

# Contradictions in Progressive Primary School Ideologies and Curricula in England: Some Historical Perspectives

*W. E. Marsden*

Educational ideologies have acquired wider meanings than the strict dictionary definition of an ideology, that is, "a system of ideas," infused as they are with values and beliefs. As the dictionary again indicates, beliefs involve a trusting assent to or acceptance of a statement or proposition as true on the grounds of external authority. The social purpose of ideologies, often covert, is to legitimize (see Alexander, 1984, p. 14). Through history, education systems have been strongly influenced by pioneering figures who have in some cases acquired cult status. They have laid down principles or doctrines which, over time, have become barely distinguishable from dogmas, that is, decreed bodies of opinion passed on as incontrovertible truth. The doctrines acquire the status of an ideology, broadly defined. In other words, an ideology in practice characteristically means accepting the propositions of an outside authority. The doctrines do not require the support of evidence, nor encourage divergent thought. Rather, they call for exegesis.

I here show contradictions between progressive primary ideologies and their application in school curricula over time. I pay particular attention to two associated dichotomies, that between child-centred and society-centred aims, and that between child-centred and subject-centred practice. All these elements—subject-matter or content, educational processes, and social purposes—have proved to be continuing components of educational practice. The presentation of these elements as incompatible dichotomies has distorted educational change in England, and not least in recent decades.

## PROGRESSIVE PRIMARY EDUCATION: CHILD CENTRED AND/OR SOCIETY CENTRED?

Froebel's belief in a Divine unity inclusive of nature, the child, the home, society, and the moral order (Darling, 1994, p. 21), had a significant impact on English elementary education in the second half of the nineteenth century. Imported from Europe, his ideas stimulated a new educational movement that included formation of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society and the National Froebel Union, and the establishment of training institutions based on kindergarten principles, such as the Home and Colonial, and the Maria Grey training colleges in London. One writer has claimed the peculiarly English

achievement to have been the practical application of Froebel's kindergarten theory. Another described the emerging infant practice as Neo-Froebelian (Selleck, 1968, pp. 201–203).

Education in Froebel's scheme was closely tied to social purposes. Pedagogy was overtly child centred, aiming to promote personal growth through warmth and encouragement, rather than inhibiting it by harshness and repression. But his pedagogy's long-term bent was to deny key progressive principles held dear in a later period, namely, cherishing present experience for its own sake, and promoting autonomous thought. Froebel's underlying intention was to instil strict religious rules, serving to ensure a passive acceptance of the socioeconomic frameworks and moral codes to be met with in adult life. My views ought not to be taken as a basis for a critique of Froebel, but rather to point to the omission of this contradiction in the dissemination of his ideas, ideas that legitimated a subsequent version of progressive primary theory and practice. Post-World War II discussion has increasingly polarized child- and society-centred principles. The original Froebelian vision did not conceive of such a dichotomy.

The roots of Froebel's philosophy were avowedly religious, and based on the Christian notion of a benevolent providence. The school should first of all teach the religion of Christ (Hamilton, 1952, p. 166). In its social education the Froebelian system was one of moulding or training. This started on the mother's lap. Procedures to be followed were spelled out in the "Mother's Songs" collection. To each item, Froebel added "mottoes," a series of maxims in verse for the mother, which preceded the ditties to be sung to the children (Heerwart, 1888; Ronge & Ronge, 1855). No child was too small to be able to acquire an initial awareness of the goodness of God.

You should not think your child is far too small  
The smallest child a magnet in him bears  
That shows him how life binds together all. (Froebel, 1888, p. 106)

One of the first principles to be instilled was the virtue of stable family life:

O how I love my peaceful home  
Where my dear parents dwell  
Where strife and discord never come  
Their tales of woe to tell. (Ronge & Ronge, 1855, p. 56)

Stability stemmed from obedience to parents. Although children should be happy, whether at home or at school, this was not an unconditional right. Mothers should consistently reward good and penalize bad behaviour.

