughes Mearns, "Some Notes on the Individual Contribution," Educational Methods, 17(1938):167.

³⁴Laura Zirbes, Guidelines to Developmental Teaching (Columbus: The Teaching Aids Laboratory, The Ohio State University, 1959):40.

³⁵ Herbert L. Coon, A Handbook for University School Parents (Columbus: University Press, The Ohio State University, 1954):28.

³⁶ Ibid., 24.

³⁷ Ibid., 12.

³⁸ Charles A. Blackman, "The University Staff in Action" (The Ohio State University Education, 704, 1952):12.

³⁹ Laura Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959):54.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 78.

⁴¹ Patridge, Notes on Talks, 181.

⁴² Washburne, 51.

⁴³ Raymond W. Osbourne, "Where Is Education Going?" Progressive Education, 14(1937):634.

⁴⁴ Mayhew, 18.

⁴⁵ Henry Barnes, "An Introduction to Waldorf Education," Teachers College Record (1980):325.

⁴⁶ Rudolf Steiner, A Modern Art of Education (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1972):133.

⁴⁷ Fenn, 176.

⁴⁸ Laura Zirbes, "What Creative Teaching Means," Childhood Education, 44(1967):213.

⁴⁹ Mayhew, 15.

⁵⁰ Elsa Denison Voorhees, "Creative Recreation for Parents," Progressive Education, 6(1929):337.

⁵¹ Parker, "Application of Child Study," 422.

⁵² Wirth, 230.

⁵³ John Dewey, Philosophy and Civilization (New York: Minton, Bolch, & Co., 1930):123.

CHAPTER VII

GRADING, EVALUATION, ASSESSMENT

The most notable comment to be made regarding the attitudes of Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes is that compared with the other topics addressed in their writing, they did their best to ignore the topics of grading, evaluation, and assessment. Mearns commented the most of the five, with Zirbes and Parker vying for second and third. Steiner said what he had to say and was done with the issue. Dewey, for all intents and purposes, ignored the subject. In general, their attitude was one of disdain for the prevailing traditional structured method. In fact, they deemed it detrimental and backward. Even so, their writings on this topic seemed more constructive than critical.

Parker and Mearns criticized the presence of fear in the classroom as a detriment to success. Parker experienced his greatest fear during the war: "If we should fail." When he returned to education, he realized that the fear of failure was most injurious to success, and he became determined to rid his schools of report cards and the fear of failure.¹ Mearns saw the same problem, and he wrote the "two fears notoriously absent should be the fear of not saying the right thing and the fear of

not speaking the correct set of words."² The problem that all five educators under study recognized was the effect of criticism. Mearns said, "Teachers' approval to the right sort is like rain on the ground."³ The problem was not only that criticism existed, but that it was abused and the abuser did not realize the power of its effects.

I have divided Chapter VII into two categories: The Problems with Evaluation and Suggestions for Evaluation. Undoubtedly, the reasons why the positive, productive suggestions have not been universally adopted will be apparent. All of these teachers worked under difficult but far closer to ideal conditions than most of the teachers they might have encouraged to employ these evaluative techniques.

Problems with Evaluation

Parker had been aware of many of the problems he believed education was facing, and he became both strengthened and vocal when he returned from Germany and conducted his reformation of the Quincy schools. Partridge quoted him in The Quincy Methods:

Most children are reading in books far above their range and power of thinking. They are going through the arithmetic with an insufficient knowledge of elements. They are learning page after page of generalizations and facts that mean little or nothing to them. Such teaching must be enforced by the hope of rewards or the fear of punishment and this causes children to hate school.⁴

He was aware of the problem. If a class of third graders, for example, was not prepared, the teacher had two choices. She could

teach them what they should have learned and have them fail the third grade examination, or she could prepare them for the examination by having them memorize empty facts. Parker quoted Spencer for emphasis: "Having by our method induced helplessness, we straightaway make helplessness the reason for our method."⁵ Consequently, Parker understood when teachers criticized the new methods as worthless. They said they couldn't change because of the exams. Perhaps they couldn't unless the examinations were changed.

When Charles Adams and the Quincy school board, which was made up of businessmen, stepped in and asked their own examination questions, they discovered they were not getting their money's worth out of the schools. The cost of education had gone up, and the children didn't know anything beyond the rote answers they had been prepared to present. They brought Parker in, and he said, "Examinations should not be made a test of fitness for promotion. If the teacher is good, she can tell it when the child is ready to do the next work."⁶

Some sixty years had passed since Parker had complained that children were being taught meaningless generalizations by coercion and hating it, when Mearns wrote "Adults encourage only a limited range of traits . . . often considering the seemingly unimportant gift the most useful."⁷ Much of Mearns' opinion on evaluation stemmed from his work with the creative writing of his students and often the rehabilitation he had to encourage for new students. Of many of them he wrote, "They failed but in reality we failed

for we did not recognize their creative genius or felt it our duty to censor it."⁸ Mearns was particularly interested in encouraging his student writers to think and write for themselves rather than what they thought others (the teacher and evaluator) wanted to hear. He advocated originality and bemoaned mimicry. "Teachers of painting have always known the dangers of imitation and subservience, the two main practices of formal education."⁹ He criticized adults who judge as "standardized persons" and said, "We have become expert copyists. "How do you do! We cry out in unison like a chorus of cuckoos."¹⁰ Mearns was critical of the fact that many adults seem to praise imitation and criticize originality though he realized that often the critics themselves do not understand the difference.

Mearns worked to develop a classroom atmosphere that dispelled fear. He wanted his students at ease in their classroom conversation, and he was critical of the usual barrage of teacher directed questioning. "All our questions in the classroom are impertinent and highly unsportsmanlike quizzes to discover and punish the guilty ones who have not obeyed. I rarely asked a child a question unless I did not know the answer and thought he could tell me."¹¹

Zirbes would have agreed, adding that that kind of quiz-like questioning could have nothing but a detrimental effect. The students would not be learning for learning's sake, but learning answers to respond and to forget. Further she believed total extrinsic motivation carried with it long range effects. For

example, if children obey merely because they are afraid, they may be expected to disobey when there is no threat or fear of consequences. And she raised the question, "Who has not known an adult whose childish dependence on approval and recognition limits his adaptation to the challenges of maturity?"¹² She also questioned the mental hygiene of teachers who are over anxious about marks, grades, and promotions. Zirbes suggested such over emphasis caused both dishonesty and demoralization, and Parker, Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns would have surely agreed. As a final criticism, she noted that it takes years to undo the regimentation and inappropriate expectations to which many students are subjected.

Suggestions for Evaluation

Parker mixed no emotions when he said the following.

I believe the greatest obstacle in the way of real teaching today is the standard of examinations What should examinations be? The test of real teaching. What is teaching? Teaching is the evolution of thought and thought is the mind's mode of action. Teaching develops the mind and leads to acquisition of that knowledge most useful to the mind and its development. Pupils must be trained in the correct modes of expression: talking, writing, drawing, making, and building. All school work is comprehended in thought and its expression. Expression is only necessary when thought is involved. Train expression at the expense of thought and we have a body without a living soul There is no point to learning disconnected facts. Real teaching leads to systematic, symmetrical, all-sided upbuilding of a compact body of knowledge in the mind. Every faculty of the mind--perception, judgment, classification, reason, imagination, and memory is brought into action and foundations are laid broad and deep in

sense-products. Words and all other means of expression are simply indications of thought-building and its complicated processes. Examinations should test the conditions and the progress of the mind in its development. ¹³ Instead, exams usually test the power to memorize.

