# Three Currents of American Curriculum Thought

Herbert M. Kliebard

Thinking about the curriculum is as old as thinking about education. It is hard to imagine any inquiry into the nature of education without deliberate attention to the question of what should be taught. From the point of view of a serious educator, whatever the historical period or the particular setting, the question of what to teach involves a selection from a vast array of knowledge and belief within a culture. Since it is impossible to teach everything, that selection from the culture reflects in part some sense of what is most worthwhile in that culture seen in relation to the kind of institution the school is and what it can reasonably accomplish. In *The Republic,* for example, Plato thought that the young men of Athens ought to study geometry because, in his view, "a training in geometry makes all the difference in preparing the mind for any kind of study."[1] Plato was thus arguing the case for geometry over other possible subjects of study and supporting his particular choice with what he assumed to be a sound reason for that choice. In this same manner, many curriculum decisions are made today but with other kinds of evidence being cited for those choices.

Aristotle recognized the complexity of deciding what to teach:

> At present, opinion is divided about the subjects of education. All do not take the same view about what should be learned by the young, either with a view to plain goodness or with a view to the best life possible; nor is opinion clear whether education should be directed mainly to the understanding, or mainly to moral character. If we look at actual practice, the result is sadly confusing; it throws no light on the problem whether the proper studies to be followed are those which are useful in life, or those which make for goodness, or those which advance the bounds of knowledge. Each sort of study receives some votes in its favour.[2]

Beyond its quaint phrasing Aristotle's statement has an unusually modern ring, capturing something of the timelessness of the questions that have pervaded the study of curriculum since ancient times. In particular, he drew attention to the fact that curriculum decisions inevitably involve questions of value. What sometimes appears to be a straightforward choice from the various subjects of study brings us into the realm of differing value systems. Even in settled periods in history, questions about what knowledge should be passed on to the young

involve conflicting ideals and values, but in periods of rapid social change, those questions become particularly urgent and puzzling.

The era we now know as the Renaissance, for example, not only was a period of profound social change and a rebirth of learning, but also one in which great thinkers were writing pedagogical tracts that attempted to define what the youth of Europe should be studying. Desiderius Erasmus, Vittorino da Feltre, Joannes Ludovicus Vives, and François Rabelais all wrote major treatises on curriculum. Rabelais's *Gargantua* and *Pantagruel* conceived of the curriculum as an enormous feast filled not only with the delicacies of Greek, Latin, Chaldean, Hebrew, and Arabic but also with musical accomplishment, physical prowess, knowledge of metals and precious gems, and even the casting of artillery. His work represents a break with a traditionally narrow and constricted curriculum. The work of Erasmus in *De Ratione Studii* and of Vives in *De Tradendis Disciplinis*, while also departing from the traditional scholastic curriculum, point in a somewhat different direction—mainly toward literary and linguistic elegance. Although in periods of change there may be agreement on the need for a reconstruction of the curriculum, it would be rare indeed for there to be any sort of unanimity on the direction the curriculum should take. What tends to emerge from the desire to change the curriculum in a changing society is a compromise among different and even competing programs for reform.

The 20th-century American curriculum emerged most directly from a period of unrest in the 1890s when there appeared to be a profound realization on the part of American leaders and the general public that a major transformation had been wrought in American society. Although the social changes themselves had been in progress for several decades, during the 1890s the perception of change became particularly acute. Urbanization, mass immigration, and immense industrial growth were themselves highly significant; but, in addition, a vast increase in railroad travel and in newspaper and magazine circulation meant that the awareness of social change was being brought home to ever larger segments of the American population. The major depression of 1893 added an ominous note to this perception of change, and Americans generally were beginning to worry about what kind of world the 20th century would bring. Labor unrest, vice in the cities, corruption in government, and what was seen as undesirable immigration from southern and eastern Europe led to fears that a fragile society would soon come apart.

It was in this context that Americans looked more and more to schools as a vehicle for addressing these problems. While the traditional humanist curriculum engendered some dissatisfaction during the 19th century, it nonetheless remained fairly stable, bolstered in large measure by the theory of mental discipline. When certain subjects, such as the classical languages, were criticized for being impractical or even useless, as was the case with the controversy over the Yale College curriculum in 1828,[3] there was always recourse to a justification similar to that espoused by Plato: certain subjects had the power to develop the mind more than others, and development of the various faculties of the mind, such as memory, reasoning, and imagination, was the chief function of schooling. Thus, a combination of the humanistic ideal and a belief that powers of the mind needed to be trained through vigorous exercise helped support existing curricular practices.