Things in Mother's face will smile  
 Only if she feels the while  
 That her little Daughter's good  
 And does everything she should  
 But if she should sulk or cry  
 That would close up Mother's eye . . . (Froebel, 1888, p. 102)

The character-formation component of the Froebelian system was later explicated to students in methodological texts and progressive educational journals, as in *The Teachers' Times*<sup>1</sup> of 22 January 1904:

A bad habit in a child is often a lack of some virtue, a want of some good quality. . . . Develop the right habit by giving the child something of his own to take care of, and so inspire him with a sense of responsibility. Physical habits are important . . . cleanliness of person is a great help towards purity of thought and deed. . . . Punctuality is looked for. Let the children realise the loss to individuals and to the class by lateness, and try to make the clock the inexorable timekeeper. (p. 65)

The brilliantly conceived Froebelian "gifts" and "varied occupations" provided resources for the pedagogic design. The gifts at one level were surrogate toys, devised for enjoyable learning. The first gift of God, six soft balls, was symbolic of the warmth and security of the mother's lap. Then followed wooden cubes, cylinders, and blocks, which could simulate chairs, steps, thrones, monuments, churches, or castles. From each a moral lesson could be drawn. The monument in the churchyard might be to a naughty little girl who had died because she had disobeyed her mother by playing with fire. The dire consequences were harrowingly described: "her dear face was spoiled, her hands and arms and neck were all burned to a cinder" (Ronge & Ronge, 1855, p. 11). After the gifts, the varied occupations took over, such as cutting paper, stick laying, rug making, and cane weaving, training children in useful "industrial" activities. As the English Froebelian M. E. Bailey (1876) wrote, the gifts and occupations contributed to the three major social objectives of the infant school: "training in the fear and love of God and duty to parents," "training in showing kindness, good-will and justice to all whom the little pupils came into contact with," and "training in their future positions as workers in the world. Through play they would come to regard work as a pleasure" (p. 22).

Froebel's principles gained further ground in England after they were taken up by large progressive urban school boards, which introduced the kindergarten system into their infant schools. A London Board Infants' School in Hampstead, Fleet Road, under its headmistress, Louisa Walker,<sup>2</sup> was regarded by at least one educational journal, *The Practical Teacher*, as being at the fountain-head of the modern implementation of the kindergarten principle (1898, vol. 19, p. 61). Trained at the Froebelian Home and Colonial Training

College, she told of how she emerged full of enthusiasm for the principles of the system (Marsden, 1990). She applied classic Froebelian concepts of nature as guide, and play as the natural activity, or the work, of children.

Louisa Walker was an independent thinker, however, and accepted some but not all the credos she had assimilated at the College. She enthusiastically applied the pedagogy, but was iconoclastic about its underlying social and moral purposes. She was antipathetic also toward the political trappings of the Froebelian movement, and was not formally part of that movement. As her commercially published action songs and games show, along with her object lessons and varied occupations, she offered a clashing secular counter-culture. Froebelian orthodoxy, for example, disapproved of dressing up, showing off, indulgence in entertainment, and developing ideas above one's station, in tune with traditional Victorian injunctions regarding appropriate behaviour for respectable women. Like "the inner petals of a flower . . . the truly modest woman" would protect herself from "the eye of the rude gazer." She would never "wantonly display" her attractions, but rather live and be happy "in the shade of obscurity" (Ventum, 1802, pp. 60-61).

Louisa Walker discarded all such inhibitions. Her action songs and games were part of the day-to-day curriculum and, more importantly, were the stuff of extra-curricular school entertainments for parents and public. Although some tales contained an authentic Froebelian moral sting, such as one about a little fish which disobeyed its mother and died an early death on an angler's line, others were based on the debunking spirit of the music hall and Gilbert and Sullivan. They were characteristically secular in theme, and meritocratic in social and gender terms, as in a song, "Nineteenth-Century Girls," inciting Walker's infant charges to aim for university careers.

Her school entertainments and educational philosophy were extremely unpopular in wealthy middle-class Hampstead, which looked to schools such as Fleet Road to provide reliable and amenable domestic servants. Her action song "Five O'Clock Tea" was a direct satire on Hampstead mores. Neither were her compositions to the taste of the Froebelian establishment, which criticized them as educationally irrelevant and designed to promote what it regarded as a bugbear of the time, the annual school entertainment. The reviewer in the Froebelian journal *Child Life* (1900) disliked, among other things, the dressing up of young children as animals, and was disturbed that the song "Up-to-Date Young Men" was considered as suitable for young children. "It cannot be anything but a mistake to allow our children, even in game and song, to treat the serious matters of adult life with foolish frivolity" (p. 64).