Parker learned during his command in the Civil War that men responded best to orders when they understood the reason for them. So when he took command of the Quincy schools, he requested two major provisions. The first was freedom for the superintendent (himself) coupled with the responsibility for results when given an adequate amount of time to secure them. The second was freedom for the teacher to "do the right thing in one's own way for the purpose of securing good results in a reasonable length of time."¹⁴ For the children Parker recommended raising the attractiveness of the object to be studied, exciting the interests of the child, and lowering the amounts of rewards and punishments. Parker's guarantee: "The true economical system of responsibility: Ascertain whether the superintendent, principal, or teacher can be trusted, and then trust them."¹⁵

Dewey explained his views in his 1935 article entitled "My Pedagogic Creed." He wrote,

All questions regarding grading and promotion should be determined by reference to the same standard. Examinations are of use only so far as they test the child's fitness for social life and reveal the place where he can be the most use, most service, or receive the most help.

It was never in the Dewey scheme to force the child to enter any particular profession or service or even to receive help for that matter. Dewey may have been influenced by trips abroad and

studies made of other school systems and his ever-increasing distance from young students. In his lab school at the University of Chicago, he preferred the favored method of all five educators in this study which was individual conferences with students and their parents.

Though growing up and living in an environment that held examinations very important, when he developed the Waldorf schools, Steiner said, "We should never want to hold official examinations."¹⁶ He obtained authorization for the schools to hold their own leaving exams so that they would be allowed to "follow the educational principles to their logical conclusions."¹⁷

Waldorf teachers did not give report cards as they were generally known. Steiner said, "There are no report cards, rather a mirror picture, a biography of progress."¹⁸ During the course of the year, the teachers held conferences with each student regarding the work done and progress to be made. At the end of the year, each teacher wrote an epigram, a short verse, or as Steiner called it a guiding verse for each child regarding their year together. This was, of course, designed to go well beyond the simple grade which represented a term's or a year's work. Steiner would not tolerate a "white washing of less positive aspects of a child's studies."¹⁹

These educators wanted to develop the abilities they believed each child had. Mearns believed that the schools should be a "self-cultivation in taste, never a slavery to information."²⁰

He said children will do good and bad work and that they must be allowed to do both so that they can be shown the difference in taste. For Mearns taste came not only from quality and respect, but originality. He opposed imitation as possibly and at times excellent, but never art.

Mearns called imitation a "confession of mediocrity" and cited examples such as moon in June, showers and flowers, a silver lake, a robin in the spring, and bare trees in the winter. "One's own good work," he wrote in Creative Power, "is never, never, never like anybody else's good work. Cast out everything you've heard, doubt the truth, and then begin to think."²¹ He admonished both teachers and students to reject imitations. He said the best work is like nobody else's because it is founded on their interpretation of the world about and within them. To encourage this kind of atmosphere, Mearns suggested schools be free of arrogant authority. He said that the student's personalities should be watched and noted and that was far more important than grades.

He explained that what the teachers at the Lincoln school looked for was "instinctive insight, never imitative, never wholly from without."²² But he warned that the process was difficult and time consuming. Teachers had to be prepared for poor work at the beginning for students have little experience with originality. Next, they have to learn how to distinguish the good work that is beginning to develop from the poor work that almost has to come first. He encouraged teachers to let it grow--"some will be silly

whims and some will not be silly. The point is that one must be able to distinguish."²³ He warned that it may be necessary to get inferior work out of the way so students may have to have several drafts of a work to arrive at the one most pleasing. Mearns explained that for those poor in English, "I don't correct their papers. That's been done before and it didn't work. I look for the idea, the thought, the picture, feeling, or argument and try to admire it. 'Blessed are the poor in English for they shall see with their own eyes.'"²⁴

Finally, for Mearns and his fellow Lincoln school teachers, evaluations were held four times each year. These included conferences with teacher, student, and parents.

Zirbes, like Mearns, wanted students to be able to discern their own good work without continual comparison to the work of others. But the struggle for status in the conventional evaluative system worked against positive personal values. Zirbes contended that the system actually pits people who should work together as rivals. She said we must face that fact that students have different endowments, drives, interests, maturity levels, and backgrounds. The grading process that defines poorest and best must be both discouraging and frustrating to those most in need. In her 1938 article on "Evaluation," she wrote that educators must

. . . reject the fact that there can be only one best paper and instead evaluate in ways that give everyone a stimulus, even ones who have no chance of ever being best. We must give evaluative comments that motivate intrinsically because extrinsic motivation causes copying, cheating, and short measure response.

And, in full agreement with Mearns, she continued,

Every child needs to learn to evaluate his own work in terms of purpose, goals, and standards which he understands and accepts so that he can develop as a creative person, one who can find satisfaction in experience and realize that values depend ²⁶ on individual and group effort rather than status.

The faculty of the Lab School believed, as did Parker, that numerical or letter grades place the primary emphasis on memorization. Yet facts and dates are less important than how a student locates, organizes, and uses facts. They believed that children naturally work hard on things that are interesting and important to them without needing the extrinsic motivations of grading, ranking, and competition. Also, as Parker realized during his military career, the university staff realized that children will work hard at jobs that make sense to them. For example, success in reading at the university school was related to the fact that students read for purposes they understood.

Evaluations were done in terms of the potential capacity of the individual and his aspirations. Social adjustment, physical and emotional maturity, and native intelligence were considered in the evaluation for promotion, acceleration, or retention. Most children were promoted regularly with their group. A two-to-three page typed evaluation letter described the progress of each student's work. There was also one parent conference a year. The final report called the senior statement was given to each graduate at commencement.

Postscript

If it had been possible, I suspect Parker, Dewey, Mearns, and Zirbes would simply have eliminated grading or formal evaluations. Parker, with his confidence in and respect for good teachers, would have left judgment on progress readiness to them. Since they also realized some kind of assessment was eventually necessary, they seemed, all five, to have settled on the oral conference and the written report.

They agreed upon the negative aspects of the competitive, extrinsically motivated, traditional grading system. It was based on short term memorization and promoted cheating and dependence. They realized, too, that it was most difficult for those students who were most in need.

They also would have agreed that the best test of student learning should not be how much could be memorized. It should be on how a student thinks, if he can perceive a problem, determine possible and practical solutions, and know how to locate necessary information. If any assessment should be done, Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes, who demanded so much from their teachers, would have assessed what they taught rather than what supposedly the students were to have learned. The test would have been theirs to take.

Notes

- ¹Jack Campbell, The Children's Crusader (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1967):28.
- ²Hughes Mearns, Creative Youth (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., 1925):61.
- ³Hughes Mearns, Creative Power (New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., 1930):160.
- ⁴Lelia Patridge (reported), Francis W. Parker, Notes of Talks on Teaching (New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1883; authorized facsimile by micro-xerography by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, MI, 1967):161.
- ⁵Ibid., 153.
- ⁶Ibid., 152.
- ⁷Hughes Mearns, "Every Child Has a Gift," The Reader's Digest (1952):22.
- ⁸Mearns, Creative Power, 164.
- ⁹Ibid., 166.
- ¹⁰Hughes Mearns, "Promoting Self-Expression," World's Work, 58(1929):63.
- ¹¹Mearns, Creative Power, 158.
- ¹²Laura Zirbes, "The Emotional Climate of Schools," Educational Methods, 14(1935):172.
- ¹³Patridge, 151.
- ¹⁴Marion Foster Washburne, et al., Francis Wayland Parker: His Life and Educational Reform Work (New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1900):46.
- ¹⁵Patridge, 154.
- ¹⁶Rudolf Steiner, Soul Economy and Waldorf Education (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1986):133.
- ¹⁷George and Peter Schneider, Integrating Vocational and General Education: A Rudolf Steiner School (Educational document):21.