Apart from the social changes that were being so keenly felt in the 1890s, one immediate factor that created the climate for reconsideration of the existing curriculum was the sheer increase in the number of children entering school, particularly adolescents. In 1890 less than 7 percent of adolescents from 14 to 17 attended school; within a scant four decades more than half of adolescents that age were in secondary schools. It was becoming problematic as to

whether the curriculum that had served so successfully in the 19th century would be suitable for the new population of students then marching through the schoolhouse doors. Among those wary of that possibility were such prominent psychologists as E. L. Thorndike, whose experiments indicated that many assumptions of faculty psychology were not borne out by experimental testing.[4]

Challenges to the old order in curriculum matters were coming from a variety of sources. The issue achieved national visibility in 1892, when the National Education Association appointed a committee of prominent educators to study the question of uniformity in high school programs of study. The committee was headed by the highly respected president of Harvard University, Charles W. Eliot, a mental disciplinarian but one who saw that theory as capable of adjusting to the demands of modern education. The report that the Committee of Ten issued in 1893 represented a modest compromise between established tradition in curriculum matters and calls for a dramatic change. The committee set up four model "programmes," which by contemporary standards are thoroughly academic, but in their time represented something of a movement away from the standard curriculum of the day. The committee, for example, accepted modern foreign languages as the virtual equivalent of Latin and Greek, thus departing from the commonly held view that the classical languages were disciplinary while French and German were simply practical.

Although the committee is often accused of imposing college domination of the curriculum in secondary schools, the members actually saw themselves as developing a curriculum for "life" and only incidentally for admission to college. Such a curriculum for life in their view developed the intellectual capacities of all students regardless of probable destination. Eliot was especially wary of early curriculum "bifurcation" into college-going and non-college-going populations, which he regarded as a form of prognostication that could easily become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Although the Committee of Ten report received much approbation in its day, its most fundamental recommendations essentially were rejected by 20th-century curriculum makers. The vast majority of educational leaders favored a change in curriculum that would parallel what they saw as the massive change that had been wrought in American society. That drive for a thorough reformulation of the curriculum in the 20th century is what many latter-day interpreters see as the progressive education movement. But when that desire for change is seen in the light of differing and even competing ideals and value systems held by educational reformers of the period, competing values of the sort that Aristotle noted, then it becomes well-nigh impossible to define a single coherent educational-reform movement. What we find instead is that when the recognition of a need for change is filtered through the lenses of people with differing political and social orientations, proposals for reform of quite different character and intent emerge.

## THE SOCIAL EFFICIENCY IDEAL

In general, three major challenges to the humanistic and plainly academic curriculum reaffirmed by the Committee of Ten began to emerge in the 1890s and survived through at least most of the 20th century. The most powerful of these movements was one that sought to redefine the curriculum in line with the tenets of social efficiency. Had the program of the social efficiency educators been fully implemented, the effect on the curriculum would have been revolutionary. In social terms, however, the basic thrust of the movement was conservative. For proponents of social efficiency, a major part of their opposition to the standard academic

curriculum of the day derived from what they perceived as its sheer uselessness. It was difficult, from their point of view, to discern in the daily lives of people any relevance to the study of foreign languages, higher mathematics, physics, or masterworks of literature that dominated the curriculum. Accordingly, they sought to build a taut connection between what was studied in school and the everyday lives of people. To major leaders of the movement such as Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, and David Snedden, this meant a careful analysis of the actual activities that people performed in the course of their work, play, home life, and as citizens that would provide the basis for what to teach. Of the three major reform movements that had some impact on the American curriculum of the 20th century, social efficiency was probably the most anti-academic.

One major manifestation of the social efficiency ideal was the *Cardinal Principles Report* of 1918.[5] Prepared by a National Education Association committee, it differed markedly from the Committee of Ten's report only a quarter century earlier. Completely absent was the mental disciplinarian justification for school subjects, now replaced by a frank appeal to utility and good citizenship. The value of school studies would not be measured by their ability to strengthen the mental faculties but by the extent to which they would contribute to seven aims of secondary education: health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character. Each of the subjects, it was urged, should be able to demonstrate its contribution to the achievements of these seven aims or face the danger of elimination. In practice, a subject like literature could make a claim to worthy use of leisure and history to informed citizenship, but clearly the subjects in the most advantageous position were the ones that appeared to have the most direct relationship to the duties of life.