For good or ill, the Walker achievement was to adapt Froebelian principles to an urban meritocratic setting (Marsden, 1991a). Her children were socialized into a culture quite different from that of the central European rural

society from which they emerged: one which discerned, in the adult life to come, burgeoning employment opportunities, the prospect of socioeconomic mobility, and the enjoyment of increasing leisure time. Thus while she celebrated its pedagogy, in the eyes of some contemporaries Louisa Walker lowered the tone and dislocated the social purpose of Froebel's system.

English educationists' attempts in the early twentieth century to fashion a progressive synthesis were complicated by competing ideas of the true philosophy of "the new education." Apart from Neo-Froebelians, there were Herbartians, Montessorians, and others, all sharing a distaste for the extremes of instrumental and mechanical instruction, and all holding a belief that education had an essential character-forming purpose. But there were inevitable tensions, as promoters claimed theirs to be the one best system. There were, for example, disputes between Neo-Froebelians and Herbartians. The influential Professor John Adams of London University concluded that these two "progressive" approaches were based on fundamentally conflicting pedagogical principles (Selleck, 1968, pp. 255–258).

A more secularized society after World War I brought with it less clear-cut social purposes and moral certainties. Distinctive features of English progressive thought during the 1920s consequently included the search for a moral regeneration not necessarily based on an evangelical, divinely sanctioned religious rule-book. This regeneration was to be achieved through developing the spiritual life of the child, primarily by means of promoting individual creativity, seen as the only sure way to realize human beings' innate potential (Mathieson, 1990, p. 377). Priority was given to child-centredness and a retreat from book-learning. The aesthetic component of the curriculum loomed large in this endeavour. The child was no longer so much a learner as a doer or creator. But Herbartians and Neo-Froebelians were not at one as crusaders in this good cause. In the different versions of progressivism, the balance between child-centred aims and those of, on the one hand, social reconstruction and, on the other, moral rearmament, were difficult to disentangle. This was arguably the transition period in which the forerunner of a later, more open dichotomy between child- and society-centredness could be identified.

#### CHILD CENTRED VERSUS SUBJECT CENTRED

A perennial contention used over the years to bolster the case for progressive primary practice in England has been that such practice is intrinsically child centred, and incompatible with subject-centred approaches. The ambiguities and contradictions of this dichotomy may be illustrated through a longitudinal case study of geography. Part of the armoury of those who have opposed the introduction of subjects into the primary curriculum has been the appeal to

higher authority, their case being legitimated through selective quotation from the great figures or official position statements of the past. In this instance, however, the historical evidence suggests that pioneering progressive voices neither countenanced nor authorized polarizations such as that between child-centredness and subject-centredness.

For example, from the late nineteenth century there was already support from Herbartians for authentic subject inputs into a progressive primary curriculum, albeit one holistically conceived. Charles McMurry (1899), a prominent American Herbartian, whose work was published in England also, teased out relationships between geography as a subject and the pedagogic frame into which it should be inserted. He conceived the relationship in terms of "type studies" of particular places, rich in instructive and interesting particulars, which must be graphic and visual, and combine the two great merits of representing wide-ranging meanings in the subject, yet being at the same time concrete, attractive, and realistic to the children.

Geography's bridging function was also noted, again as offering a *rap-prochement* between subject and topic approaches, through giving the latter a distinctive focus.