- ¹⁸Steiner, Soul Economy, 135.
- ¹⁹Ibid., 138.
- ²⁰Mearns, Creative Power, 261.
- ²¹Ibid., 131, 146-150.
- ²²Mearns, Creative Youth, 26.
- ²³Mearns, Creative Power, 56.
- ²⁴Ibid., 237.
- ²⁵Laura Zirbes, "Evaluation," Childhood Education,
24(1948):251.
- ²⁶Ibid., 252.
- ²⁷Laura Zirbes, Spurs to Creative Teaching (New York: G. P.
Putnam's Sons, 1960):42.

CHAPTER VIII

ESTOPPEL

One of the profound mysteries in the world is the marvelous psychological change that comes over respectable, intelligent, and otherwise laymen when elected to serve on school committees. Persons who would never dream of superintending an electric plant, managing a railroad, building a bridge, leading an army, or commanding a ship enter upon the duties of a school committee with astonishing presumption. They can with safety minister directly to the welfare of children, mold society into right living and shape the destinies of the nation by means of common education. They can make courses of study, select teachers, examine pupils, and manage internal and pedagogical affairs of the school system. It would e ridiculous were it not so solemn. It is the culmination of bad politics and the very worst by-product of democratic evolution. I have sometimes thought that theology had the deepest and strongest hold upon the human mind, especially in New England, but that is not true. Educational ideas are the slowest to change. Noah Webster was mightier than Jonathan Edwards; technical grammar mightier than predestination. Human progress is measured by the time it takes to get good ideas into life. . . . You may argue that Webster, Clay, Sumner, all our greatest were educated in the old way so why change? My dear sirs, you can count the successes but is your power of calculation great enough to count the failures? I have no doubt that many of the frauds and defalcations so common at present in this country may be traced directly back to well-meant, but dishonest, training in the school room. The learning of words and pages of a textbook, without the privilege of verifying the facts and

generalizations there given, weakens the reasoning power that should be developed for the purpose of controlling the will. The long perspective of our life is truth and not a show; and I hold that sort of teaching in the highest degree immoral which crams the heads of our children with the unusable pages of textbooks and then leads them to suppose that they are gaining real knowledge. By making quantity our ideal, we develop and foster conceit, and conceit is one₁ of the most formidable barriers to true knowledge.

Parker delivered that address on April 20, 1900, in the Old Stole Temple, Quincy, Massachusetts. "The long perspective of our life is truth and not a show." Though these words were spoken before the other educators in this study--Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes--even began their major educational emphases, they could easily stand for their educational and life-long foci. These educators were above all for truth in every permeable facet of every child's existence. They decried educational dishonesty and false methodology. And they devoted their lives to the goal of a true education for all children.

Parker spoke against the influence of outsiders upon education. Though each of the educators in this study had devoted followers, they also had many battles in which they encountered opponents of what they were trying to do in the classroom and for the children. Those opponents ranged from school boards to politicians to government officials, newspaper editors, school and university officials, to individuals who visited their classrooms and complained about students talking to each other. In varying ways and degrees, all of society made demands upon the schools. Each of the educators in this study developed a vision and a sense

of what they believed would be best for the children and ultimately best for society. The purpose of this study was to learn what five educators--certainly well known and influential in their respective eras--thought and did. In that I was successful. I've learned what they thought, perhaps why they thought it, what they did, how they succeeded, and how they failed. The most solemn failure to me was that their successes have had to be re-invented. The unaccountable successes must have been the good they did for children and the effect that had on society.

Good and Teller in A History of America Education wrote in 1956 that perhaps Parker had underestimated the economic and political forces of the day and underestimated the power of the school.² Perhaps that was a partial explanation, at least, of the ultimate problems each of these educators had in the promotion, acceptance, continuity, and continuation of their pedagogical processes. Parker's battles drained his life from him; Dewey lived to see his vision incorrectly and in some cases incompetently practiced; Steiner, who might have been the "herald of a new epoch," had his spirit broken by arsonists and hate; Mearns sat upon the podium of the annual MEA convention one year beyond the appropriate time. His vision of creativity had been displaced and the members were there, eager to hear from someone else. Zirbes continued to speak out and publish literally until the day she died, continuing to fight a battle she must have felt she had not quite won.

It seems to me that though the times have certainly changed, the problems have not. The schools continue to be influenced, pressured, and requested by politicians, the governments, newspaper editors, school boards, committees, and the general voting public. Too many children do not score well on assessment tests, too many children cannot read, write, or cipher. Too many children are not in school while there are too many children in most classrooms. Too many children do not know how to learn independently. Too many children do not know how to think. Dewey warned that we would lose the democracy if the people could not analyze, evaluate, and understand propaganda. And in June 1989 Gephardt, the new majority leader of the U. S. Senate, warned that these are tough times because problems are difficult to see.

This study is divided into six categories: Biographies, The Child, Language/Literacy, Academic and School Discipline, School Structure, and Evaluation/Assessment. The research was both interesting and extensive. I believe I was able to read much that has been published by and about Parker, Mearns, and Zirbes. The same held true for Steiner with the condition of being written in English and published in America. So many have tackled Dewey that I was forced to evaluate and exclude works both by and about him. Of all the people I have contacted, librarians and archivists were best acquainted with the existence and availability of material, but they did not, of course, know the person. I have spoken to two people who knew Laura Zirbes. They were former students. I contacted all of the schools, but the people there now do not know

much about the people whose vision created them. A teacher at the Francis W. Parker School in Chicago was kind in her offer to help, but she wrote, "You can visit if you'd like and I know there are a few old books around here but they are dusty and musty and probably of little use." These five--Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes--have seemed larger than life to me, yet as I sat digging through microfiche of old newspapers and reading their obituaries despite all they seemed to have done or tried to do, I remembered hardly anyone, even at their own schools, remembered them.

Parker grew up a poor boy in New Hampshire. He was apprenticed at the age of seven. He had to defy his guardian in order to attend school. Following a relatively successful career in the Civil War and despite other offers, Parker returned to teaching. This surprised and disappointed many members of his family and friends as education was not considered a very worthy profession, especially for a man. He devoted his life to education and became the "children's crusader." He wanted schools to become a place where "all good things come together." Each new position he took was made with the intention of reaching more people and helping more children. Both Parker and Steiner died young--in their sixties--and I wondered if the bitter battles they encountered had not influenced those early deaths.

Dewey had an easier childhood than both Parker or Steiner. He complained about his early education, but that was because he could not get enough of what he wanted. He certainly had access

to all that was available. Dewey taught briefly in the schools but was much more at home teaching philosophy at the University of Michigan while he certainly wrote prolifically and influenced many, Dewey--to me--seemed more interested in education from a more universal perspective despite his intensive work at the University of Chicago Laboratory School.

Steiner did not actually teach until the early 1900s when he taught an adult education class. He received his experience and developed many of his ideas through his extensive tutoring. Yet of the five, Steiner's Waldorf Schools are the most developed and prolific. Mearns did not want to devote his life to education, yet he did, and certainly not unhappily from what I have learned. Zirbes received her teacher education at a normal school and after her first year of teaching was told by her principal that she should consider transferring to a private school where her unique methods might be more acceptable.

What Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes wanted for children was the development of respect and appreciation for the acquisition of knowledge as life-long learners. What they fought against was the rigidity, the strictness, the formality, the dullness, the lack of integration, and the lack of respect for the individual. They described childhood as a unique, developmental, imitative, imaginative, energetic, and enthusiastic period of human development. A consensus seemed to appear that the best treatment which allowed the highest capabilities and offered the most substantial learning was an in-depth knowledge of the

individual child followed by suitable arrangements and adjustments.

For these five educators, the teaching of language was of paramount importance. They were especially troubled by what they considered to be incorrect methodology. For Parker and Steiner, language had to be whole. It should permeate every lesson, every aspect of the school day, every aspect of the lives of the students. For Dewey language was a social instrument, a device for communication, a tool used by one person in order to share his feelings and thought with others. For Mearns language spoke through the heart. He made language beautiful and intelligible. For Zirbes language was purposeful. Children should have rich and varied experiences through their reading. They should develop strong motives toward permanent interests in reading.