The *Cardinal Principles Report* achieved wide acclaim not only when it was first issued but also for many decades thereafter. Part of its popularity may be attributed to the fact that Clarence Kingsley, in formulating the recommendations, avoided the extremes that many of the leaders of the social-efficiency movement were recommending. Snedden, Kingsley's close colleague, favored a dual system of secondary education involving a separate system of vocational education along the German model. Early division along academic and vocational lines was much more efficient in determining what should be taught. But Kingsley strongly favored the comprehensive high school with differentiated curriculums, not separate institutions attuned to the different educational requirements of high school students. Kingsley also stopped short of eliminating academic subjects altogether for the majority of high school students, a course of action that was also widely recommended. Instead, he advocated that subjects be adapted so as to be more directly functional.

The social efficiency movement as a form of curriculum thinking had two great appeals. The first was to efficiency itself. During the first quarter of the 20th century, efficiency became a watchword in industry through the work of Frederick Winslow Taylor and his disciples, and thus became, to some, almost synonymous with science. Scientific curriculum-makers, as they liked to call themselves, like Bobbitt and Charters, became enormously influential in their efforts to trim the curriculum of its dead wood. Their technique of curriculum making, the analysis of activity, was essentially borrowed from Taylorism and represented for them a scientific way to determine what should be taught just as scientific management replaced older, less efficient approaches to production in industry. After careful study of what people did in life, a curriculum scientifically attuned to their needs could be constructed in the same way that the most efficient route to production could be discovered by careful observation of the workers' motions.

The second appeal to social efficiency was more subtle. It was the appeal to social stability in a society where many of the earlier mechanisms of social control were losing their potency. The school was seen not so much as an institution where mental development would be fostered as the Committee of Ten had advocated, but as a place where the individual would be prepared to assume a specific social role. By conceiving of the curriculum as a vehicle for training individuals to perform effectively in their assigned societal roles, social efficiency as a curriculum doctrine held out the promise of an orderly and well-run society. In order to accomplish this, early determination of future roles was necessary, a course that Eliot had vigorously opposed in 1893, but which, by the second decade of the 20th century, mass mental testing had made a much more plausible option.

## A CURRICULUM ATTUNED TO HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

A second movement for reform of curriculum thinking also represented itself as having the backing of science, but it was a far different science from that borrowed from scientific management. Basically, this developmentalist movement sought the key to the curriculum riddle by deriving the course of study from the natural order of development in the child. Once we knew the secrets of child and adolescent development, we could develop a curriculum based on the natural inclinations and ways of thinking that are part of the child's make-up. The idea that individuals passed through stages of development with distinctive characteristics is, of course, centuries old. Its application to education and particularly to the question of what to teach was elaborately treated in Rousseau's *Émile* in the late 18th century, and reemerged in a particularly powerful form in American curriculum thinking in the late 19th century.

One source of the new thinking about the curriculum was the American disciples of Johann Friedrich Herbart such as Charles De Garmo and Frank McMurry who had studied at the great centers of pedagogy in Germany and returned to the United States with a zealous desire to reform American education. They rejected the dominant psychology of the day, faculty psychology, in favor of an approach that attempted to capitalize on children's interests and eliminated much of the monotonous drill and teacher imposition that they felt dominated American schools. Through their concept of apperception, they sought to tie what was learned to the existing cognitive structure, and so it became extremely important to know what was already in the child's mind before proceeding with anything new. In their search for a curriculum tied to the child's natural predilections, they frequently employed the concept of culture epochs, the notion that there was almost an exact parallel between the stages of human history and the maturational stages of the individual. Thus very young children would be interested in myths and legends because our early ancestors with whom they were somehow affiliated used them to explain their world. Similarly, children were believed to pass through distinct periods such as a savage stage and an agricultural stage, each with important implications for what curriculum materials would be most appropriate at given ages.