In order to secure and establish the independent right of geography in the sisterhood of studies, it is necessary to make out a series of important type-subjects in each of which a characteristic central thought is so distinctly geographical that no other standpoint of natural science or history is able to dislodge the teacher from his geographical stronghold. (McMurry, 1899, pp. 122–125)

John Dewey equally valued the potential of geography and history in the primary school curriculum. To him also the polarization of child-centredness and subject-centredness was an aberration. As he wrote in *A Child and the Curriculum* (1902),

How, then, stands the case of Child vs. Curriculum? . . . The radical fallacy in the original pleadings with which we set out is the supposition that we have no choice save either to leave the child to his own unguided spontaneity or to inspire direction upon him from without . . . the value of the formulated wealth of knowledge that makes up the course of study is that it may enable the educator to *determine the environment of the child*, and thus by indirection to direct. (p. 30)

To Dewey, geography was a unifying subject, and he regarded geography and history, correctly taught, as

the two great school resources for bringing about the enlargement of the significance of the direct experience. . . . [T]heir chief educational value is that they provide the most direct and interesting roads out into the larger world of meaning. (1916, pp. 210–213)

In their attacks on subjects, latter-day English proponents of the progressive primary ideology, seeking to authenticate their case, have drawn selectively not only on Dewey, but also on the former government inspector Edmond Holmes, whose writings recorded his revulsion against mechanical teaching and his Pauline conversion to "the true gospel of education," namely child-centredness (Selleck, 1968, p. 205). But Holmes's attack was on the instrumentalism and pedagogic rigidities of elementary school teaching, and not on subjects as such. Indeed, he regarded the memorization and recall procedures of this tradition as inimical to subjects as well as to children, in a statement referring to both geography and history.

Information as to the names and positions of capes and bays, as to areas and populations, and other geographical facts, is easily converted into knowledge of those facts, but it is not easily converted into knowledge of geography. (Holmes, 1911, p. 90)

[I]n the absence of . . . the geographical sense, the possession of . . . geographical information cannot possibly be converted into knowledge of . . . geography. (Holmes, 1911, p. 134)

Similarly, the Dalton Plan, an import from the United States, demanded a child-centred approach, based on individual work. Each child proceeded at her or his own pace, and in a "laboratory" rather than a class. Children would not necessarily stay in the same classroom, therefore, but would move around from specialist room to specialist room. In each an appropriate set of resources was provided for each child to use. But no child- versus subject-centred schism was evident in advice given in the progressive teachers' press as to how to incorporate subject approaches into the Dalton scheme. One of the Dalton Plan's English protagonists was a London elementary school head-teacher, A. J. Lynch, who pointed out "that there is little difficulty in getting the right environment and creating the right atmosphere in the Geography room" (1924, p. 228).

Progressive writers in the journals and methodological texts were in general not at all averse to introducing subjects such as geography to young children. For example, Miss Mackenzie's *The Principles and Practice of Kindergarten*, published in 1896 by Joseph Hughes, Froebel House, included a chapter on geography. *Child Education* in 1926 ran a series on developing a geography scheme of work for infant classes, as did *The Teachers' Times* regularly between 1924 and 1927, as well as *The Teachers' World* in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Similarly, the Froebel Society's journal, *Child Life*, periodically offered special editions on particular subjects, as in the case of geography in July 1936. In this edition one of the Goldsmith's College, London, team, E. M. Forsaith, expounded her views on geographical

approaches for pupils under age 11 (pp. 98–100), while E. J. Orford, another geographical educationist, gave guidance on “Geography through Literature” (pp. 101–103). Even more strikingly, the National Froebel Union ran examinations for a teachers’ certificate for students wishing to enter into kindergarten and preparatory school work. To help such students, E. Bown, a lecturer at St. Mary’s College, London, wrote *The Approach to Geography* (1931). Geography, it was stated, could be taught to children from six years upwards, so long as it started with their own experience. This would be directed in time toward a broader view of the subject, which she regarded as foremost in bringing children into contact on the one hand with the marvels of the natural landscape and, on the other, in enabling them to recognize “their responsibilities as part of the great family of mankind,” based on the ideals of the League of Nations (p. xi).

Progressives have also argued that the teaching of subjects is geared to instruction for later life rather than concentrating on education for current personal growth. It is true that geography, history, and literature were once defined as the “Empire group” of subjects, and had an overriding socio-political purpose. But imperial study was equally strongly espoused as a vital part of the integrated primary curriculum. Indeed, recognizing the unifying potential of the Empire as a popular topic, progressive primary teaching journals, whether *Child Life*, *The Teachers’ World and Schoolmistress*, or *The Teachers’ Times and Kindergarten Gazette*, offered regular guidance on how to link subjects in constructing suitable Empire Day projects. Among many other things, they printed patriotic songs and plays that the children could perform. For over fifty years, the pageantry of Empire Day was a significant event in the calendars of British schools.