All five educators in this study based their reading instruction on the experiences of children. The knowledge base should be built upon and developed from what children already knew. Their goal was not only a literate society, but one obtained in a less painful manner.

To Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes, academic and school discipline were how, why, and what to teach. They discussed what education was about, what human beings were capable of learning and doing, and how to advance the furthest with each individual and how everything fits together. They favored discipline that led to self-discipline, self-direction, and

self-mastery, and that, therefore, academic and school discipline were automatically integrative.

The structure of schools should, according to Parker, Dewey, steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes, be directed toward the child, the ways in which he learned, and the on-going processes of his education. The curriculum was integrative and developmental and organized in such a way as to reach the whole child: body, mind, and soul. It must promote freedom, individuality, independence, and responsibility. Students and their teachers were the most important people in these schools.

The structure was to be one in which students and teachers could work together in as painless a manner as possible. Therefore, Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes worked to eliminate the pain inflicted through fear of failure and punishment. They attempted to do this through intrinsic motivation and developmental, integrative, and holistic evaluations. This was accomplished not on the basis of a test, but on the collaboration of the teacher and student over time.

The predominant motif which joined the work of Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes was a concern for the development of the whole child. Though their backgrounds were different and their basic interests varied--Parker's study of geography, Dewey's society, Steiner's science, Mearns' writing, and Zirbes' reading--they worked conscientiously for the development of a better, more substantial, more humane, and more successful way to teach children. Whatever their successes and failures no one can argue their intentions nor their determination.

Notes

¹"Address of Colonel Francis W. Parker" (Quincy, MA: Old Stole Temple, April 20, 1900).

²Harry G. Good and James D. Teller, A History of American Education (New York: Macmillan Company, 1956, 1973).

REFLECTIONS

America was the great experiment in democracy, and people fighting for the democratic right of the future demanded democratic, egalitarian, common public schools. DeTocqueville wrote in a communique to Europe on this new American experiment that Americans are interested in equality to the ultimate detriment of the majority. Perhaps that is one explanation for the supposed failure of the American public school system. It would seem, however, difficult to fail at something that no one has ever done before and that, therefore, at which no one has ever been successful.

Parker and Dewey proclaimed that without free and common schools, democracy would not survive. The question in these concluding statements rests mainly in a critical analysis of the connections between the past and the present. Certainly, the argument has been offered in defense of historical study prior to proposed change. I shall restrict my arguments to the educational domain in general and the progressive alternatives offered in response to the supposed failure of traditional education.

I begin with a reminder that in some sense, all things, all ideas, all peoples are ultimately linked together. This is not a

phenomenon peculiar to education, though many in the field proclaim it so. Democracy begot public, common schools. We were the first country to attempt or even want to educate every youth in our land. We clearly have not succeeded; however, we may argue we have not only improved from the idea conception but also have reaped much knowledge base due to the "grand experiment."

As an example, I have compiled a Zirbesque list of 16 connections among the five educators in this study. These connections are by no means judgmental or indicative of success or failure in educational or social matters.

1. Mearns dedicated his book Creative Power (1929) to John Dewey.
2. Both Parker and Dewey began their teaching careers in country schools. Parker's experience was good; Dewey's was not good--both may have directed them toward their future emphasis.
3. Parker, Dewey, and Steiner ultimately became devotees of non-sectarian religions. Mearns and Zirbes were not included only because information is not available.
4. War influenced Parker, Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns--and probably Zirbes, but information is not available. Parker learned about the importance of communication during his tenure as a colonel in the Civil War. Dewey learned the importance of family support when during the Civil War his mother moved her family to the south to be near her fighting husband. Steiner's schools came about because of the need for social stability as a result of World War I and were closed during World War II. Mearns served in World War I.

5. Both Parker and Zirbes taught in Ohio--a progressive state at one time in the formation of the nation.
6. Both Parker and Steiner literally rejected tests and grades. Though all of the educators in this study rejected strict, objective, destructive evaluations figuratively.
7. Again both Parker and Steiner stand out as forcefully and vocally insisting that teachers be masters of their content.
8. Zirbes was both influenced and recognized the influence of Dewey as she developed her laboratory school.
9. Parker, Dewey, and Steiner were vehemently opposed by many.
10. Parker, Dewey, and Steiner grew up in small, rural villages.
11. Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns were bored with their schooling. Parker criticized certain of his teachers to their faces.
12. All five--Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes-- published the lectures that they gave.
13. Parker, Steiner, and Dewey were very poor in their youth and had to work for their schooling.
14. Dewey and Steiner were involved in many areas outside of education. For Parker and Zirbes, education was their whole life.
15. Parker, Dewey, and Steiner were married twice.
16. Dewey, Steiner, and Mearns hated their early schooling.

Some of these connections caused their interest in making education a focus of their professional careers, and some were

effects of their educational involvement and commitment. All of them were very dedicated foremost to children followed by concern for the educational structure at large. There was a suggestion that perhaps Parker underestimated the economic and political forces of the day and overestimated the power of the schools. I suggest the same questionable state of consciousness may exist among those who attempt and advocate reform today. It seems that an essential yet too frequently ignored element of educational reforms is a study of past attempts and the problems and barriers to success. As I have reported throughout this study, Parker, Dewey, Steiner, Mearns, and Zirbes had many educational beliefs and suggestions in common. I see many in the reforms of the 1980s and 1990s. My question is, are we not only re-inventing the wheel, but are we attempting the task in a similar context and are we not, therefore, doomed to repeat the failures?

Another question comes to mind: of the five, is Parker, in a sense, the only one without some degree of responsibility for sharing the blame I place on many reformers even today. That is because he took as his primary theoretical and behavioral models the influential Germans of the time. He appreciated much of what the Germans were doing in their schools, but he realized that what they had was not what he, as an American educator, had or wanted. At that time the Germans fostered a restrictive, segregated school system while Parker promoted a common, egalitarian one.

Thus, Parker had no one person or experiment to model or to explore. He had no one's success or failure to study. My

question is have the reformers since taken advantage of the reforms and experiments that have preceded them? Dewey has suggested that there are two doctrines of education: that of the mental disciplinists (the university and school administrators and subject matter specialists) and the revolutionists who protest the status quo and preach growth, activity, and initiative. He commented that everyone who devotes time to thinking about education from 1890 on has "consciously or naively lined up with one or the other." Dewey questioned why when these two should actually reinforce one another. The requirements of civilization should not be at war with the conditions of individual development.

Yet they are, and the conflicts continue to attempt reforms of content but within the same context. Talk of structural change remains talk. "Good as our schools are, mighty as their progress and magnificent the result, they are not, by any means, equal to the tremendous social problems that face us in the coming 20th century." Parker wrote that in 1885. One hundred years have passed, and a similar claim can be made today.