In the 1870s, the cause of child-study gained impetus through the criticism of American education advanced by Charles Francis Adams,[6] especially by his efforts to draw attention to the child's mental habits as a way of bringing the light of science to a benighted pedagogy. Adams' high praise for the work of Colonel Francis Parker in the Quincy, Massachusetts, school system, not only brought Parker national prominence, but seemed to indicate that drudgery and repression were not necessary concomitants of schooling. Parker had not simply introduced a much greater measure of freedom for the child than was typical of the regimented schools of that time. He had essentially discarded the old course of study in favor of one that was congenial to the

child's penchant for play and activity. He introduced what he called the "word method" of teaching reading, which replaced drill in phonics with what Parker considered the natural way by which children learned language. Word problems in arithmetic were favored over the mere manipulation of numbers, and rules and generalizations were reserved for the later periods of schooling. Formal grammar in the early grades was also discontinued, and natural language activities such as letter writing were introduced. They Quincy schools were held up by Adams as a model of schooling not only because the natural predilections of the child could be used to enrich the spirit of the school, but because effective learning was taking place.

Of the numerous proponents of child study in the late 19th century, however, none was more prominent than G. Stanley Hall. Upon his return from study in Germany in 1880, he quickly became the most prestigious psychologist in the country. Like the social efficiency educators, Hall and his fellow developmentalists rejected the recommendations of the Committee of Ten report, especially its emphasis on the training of the intellect as the primary function of schooling. Hall felt that reasoning power was not yet in the child's repertoire and that early concentration on intellectual matters could be injurious to the child's health. Unlike the social efficiency reformers, he took the position that the school must first and foremost stay out of the child's way, and that one way of preventing harm to the child was to prolong the period of childhood rather than to point too quickly to adult life. Hall's curriculum would be dominated by play at least until the eighth year, and drill and memorization would be preferable to the attempt to teach reasoning since, according to his studies, the child was not capable of reason until a much later age.

Hall's vision of a curriculum carefully attuned to the natural development of children and adolescents, despite its persistent call to scientific validity, was infused with rampant sentimentality and a high romanticism. His mystical beliefs in race recapitulation, derived from the Herbartian concept of culture epochs, were often wildly far-fetched, and by the beginning of the 20th century his influence began to wane. The appearance, however, of "The Project Method" by William Heard Kilpatrick in 1918 gave fresh impetus to the idea that the child could, after all, become the center for curriculum making.[7] Although the idea of developing a curriculum around projects rather than subjects had been gathering momentum for about a dozen years before he published his article, Kilpatrick's ideas served to broaden its scope beyond its origins in vocational agriculture to the curriculum as a whole. Projects were designed to capitalize on children's interests and to make them active learners. Content in the curriculum played a distinctly secondary role usually acquired in the context of the child's own "purposing." Contrary to the main precepts of social efficiency, projects emphasized the child's own present orientation rather than future adult roles. Kilpatrick's enormous popularity as a professor at Teachers College, Columbia University, and his prolific writing put him, a philosopher rather than a psychologist, in the forefront of the effort to reform the curriculum in line with the natural unfolding of the child's mind and personality. As the movement progressed, what was once known simply as the project method was elaborated into the activity curriculum or the experience curriculum. Those forms of curriculum organization, while not replacing the standard subject organization, had some impact within the context of subject areas such as English and social studies.

## THE ROAD TO SOCIAL MELIORISM

The third major reform movement in curriculum also had its origins around the turn of the century, although it remained a largely subterranean movement except for one brief period of prominence in the 1930s. In 1896, John Dewey's colleague at the University of Chicago, the

great American sociologist Albion Small, delivered a paper before the annual meeting of the National Education Association. Three years after the report of the Committee of Ten was issued, Small began his address by apologizing for reopening "a closed incident of ancient history" in using that committee's recommendations as a vehicle for proposing a different conception of a proper course of study.[8]

Small was particularly disturbed by the report of the Conference on History, Civil Government, and Political Economy, a subcommittee that had included among its members James Harvey Robinson and Woodrow Wilson. Small interpreted its report as assuming that the purpose of education was, first of all, "completion of the individual," and secondly, "adaption of the individual to such cooperation with the society in which his lot is cast that he works at his best with the society in perfecting his own type. . . ."[9] The report, Small felt, presented a "classified catalogue of subjects good for study" without any real social philosophy. If the report offered any conception of education as a whole, it was dominated by a "naively mediaeval psychology . . . which would be humorous if it were not tragical."[10] Such a dependence on faculty psychology led the committee to believe, according to Small, that history can train the faculty called judgment, that mathematics hones the faculty called reasoning, and so on as if powers of the mind existed as isolated entities and intelligence itself were somehow separated from the rest of existence. "Education," he claimed, "connotes the evolution of the whole personality, not merely of intelligence."[11]