Yet while the political intention of this pedagogically progressive device was in no way disguised, the moulding of minds that it assumed was evidently not seen as flouting good primary practice, as implicit in the following justification of Empire Day celebrations by an anonymous columnist, “The Pathfinder,” in *The Teachers’ Times* of 19 May 1922:

To catch the fire of enthusiasm, to disclose the gleam of inspirational light, to impress the plastic nature of the pupil with spiritual ideals to help him in those dreary hours when he must work out the task conceived in brighter moments, this is to bring a healthy rhythm of mental activity that will be of undoubted value in future life . . . the Empire Day celebration movement holds within it a germ which in later years will give the pupil a pride of race and larger patriotism that will consolidate and strengthen the Empire. (p. 311)

Perhaps the most frequently launched historical salvo of progressives against subject specialism in the primary school is the celebrated maxim of the



Hadow Report on *The Primary School* (Board of Education [U.K.], 1931) that "the curriculum is to be thought of in terms of activity and experience rather than of knowledge to be acquired and facts to be stored" (p. 93). The much less often cited quotation from later in the same Report is that "*in geography, as in other subjects,*" primary school work was to be thought of in terms of activity and experience, rather of knowledge to be acquired and facts to be stored (p. 171). Although Hadow accepted the view that organization of the curriculum into subjects was not a priority for younger children, nonetheless there was need for a distinctive geographical input. For example, it was argued that the teaching of distant places through topics would, when complete, help to build up to a conception of the world as a whole, seen as a necessary part of citizenship education.

Even more aggressive polarization followed the later Plowden Report of 1967 (Department of Education and Science, 1967). As is well known, *Children and Their Primary Schools* was immediately hailed as a linchpin document, affirming the true values of English progressive primary practice. Yet whereas the Report clearly rejected subject categories as suitable for the needs of young children, it accepted that subjects became more relevant as children progressed into the upper junior phase. Thus it identified, among other things, a need for specialist subject co-ordinators in the primary school (paras. 555–556). It included a section on the potential contributions of subjects to the primary curriculum. One of these subjects was geography, and the scheme presented (pp. 230–235) was in essence similar to that of the later much-maligned subject-centred National Curriculum (Marsden, 1991b, pp. 42–43).

#### RECENT IDEOLOGICAL CONFRONTATIONS IN ENGLAND AND WALES

Primary educational practice in England by the early 1980s was thus riddled with ambiguities and contradictions. Right-wing anti-Plowden reaction was by then a strong political force, presenting an unrelentingly negative image of a rampant progressivism undermining educational standards. The disputation became not only more polarized but also highly politicized. Countering the right-wing assault, many primary teachers, and even more so persons engaged in primary teacher education, held their ground, insisting anew that subject approaches were antipathetic to the spirit and purpose of good primary practice. They also began to locate those attacking the Plowden ideology and those promoting subject study in the same enemy camp.

Two of the most vigorous proponents of progressive primary principles, Blenkin and Kelly, made clear there were two sides of the fence. Although aware of inconsistency between the rhetoric and reality of progressive primary practice, they allowed no disagreement with the underlying principles.

Progressive theory was “the basic philosophy of English Primary education” and between the opposing views of education there was “fundamental incompatibility” (Blenkin & Kelly, 1981, p. 62). Developmental approaches (Kelly, 1988, p. 112), needed to be protected from “less satisfactory” ideologies (p. 122).

It is perhaps a caricature (though only slight) or an over-simplification (though not a great one) to see this as to a large degree a conflict between the traditional, subject-based approaches of the secondary school . . . and the less formal process-based approaches adopted (perhaps more often in theory than in practice) by many primary teachers. (Kelly, 1988, p. 98)

Although Kelly accepted that at secondary level there was a case for insinuating subjects into a structure of inter-disciplinary enquiry (1982, pp. 72–73), in the primary phase, even where informal approaches were applied to subjects like geography, he contended that any subject input either “switched off” children or that children were cognitively unready. He dismissed the idea that a subject-based approach could satisfactorily be implemented through experiential enquiry.