APPENDIX

**INVENTORY OF READING ACTIVITIES OF A
PROGRESSIVE PROGRAM COMPILED FROM
RECOMMENDATIONS OF REPRESENTATIVE
PROGRESSIVE LEADERSHIP**

First Grade

- I. Activities Based on Content Units More than One Paragraph in Length
- Putting cut up stories together (reading puzzles)
 - Dramatizing rhymes
 - Composing story for others to read
 - Using Mother Goose books
 - Giving the name of a rhyme recited by another
 - Drawing pictures to illustrate an experience
 - Listening to others read
 - Reading meaning from pictures
 - Illustrating silent reading material
 - Reading to carry out directions
 - Answering silent reading questions on the board after a class trip
 - Reproducing story read silently
 - Selecting material to read in class
 - Reading silently for interesting information
 - Dramatizing stories
 - Answering thought questions on a selection
 - Answering questions orally or in writing
 - Reading interesting parts of a library book to the class
 - Listening to a story or poem read by the teacher
 - Conversing about various points brought out in the story
 - Reproducing stories orally--after silent study
 - Proposing simple problems for solution through reading
 - Reading cumulative stories
 - Rereading interesting stories
 - Reading for oral reproduction
 - Silent reading, all the class using same material
 - Silent reading, all using different material
 - Silent reading, each of two or more groups using different material
 - Illustrating a story read previously
 - Dramatizing a story read previously
 - Choosing and using different material to illustrate readings

Answering thought questions orally
 Making individual booklets
 Matching Mother Goose rhymes with illustration
 Rearranging stories and rhymes
 Answering silent reading questions about reading selections

II. Activities Based on Unrelated Paragraphs or Sentences

Using paragraph cards with specific questions on the
 back of cards
 Following directions written on blackboard
 Pantomiming sentences read silently
 Answering questions
 Rearranging lines of a rhyme

III. Activities Based Chiefly on Phrases, Words, or Phonic Elements

Finding how many times a given phrase was used in a
 cumulative story
 Reading children's names in print on cards, backs of
 chairs, and lockers
 Reading names of colors on crayola boxes
 Matching pictures with phrases
 Reading underlined words and phrases
 Recognizing words and phrases written independently
 Finding in books words or phrases written on blackboard
 Making and using signs in correlation with building
 projects
 Reading signs and notices
 Printing signs with price and sign markers
 Pointing to words on chart as teacher retells story
 Matching names and colors
 Noting similarities and differences in words
 Analyzing words into sound elements

IV. Activities Involving the Use of the Table of Contents, Index, etc.

Using table of contents to find reading matter in book

Second and Third Grades

I. Activities Based on Content Units More Than One Paragraph in Length

Taking tests in silent reading
 Summing up paragraphs by finding topics for each paragraph

Illustrating silent reading material
 Reading to carry out directions
 Reproducing story read silently
 Reading silently under a time pressure
 Answering factual questions based upon reading story
 Selecting material to read to class
 Choosing best-liked selections and giving reasons for choice
 Listening to a reader with a problem in mind
 Putting cut-up stories together (reading puzzles)
 Reading silently for interesting information
 Dramatizing stories
 Answering thought questions on a selection
 Comparing one reading selection with others
 Answering questions orally or in writing
 Solving problems through reading
 Reading to get material for projects
 Answering judgment questions
 Suggesting headings for paragraphs
 Suggesting original titles
 Reading interesting parts of a library book to the class
 Conversing about various points brought out in the story
 Reproducing stories orally--after silent reading
 Proposing simple problems for solution through reading
 Reading cumulative stories
 Rereading interesting stories
 Studying selection to be used in class
 Reading for oral reproduction
 Silent Reading, all the class using same material
 Silent reading, all using different material
 Silent reading, each of two or more groups using different material
 Silent reading without preliminary preparation
 Silent reading with preliminary preparation
 Illustrating a story read previously
 Dramatizing a story read previously
 Choosing and using different material to illustrate readings
 Reading to answer questions on current events
 Studying independently to solve problem difficulties
 Answering thought questions orally
 Finding a quotation in a book or selection
 Using Mother Goose books
 Keeping own record of speed tests
 Giving setting of story in few words
 Paraphrasing stories and rhymes
 Drawing pictures to illustrate an experience
 Answering silent reading questions about reading selections
 Listening to others read
 Reading meaning from pictures

II. Activities Based on Unrelated Paragraphs or Sentences

Following directions written on blackboard
 Pantomiming sentences read silently
 Asking questions of group
 Answering questions
 Rearranging lines of a rhyme

III. Activities Based Chiefly on Phrases, Words, or Phonetic Elements

Reading underlined words and phrases
 Recognizing words and phrases written independently
 Analyzing words into sound elements
 Analyzing long words into syllable elements
 Recombining sound elements into original wholes
 Recombining sound elements into different wholes
 Listing words according to phonetic rules or groups

IV. Activities Involving the Use of the Table of Contents, Index, etc.

Using table of contents to find reading matter in book

Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Grades

I. Activities Based on Content Units More Than One Paragraph in Length

Reproducing parts of text orally
 Reading for pleasure and appreciation
 Memorizing favorite selections or parts
 Finding and preparing material for bulletin board
 Listening to good oral reading
 Studying pictures in connection with stories
 Discussing to arouse interest
 Voluntary home reading
 Composing original stories for others to read
 Solving riddles
 Inventing titles
 Connecting illustrative material with appropriate reading
 Drawing or illustrating selections read
 Giving directions
 Making tests
 Finding sentences that answer specific questions
 Stating conclusions
 Evaluating materials of reading
 Finding the main topics in factual material

Writing committee reports based on readings for projects
 Making a bibliography of reading on a subject
 Giving book reviews
 Retelling famous stories
 Selecting books
 Reading to check answers
 Selecting significant paragraphs or chapters
 Selecting key sentences
 Selecting appropriate topical headings for paragraphs
 Making summary of paragraphs by having topic for each paragraph
 Making topical outlines
 Making running notes while reading
 Making and matching paragraph headings
 Studying organization of headings in texts and newspapers
 Analyzing short and long narrative units
 Finding central thought or essential idea in limited time
 Answering questions on books read
 Keeping time limits on material read outside of recitations
 Reading to compare two versions of a story
 Using room library
 Selecting material to read to class
 Reading aloud to appreciate rhyme and rhythm
 Discussing the appropriateness of headings
 Reporting out of class reading
 Writing questions to stress essential facts
 Writing a synopsis of a story
 Discussing current events and using clippings to prove points
 Reading the most interesting part of a book to others
 Reading to solve problems
 Reading to satisfy curiosity
 Verifying facts and opinions
 Reading to find new problems
 Taking notes on an oral class report
 Reading for information
 Library reading of books and magazines
 Locating data
 Evaluating and selecting data
 Organizing ideas
 Memorizing material read
 Making outlines
 Giving information about outside reading, pertinent to topics
 Reporting to class on topical reading
 Reading aloud for group enjoyment
 Skimming for particular items
 Reading aloud to prove a point
 Reading independently books relating to content subjects
 Studying selections to choose one to read aloud
 Reading aloud for personal enjoyment

Reading to inform others
 Reproducing the main thought
 Reading to reproduce the most important facts
 Writing summaries
 Retelling parts of stories
 Using paragraph headings
 Interpreting maps, figures, diagrams, charts, and illustrations
 Interpreting tables, graphs, and other statistical material
 Making figures, diagrams, and simple graphs to interpret reading matter
 Selecting materials to fill out a topical outline or to answer a question
 Selecting the aim or purpose of a selection
 Reading to find specific items
 Finding topic or title for paragraph
 Answering questions which require a summary
 Solving science problems through reading
 Reading weather maps
 Writing class books for class library
 Reading club organization
 Discussing and enjoying stories
 Reading aloud to prepare for dramatization
 Practicing parts for a dramatization
 Practicing breathing properly while reading orally
 Finding and using materials in geography, history, etc.
 Taking standard oral reading tests
 Reading by groups
 Reading minutes and announcements
 Solving a problem of language
 Checking and correcting own work
 Comparing maps, charts, graphs, and statistical tables
 Reading railroad folders, etc.
 Picking out central thought or most important idea
 Picking out points which support author's point of view
 Reading from films or slides
 Finding specific words, phrases, and ideas
 Finding relationships or contrasts between facts and ideas
 Describing conditions described in selections
 Reading between lines and interpreting in terms of past experiences
 Selecting important ideas or main points
 Answering questions on reading
 Dramatizing for grade assembly
 Acting moving picture shows
 Reading stories outside class to tell at class period
 Diagnosing own weakness
 Making a list of questions on reading matter
 Reading to check accuracy of reports on books
 Selecting key word to use in notes