Small argued that students must be taught to see the whole if they are to make any sense or derive any meaning from the abstractions that these subjects presumably represent. "Knowledge so far as it is gained at all," Small emphasized, must be seen in relationships, "not as self-sufficient knowledges."[12] Not simply the study of sociology, but all branches of knowledge should begin at the heart of concentric circles of social activity starting with the household and gradually extending outward until the social *desideratum* is finally reached, whereby "the developing member of the society shall become analytically and synthetically intelligent about the society to which he belongs."[13] He concluded his address with a strong endorsement of education as a vehicle of social amelioration. Contrary to the position endorsed by the child-study advocates, he insisted that educators "shall not rate themselves leaders of children, but as makers of society. Sociology knows no means for the amelioration or reform of society more radical than those of which the teachers hold the leverage."[14] In general, Small's ideas reflected not simply the growing impatience with the traditional course of study, but more particularly his ideas foreshadowed a growing tendency to see education not simply in terms of individual development of intellectual powers or even encouraging the child's natural tendencies to unfold, but in terms of social progress. Unlike the social efficiency educators who viewed the social role of the school as a tool of societal stability, Small and those who followed his lead saw the schools as a lever for social rejuvenation.

Small's vision of the schools as an instrument of social reform can be detected in the early work of John Dewey and George S. Counts during the first two decades of the 20th century, but it did not become a potent force on the national educational scene until the Great Depression of the 1930s once more raised doubts about the ability of the economic structure to survive. Until that time, curriculum reform was dominated by the opposing ideals represented by social efficiency and child growth and development tempered by the existing structure of schools, which tended to favor the traditional curriculum organization recommended by the Committee of Ten. In that sense the standard curriculum remained surprisingly resilient to the zealous efforts of the reformers. Probably the most significant curriculum change of the early 20th century was the introduction on a massive scale of vocational educa-

tion advocated by social efficiency educators, particularly specific occupational training. In line with the social meliorist position enunciated by Small, Jane Addams and Dewey had argued unsuccessfully that industrial education should educate future workers about the nature of the industrial process and of an industrial society.

When the Progressive Education Association was organized in 1919, its platform reflected the romantic ideal of childhood imbedded in the developmentalist position of Hall and later Kilpatrick. It was not until the 1930s that prominent professors of education, drawn largely from faculty of Teachers College, Columbia University, succeeded in diverting the central purpose of the PEA away from its child-centered ideal to an emphasis on social concerns. Epitomized by Count's clarion call, "Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?"[15] the new leaders of the PEA sought a curriculum that would address directly the social and economic ills that beset American life. Despite the prominence of the leaders of the social reconstructionist movement and the fact that the social conditions of the time were congenial to a radical reformulation of the curriculum, there were few notable successes. Most school administrators and teachers simply did not share the ideas being promulgated by a small group of eastern intellectuals. Clearly the most successful of the efforts of the social meliorists was the wide adoption of a series of 14 social studies textbooks written by Harold Rugg. In a deliberate attempt to redirect the social studies from the typical chronological rendering of history, Rugg introduced into that series issues relating to racism, the treatment of immigrants, sexism, efforts to organize labor, inequality in income and living conditions, and government corruption.[16] In time, however, certain business leaders and right-wing groups attacked the books as dangerously socialistic and succeeded in getting at least some school boards to rescind their adoptions. When World War II ended in 1945, American educators heartily embraced life adjustment education, a mixture of educational doctrines dominated by social efficiency.

## A FEEBLE COMPROMISE

Contrary to widespread belief, 20th-century curriculum thinking was not dominated by a two-way struggle between traditionalists, as exemplified in the Committee of Ten report, and a more-or-less unified progressive education movement on the other. Three distinct strains of curriculum thought emerged in the 20th century to challenge the humanistic curriculum that had been dominant in the 19th century. Although proponents of each of these ways of thinking about the curriculum shared a common belief that the traditional academic curriculum was inadequate to the task of modern education, each had quite different reasons for doing so and widely divergent programs for reform. The social efficiency educators saw the traditional curriculum as simply useless except to a small minority of students and urged adoption of a curriculum tied to direct utility and keyed to the probable role that the student would one day occupy. Once the knowledge necessary to function successfully as an adult was determined, that knowledge would become the content of the curriculum. From a social point of view, their vision was of order and stability in a society that seemed in danger of disintegration.