Using questions formulated in advance to guide readings
 Reading references for a topic or question
 Keeping record of library books used
 Reading to prepare material for assembly program
 Reporting by groups, covering special topics
 Comparing dates of publication and reliability of
 statements
 Reading to settle questions of disagreement
 Answering specific questions in connection with reading
 Recording specific things on outline map according to
 directions
 Rereading for something overlooked
 Reading for fun
 Dramatic reading by groups
 Discussing problems involving humorous parts of selections
 Dramatizing a poem
 Summarizing essential values of a story
 Giving the most interesting point in a story
 Naming characters, chief character, and highest point of
 interest in a story
 Guessing what may happen next in a story
 Listening while another group reads
 Putting together a cut up story
 Illustrating stories
 Solving situations through reading
 Answering a question for each paragraph of factual
 material
 Listing the facts in a selection
 Reading particularly interesting paragraphs aloud
 Varying answers by careful reading
 Analyzing short literary selections on some topic or
 by some author
 Rapid reference reading
 Writing book reports
 Finding materials for projects

II. Activities Based on Unrelated Paragraphs or Sentences

Judging correctness of answers or processes in arithmetic
 Completing sentences on an informal test
 Visualizing situations in arithmetic problems
 Reading to be able to direct games
 Paraphrasing
 Pantomiming sentences and directions read silently
 Analyzing arithmetic problems to state facts given
 Analyzing arithmetic problems to find process necessary
 to a solution
 Selecting arithmetic problems requiring same process

III. Activities Based Chiefly on Phrases, Words, or Phonic Elements

Studying difficult and unusual wording
Talking about words occurring in geography content
Listing words according to phonetic rules
Interpreting the pronunciation of words through the use
of diacritical marks
Pronouncing words to get clear enunciation
Analyzing words phonetically
Studying prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and
antonyms

IV. Activities Involving the Use of the Table of Contents, Index, etc.

Using texts and reference books to find a definite topic
Using marginal headings to locate facts
Using local libraries to find material
Using encyclopedias to find information on a definite
topic
Using card catalogue to locate information
Using reader's guide to locate articles on specific topics
Using word list to pronounce difficult words
Using table of contents
Using index
Consulting dictionary
Finding materials
Using appendix
Using glossary
Using chapter headings

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works Cited

FRANCIS PARKER

Books by Parker

- Parker, Francis W. How to Study. New York: 1894.
- _____. Talks on Pedagogics. New York: 1894.
- _____. Talks on Teaching. New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1883. (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1967).

Articles by Parker

- Parker, Francis W. "Application of Child Study in the School." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1885):418-429.
- _____. "Art in Everything." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1900): 509-514.
- _____. "The Child." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1889): 479-82.
- _____. "Discussion." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1880): 49-50.
- _____. "Discussion of James L. Hughes' 'Comparison of the Educational Theories of Froebel and Herbart.'" The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1895):344.
- _____. "Discussion of John S. Clark's 'The Place of Art in General Education.'" The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1895): 846-851.

- _____. "Discussion of Nathan C. Schaeffer's 'The Meaning and Limitations of the Maxim We Learn to Do by Doing.'" The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1887):381-382.
- _____. "Discussion after Professor Richard Jones' 'German Methods of Using the Mother Tongue.'" The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1887):493-494.
- _____. "Discussion of the Report of the Sub-committee on the Correlation of Studies in Elementary Education." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1895):344.
- _____. "Discussion on the South and Its Problems." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1894):586-590.
- _____. "Discussion of W. P. Search's 'Individualism in Mass Education.'" The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1895):408.
- _____. "The Farm as the Center of Interest." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1897):527-536.
- _____. "The New Department." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1895): 949.
- _____. "The Report of the Committee of Ten--Its Use for the Improvement of Teachers Now at Work in the Schools." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1894):442-461
- _____. "Responses." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1895): 61-62.
- _____. "Syllabus of the Philosophy of Education in the Course of Study." Elementary School Teacher (1900):27.
- _____. "The School of the Future." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1891):82-102.
- _____. "Simplified Spelling." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1901):216.

_____. "The Training of Teachers." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1895):969-972.

_____. "Work of the Illinois Society for Child Study." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1896):844-846.

Books about Parker

Cambell, Jack. The Children's Crusader. New York: Teachers College Press, 1967.

Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators. New Jersey: Pageant Books, 1959.

Francis Wayland Parker Scrapbooks and Miscellaneous Papers. University of Chicago Library, 1880-1901.

Good, Harry G. and James D. Teller. A History of American Education. New York: Macmillan, 1956, 1973.

MacConnell, Charles M. New Schools for a New Culture. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Ohles, J. F. Ed. Biographical Dictionary of American Educators. London: Greenwood Press, 1978.

Patridge, Lelia. The Quincy Methods. N.Y.: E.L. Kellogg & Co., 1989.

Rugg, Harold & Ann Shumaker. The Child Centered School. Yonkers: World Book, 1928.

Washburne, Marion Foster. Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Man and Educational Reformer. N.Y.: E.L. Kellogg & Co., 1990.

Articles About Parker

Adams, Charles F., Jr. "The New Departure in the Common Schools of Quincy and Other Papers on Educational Topics." The Elementary School Journal (1935):495-504.

"Address of Colonel Francis W. Parker" Old Stole Temple, Quincy, Mass. April 20, 1900.

"An American Educator." The Outlook (1902):754-755.

Bogan, W. J. "Progressive Education in Chicago." Progressive Education (1931):401-402.

Cook, John W. "Remarks" The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1902):407-408.

Cooke, Flora J. "Colonel Francis W. Parker and His Influence on Education." Progressive Education (1937):583-588.

_____. "The Social Philosophy of Francis W. Parker: Its Implications for Today and Tomorrow." Progressive Education (1937):629-631.

Fox, Florence. "A Personal Glimpse of Colonel Parker." Progressive Education (1932):59-61.

Hefferan, Helen M. "Colonel Francis Wayland Parker." Chicago Schools Journal (1936):4-8.

_____. "The Social Philosophy of Colonel Francis W. Parker." Progressive Education (1937):621-622.

Jackman, Wilbur S. "Colonel Francis Wayland Parker." Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1902):399-405.

Judd, Charles H. "Francis Wayland Parker." Dictionary of American Biography, N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Kline, Elinor; David W. Moore; and Sharon Arthur Moore. "Colonel Francis Parker and Beginning Reading Instruction." Reading Research and Instruction (1987):141-150.

Lang, Ossian H. "Francis Wayland Parker." The Forum (1902):114-116.

Newlon, Jesse H. "Education and Social Problems: Democracy and Education in Our Time." Progressive Education (1937):589-594.

Osborne, Raymond W. "Where is Education Going?" Progressive Education (1937):632-634.

Parker, Franklin. "Francis W. Parker & Public Education in Chicago: The Stormy Career of a Great Educational Reformer." Chicago Schools Journal (1961):305-312.

"The Silver Anniversary of the Quincy Movement." The School Journal (1900).

Tostberg, Robert E. "Colonel Parker's Quest for 'A School in Which All Good Things Come Together.'" History of Education Quarterly (1986):22-42.

Washburne, Marion Foster. "The Educational Crisis in Chicago." The Arena (1896):611-618.

White, E. E. "Remarks." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1902):405-406.

Winship, A. E. "Mrs. Frank Stuart Parker." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1899):246.

Wotherspoon, Marion Foster. "A Memory or Two of Colonel Parker." Progressive Education (1937):635.

JOHN DEWEY

Books by Dewey

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. N.Y.: The MacMillan Co., 1916.

_____. Experience and Education. N.Y.: The MacMillan Publishing Co. Inc., 1938.

_____. German Philosophy and Politics. N.Y.: H. Holt & Co., 1915.

_____. The School and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1915, 1943, 1953.

Articles by Dewey

Dewey, John. "Current Problems in Secondary Education." Address to the Fifteenth Educational Conference of the Academies and High Schools Affiliating or Cooperating with the University of Chicago. The School Review (1902):13-28.

_____. "Current Tendencies in Education." The Dial (1917):287-289.

_____. "Education and Social Direction." The Dial (1918):333-335.

_____. "Experiment in Education." The New Republic (1917):15-16.

_____. "In Explanation of Our Lapse." The New Republic (1917):17-18.

_____. "My Pedagogoc Creed." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1935):13-16.

_____. "The Need for Orientation." The Forum (1935):333-335.

_____. "Public Education on Trial." The New Republic (1917):245-247.

_____. "The Schools and Social Preparedness." The New Republic (1916):15-16.

_____. "The Situation as Regardds the Course of Study." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association (1901).

_____. "Some Aspects of Modern Education." School and Society (1931):579-584.

Books About Dewey

Bernstein, Richard J. John Dewey. N.Y.: Washington Square Press, 1966.

Boucher, Chauncey Samuel. The Chicago College Plan. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935.

Brickman, William W. and Stanley Lehrer. John Dewey: Master Educator. N.Y.: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1959.

Campbell, Harry M. John Dewey. N.Y.: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Coon, Horace. Columbia: Colossus on the Hudson. N.Y.: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1947.

Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators. N.J.: Pageant Books, Inc., 1959.

DePencier, I. B. The History of the Laboratory Schools, The University of Chicago, 1896-1965. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967.

Dwarkin, Martin S. Dewey on Education. N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1959.

Dykhuizen, George. The Life and Mind of John Dewey. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

Goodspeed, Thomas Wakefield. A History of the University of Chicago. Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1916.

Graham, Patricia A. A History of the Progressive Education Association. N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1967.

Mayhew, K. C. and A. C. Edwards. The Dewey School. N.Y.: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.

Rugg, Harold and Ann Shumaker. The Child Centered School. Yonkers: World Book, 1928.

Wirth, Arthur G. John Dewey as Educator. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Articles About Dewey

Barton, George E., Jr. "John Dewey: Too Soon a Period Piece." The School Review (1959):128-138.

Bode, B. H. "John Dewey." Education Research Bulletin (1929):342-343.

_____. "Is Progressive Education Obsolete?" School & Society (1933):544-548.

Breed, Frederick S. "Progressive Education." School & Society (1933):544-548.

Bruce, Wm. F. "Comment Upon Breed's Criticism of Dewey." School & Society (1933):812-814.

Bucholz, H. E. "Dewey Mocked by the N.E.A." Educational Administrators and Superintendents (1932):413-421.

Cremin, Lawrence A. "John Dewey and the Progressive Education Movement, 1915-1952." The School Review (1959):160-173.

Dennett, Tyler. "Education Cannot Lead." Debate Rebuttal to Dewey's "The Need for Orientation" The Forum (1935):335-337.

Dunkel, Harold B. "Dewey and the Fine Arts." The School Review (1959):160-173.

Dunkel, Harold B. & Robert L. McCaul. "Dewey: 1859-1959." The School Review (1959):123-124.

Jordan, James A. "Dewey & Progressive Education." The School Review (1959):125-127.

Kimpton, Lawrence A. "Dewey & Progressive Education." The School Review (1959):125-127.

Levit, Martin. "The Context of a Contextualist Philosophy." The School Review (1959):246-257.

McCadden, Helen M. "John Dewey and Education." The Commonweal (1929):113.

McCaul, Robert. "Dewey's Chicago." The School Review (1959):258-280.

Moore, Ernest C. "John Dewey's Contribution to Educational Theory." School and Society (1930):37-47.

- Newlon, Jesse H. "John Dewey's Influence in the Schools." Teachers College Record (1929):224-238.
- "Notes and Announcements." The Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association (1933):68.
- Popp, Jerome A. "If You See John Dewey, Tell Him We Did It." Educational Theory (1987):145-152.
- Roche, George. "Capitalism and the Future of America." Imprimus Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI. Special Edition.
- Schwab, Joseph J. "The Impossible Role of the Teacher in Progressive Education." The School Review (1959):139-159.
- Slosson, Edwin E. "John Dewey: Teacher of Teachers." The Independent (1917):541-544.
- "Some Popular Appraisals of John Dewey." Teachers College Record (1929):207-223.
- Williams, Joy. "Dewey and the Idea of a Science of Education." The School Review (1959):186-194.
- Wood, Jacalyn. "The Dewey School Revisited." Chicago Education (1981):99-101.

RUDOLF STEINER

Books by Steiner

- Steiner, Rudolf. The Cycle of the Year. N.Y.: The Anthroposophic Press, 1984.
- _____. Discussions With Teachers. (Fifteen Discussions, Stuttgart, August - September 1919) N.Y.: The Anthroposophic Press.
- _____. The Education of the Child. London: Rudolf Steiner Press. 1965.
- _____. The Four Temperments. (Lecture given in Berlin on March 4, 1909) London: Rudolf Steiner Press.
- _____. The Gospel of St. John. N.Y.: The Anthroposophic Press. 1940.
- _____. An Introduction to Waldorf Education. N.Y.: The Anthroposophic Press, 1985.
- _____. Knowledge of the Higher Worlds. London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1969.
- _____. A Modern Art of Education. London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1928, 1972.
- _____. Soul Economy and Waldorf Education. London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1986.
- _____. The Story of My Life. London: The Anthroposophical Publishing Co., 1928.
- _____. Theosophy. N.Y.: The Anthroposophic Press, 1971.
- _____. Younger Generation. N.Y.: The Anthroposophic Press, 1967.

Books About Steiner

- Davy, John. ed. Working Arising. London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1975.
- Eccles, John C. The Human Mystery. Berlin: Springer International, 1979.
- _____. The Human Psyche. Berlin: Springer International, 1979.

Glas, Werner. The Waldorf School Approach to History. N.Y.: The Anthroposophic Press, 1963.

Harwood, A. C. The Way of a Child. London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1967.

_____. The Recovery of Man in Childhood. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958.

Holland, Wade B. The Waldorf Schools: 32 Questions and Answers. California: Children's Book Services, 1981.

McDermott, Robert A. ed. The Essential Steiner. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.

Ogletree, Earl J. Eurythmy: A Motoric and Artistic Method of Teaching Young Children. Chicago: Chicago State University.

Rist, Georg and Peter Schneider. Integrating Vocational and General Education: A Rudolf Steiner School.

Richards, Mary Caroline. Towards Wholeness: Rudolf Steiner Education in America. Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1980.

Shepard, A. P. A Scientist of the Invisible. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1954.

Sloan, D. ed. Toward the Recovery of Wholeness. N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1984.

Stewart, Desmond. The Foreigner. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1981.

Articles About Steiner

Barnes, Henry. "An Introduction to Waldorf Education." Teachers College Record (1980):322-336.

_____. "What is Waldorf Education?" The Education Digest (1980):46-49.

Davy, John. "The Social Meaning of Education." Teachers College Record (1980):344-359.

Ginsburg, Iona H. "Jean Piaget and Rudolf Steiner: Stages of Child Development and the Implications for Pedagogy." Teachers College Record (1982):327-337.

Howard, Alan. "Education and Our Human Future." Teachers College Record (1980):337-344.

Leichter, Hope Jensen. "A Note on Time and Education." Teachers College Record (1980):360-370.

Ogletree, Earl J. "Intellectual Growth in Children and the Theory of Bioplasmic Forces." Phi Delta Kappan.