The developmentalist position saw the traditional curriculum as inconsistent with the natural order of development in the child. Their priorities lay with replacing what they regarded as a passive and meaningless approach to schooling with one that appealed directly to the interests of children and their penchant for activity. They envisioned a new curriculum emerging from children's interests and emphasizing active problem solving rather than drill and memorization. Developmentalists consistently regarded the present status of the child as the key to curriculum making, not future adult role.

Finally, the social meliorists saw the traditional curriculum as lacking in social purpose and social concern. Their effort was to rebuild the curriculum around critical social questions affording future citizens the opportunity to grapple with the kinds of problems that society faces. Unlike the social efficiency educators, they did not seek adjustment to the existing society but a new breed of citizens capable of addressing the problems that many believed was a social order urgently needing reconstruction. Each of these forms of curriculum thinking existed alongside the traditional humanistic education, which was also attempting to adapt itself to the demands of modern life. Depending on the social and political climate, each of these approaches made its mark on the American curriculum of today. Neither the traditional curriculum nor any of the three reform movements ever won a clear-cut victory. What passes for the contemporary American curriculum is an agglomeration of all of them.

Since there is no unanimity of opinion at any given time on what is most worthwhile in a culture—whether Aristotle's or ours—it should not be surprising that each of these main currents of curriculum reform would find its adherents. The curriculum, after all, as a selection of elements from the culture reflects to some extent the diversity that exists within the culture. Great value is accorded at one and the same time to mastery of academic subject matter, safe driving, and occupational proficiency as elements in the curriculum. Moreover, social conditions such as the Great Depression and the Cold War created climates that were at least temporarily conducive to different positions at different times. What emerges as a dominant strain in the curriculum is not a function of the force of a particular proposal alone but the due interaction of curriculum ideas and sympathetic or antagonistic social conditions. Therefore, over the course of time, one would expect that first one current then another should assume prominence and that, to some extent, they should all exist side by side.

Moreover, the three currents of curriculum reform must also be seen against the backdrop of a traditional humanist curriculum that consisted of conventional subjects such as English, history, and mathematics. That curriculum proved more resilient than many reformers expected. The substitution of the project for the subject as the basic building block of the curriculum, as followers of Kilpatrick advocated, was too fundamental a change for most to accept, as was the substitution of "areas of living" as some social efficiency educators proposed. Even John Dewey, the quintessential American educational reformer, was, more often than not, interested in reconstructing the existing subjects rather than replacing them.

Finally, in periods when curriculum reform had charged the atmosphere, it was probably more important for school systems simply to change than to change in a particular ideological direction. Choices at the school level were sometimes politically sensitive or too difficult to implement. At the same time that some proponents of curriculum reform were proclaiming that the curriculum should be derived from the spontaneous interests of children, others were proposing that the curriculum should be a direct and specific preparation for adulthood. Each doctrine had an appeal and a constituency. And, rather than make a particular ideological choice between apparently contradictory curriculum directions, it was perhaps more politically expedient to make a potpourri of all of them.

## Notes

1. Plato, *The Republic,* Book VII (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945. Translated by Francis M. Crawford), p. 244.
2. Aristotle, *Politics,* Book VIII (London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1946. Translated by Ernest Barker), pp. 333–334.

3. "Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education." *American Journal of Science and Arts* (15 January 1829): 297–351.
4. Edward Lee Thorndike and Robert S. Woodworth, "The Influence of Improvement in One Mental Function upon the Efficiency of Other Functions," *Psychological Review* 8, 3 (May 1901): 247–261.
5. National Education Association, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* (Washing, D.C.: Bureau of Education, 1918).
6. Charles Francis Adams, *The New Departure in the Common Schools of Quincy and Other Papers on Educational Topics* (Boston: Estes & Lauriat, 1879).
7. William Heard Kilpatrick, "The Project Method," *Teachers College Record* 19, 4 (September 1918): 319–335.
8. Albion Small, "Demands of Sociology upon Pedagogy," National Education Association, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the 35th Annual Meeting* (1896): 174.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 175.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid., p. 180.
13. Ibid., p. 182.
14. Ibid., p. 185.
15. George S. Counts, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* (New York: John Day and Company, 1932).
16. See, for example, Harold Rugg, *An Introduction to the Problems of American Culture* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1931).