Ogletree, Earl J. "Rudolf Steiner: Unknown Educator." The Elementary School Journal (1974):344-351.

_____. "The Waldorf Schools: An Artistic Approach to Education." Journal of Suggestive-Accelerative Learning and Teaching (1980):81-86.

HUGHES MEARNS

Books by Mearns

Mearns, Hughes. The Creative Adult. N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., 1940.

_____. Creative Power. Garden City: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., 1930.

_____. Creative Youth. N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran, & Co., Inc., 1925.

_____. The Demon of Inhibition. N.Y.: Doublday, Doran, & Co.

Articles by Mearns

Mearns, Hughes. "The Authentic Language of Childhood." Progressive Education (1929):290-293.

_____. "Creative Education." The Parents Magazine (1931):11+.

_____. "Creative Education in College Years." Progressive Education (1946):268-279.

_____. "Cultivating Self-Expression in English." Junior-Senior High School Clearing House (1930):52-53.

_____. "Culture and Education in America." book review. Progressive Education (1931).

_____. "The Demon of Inhibition." Junior-Senior Clearing House (1930):346-350.

_____. "Discipline and the Free Spirit." Progressive Education (1931):633-641.

_____. "Education Isn't What It Used to Be." The Parent's Magazine (1936):22-23+.

_____. "Educating the New Child." The North American Review (1930):696-703.

_____. "Every Child Has a Gift." The Reader's Digest (1952):21-24.

_____. "The High School Student and the 'Standard.'" The Independent (1912):480-485.

- _____. "Language Artists in the Primary Grades." Childhood Education (1963):178-181.
- _____. "The Love That Fails." The Parents Magazine (1934):17+.
- _____. "A Note on Ordinary Folks." Junior-Senior Clearing House (1930):516-517.
- _____. "Our Native Speech." McClure (1916):87.
- _____. "Promoting Self Expression." World's Work (1929):60-63.
- _____. "Salvation by Information." The North American Review (1930):65-72.
- _____. "Some Notes on the Individual Contribution." Educational Method (1938):166-169.
- _____. "Trust in Their Own Ability." Childhood Education (1951):153-156.

Books About Mearns

- Coon, Horace. Columbia: Colossus on the Hudson. N.Y.: E. D. Dutton & Co., Inc, 1947.
- Ohles, J. F. Biographical Dictionary of American Educators. London: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Rugg, Harold and Ann Shumaker. The Child-Centered School. N.Y.: World Book Co., 1928.

Articles About Mearns

- Clark, John R. "Life in the High School." Teachers College Record (1936):393-398.
- Crockett, Ann. "Miss Crockett Replies." Progressive Education (1940):299.
- Deffendal, P. H. "Cultivating Self-Expression in English." Junior-Senior High School Clearing House (1930):52-53.
- Dix, Lester. "The Experimental High School Program." Teachers College Record (1937):503-517.

_____. "Integration in the Lincoln School Philosophy."
(1936):363-371.

Duff, John Carr. "Hughes Mearns: Pioneer in Creative Education."
The Clearing House (1966):419-421.

"Eastern Conference at Providence." Music Supervisors Journal
(1933):26.

Hopkins, L. Thomas. "Curriculum Development." Teachers College
Record (1936):441-447.

Larrick, Nancy. "Readings That Made a Difference." Journal of
Reading (1979):202-204.

Meyer, Ovida R. "Leisure in the New Curriculum." Teachers
College Record (1936):388-392.

"North Central Conference." Music Supervisors Journal
(1933):48-49.

"Portrait." Music Supervisors Journal (1933):26+46.

Wolf, Anna W. M. "Study Course on the School-Age Child." The
Parents Magazine (1936):89-90.

LAURA ZIRBES

Books by Zirbes

Zirbes, Laura. Comparative Studies of Current Practice in Reading. N.Y.: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Columbia University, 1928.

_____. Focus on Values in Elementary Education. N.Y.: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1960.

_____. Guidelines to Developmental Teaching. Ohio: The Teaching Aids Laboratory, 1959.

_____. Spurs to Creative Teaching. N.Y.: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.

Articles by Zirbes

Zirbes, Laura. "The Challenge of Children's Needs." Childhood Education (1949):417-419.

_____. "Children Need Experiences." Childhood Education (1948):51.

_____. "Children Need Understanding." Childhood Education (1949):338-339.

_____. "Clear the Way for Learning." National Educational Association Journal (1951):599-602.

_____. "The Continuity of Social Learning." National Educational Association Journal (1949):599-602.

_____. "Creative Teaching for Creative Thinking and Living." Educational Leadership (1956):19-25.

_____. "Discipline for Freedom." Childhood Education (1951):225-230.

_____. "The Dynamics of Advance in Teacher Education." Progressive Education 9(1939):467-473.

_____. "The Emotional Climate of the Schools." Educational Methods (1935).

_____. "The Emotional Implications of School Practices and Tasks." The Educational Record (1935).

- _____. "Equipping Today's Kindergarten." The Nation's Schools (1941):46-47.
- _____. "Evaluation." Childhood Education (1948):251-252.
- _____. "Gaps in Curriculum Research." Educational Leadership (1949):187-192.
- _____. "Give Beauty a Chance." Childhood Education (1949):290-291.
- _____. "The Human Network." Principal (1947):5-6.
- _____. "Identification." Childhood Education (1949):387-388.
- _____. "Inalienable Rights of Children." Childhood Education (1945):341-342.
- _____. "Let's Pool What We Know." Children Education (1952):339-340.
- _____. "Modern Settings for Learning." Educational Leadership (1948):353-357.
- _____. "Needed Research in Education." Educational Leadership (1952):129-131.
- _____. "Objectives in Reading." Educational Research Bulletin (1929):343-344.
- _____. "Our Research Responsibilities." Educational Leadership (1952):485-488.
- _____. "The Principal's Challenge." National Elementary Principal (1952):28-36.
- _____. "Priorities in Childhood Education." Progressive Education (1943):103-107.
- _____. "Programs and Practices in Focus and Perspective." The National Elementary School Principal (1956):21-24.
- _____. "Raising Our Sights." National Educational Association Journal (1955):394-396.
- Zirbes, Laura and Lou LaBrent. "Social Studies in a New School." Progressive Education (1934).
- _____. "The Status of Progressive Schools." Progressive Education (1931).

- _____. "Thoughts on the Education of Science Teachers for Today's Schools." Science Education (1958):280-288.
- _____. "Toward Social Maturity." Childhood Education (1947):107-108.
- _____. "Viewing Remedial Work." Childhood Education (1956):51-54.
- _____. "What Creative Teaching Means." Childhood Education (1956):51-54.
- _____. "What is 'Freedom' in the Classroom?" Progressive Education (1934):383-385.
- _____. "What is 'Valid' in Safety Education?" The National Elementary Principal (1953):22-23+.
- _____. "Why Guidance?" Childhood Education (1948):261-262.
- _____. "Why Motives Matter." Childhood Education (1948):261-262.
- _____. "Work and Play." Childhood Education (1948):147-148.

Books About Zirbes

- Coon, Herbert L. A Handbook For University School Parents. Columbus: University Press, The Ohio State University Press, 1954.
- Howes, D. ed. American Women. L.A.: American Publishing Inc., 1939.
- Ohles, J. F. ed. Biographical Dictionary of American Education. London: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Ramsey, John A. and the Faculty of the University School. The Purposes of the University School. Columbus: University Press, the Ohio State University, 1948.
- Rugg, Harold and Ann Shumaker. The Child Centered School. Yonkers: World Book, 1928.
- VanTil, William. My Way Of Looking At It. Terre Haute: Lake Lure Press, 1983.

Articles About Zirbes

Serviss, Trevor. "Teachers for Today's Schools...Gain Professional Competence." Educational Leadership (1952):152-154.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293005733179