Reinforcement of these confrontational views appeared in the 1970s with the rise of “new directions” in the sociology of education. A key concept was the proposition that knowledge was socially constructed and embodied both the distribution of power in society and the principles of social control (Young, 1971). This notion rapidly entered the debate over structures of curriculum in the new secondary comprehensive schools. On this view, the secondary grammar school curriculum embodied a rigid and historically arbitrary stratification of knowledge, dominated by traditional academic subjects, unlikely to be congenial to the new mixed-ability pupils groups in comprehensive schools. A trend against separate subject timetabling at secondary level thus gained ground, and predictably encouraged similar developments at the primary level.

There was at the same time more nuanced discussion about the place of subjects in the curriculum. Thus the Schools Council’s 1970s project “History, Geography and Social Science 8–13” regarded subjects as resources, differentiating their position as labels in the curriculum from their states as distinctive intellectual disciplines. It countered the negative stereotype that subjects were inevitably dull and arbitrary bodies of factual content, merely to be absorbed by rote. The disciplines of geography, history, and selected social sciences were presented in a more positive guise as offering the curriculum not only knowledge about the real world, past and present, but also discrete skills and conceptual frameworks helpful in making sense of that world, of potential benefit whether or not they were timetabled separately (Blyth et al., 1976, pp. 32–33).

Attacking the “unnecessary dichotomies” that underlay progressive primary school practice—including subject-centredness versus child-centredness, child-centredness versus society-centredness, product versus process, and the like—Alexander (1984) accepted the view of the Schools Council’s 8–13 Project that it was necessary to distinguish the concept of a subject as a means of dividing up the school timetable, and that of a discipline, implying a distinctive mode of study, enquiry, and explanation. Thus a pedagogic argument for resisting the break-up of the primary curriculum into subject compartments would be different from, and probably more sustainable than, one refuting altogether the value of infusing distinctive modes of geographical or historical practice into primary education.

An associated “unnecessary dichotomy” noted by Alexander was that implicit in the notion that knowledge about children was more important than knowledge about subjects—“I teach children, not subjects” being the approved maxim. Yet the contradictory fickleness in the application of this precept could be demonstrated by the widespread presence, within self-proclaimed progressive primary curricula, of tightly demarcated, carefully graded schemes of work in subject compartments as, for example, in mathematics. By contrast, in humanities/social subjects provision, a variety of loosely integrated topic approaches, some including no authentic geographical or historical element at all, was considered to be good practice.

Alexander explained this discrepancy as a long-term consequence of the English tradition of employing generalist teachers in the primary school. Whereas such teachers were trained to cope with a degree of specialized knowledge in the basic subjects, this was not expected of them in other areas. A topic-based approach was thus a means of denying the need for specialist expertise outside the basic subjects. He went on to identify the historical roots of this situation, based as it was on the elementary tradition of the nineteenth century:

The class-teacher system . . . was the cheapest and most straight-forward means of educating children to the minimal levels required. . . . [In] the twentieth century . . . there was need to develop a conceptual framework for the practice of class teaching which . . . would support and sustain class teachers. Child-centredness . . . provided the best ideology to meet the primary teacher’s class situation. (Alexander, 1984, p. 14)

In this persuasive argument, the presence of a broad and balanced range of subjects was interpreted as a threat not only to primary children, but also to their teachers. Supporting this view, in defining the paradigm of the model primary teacher as the “mother made conscious,” Steedman (1985) drew attention to the historic definition of her important virtues as to do with feeling, intuition, sympathy, and empathy, rather than with intellectual capacity. The

woman primary teacher did not need to be very clever (p. 160). Thus a de-intellectualized and deficit view not only of primary children, but also of generalist primary teachers, was implanted.

The imposition of a National Curriculum on England and Wales, through the so-called Education Reform Act of 1988, has added fuel to the flames. As a subject-based enterprise, the National Curriculum has confirmed the worst suspicions of child-centred lobbyists, who have portrayed it in apocalyptic terms, as a curriculum for the doomed, the damned, and even the dead. It has also been derided as a reversion to nineteenth-century didacticism and utilitarianism, to early twentieth-century academic parochialism and protectionism, and as a positivist edifice irrelevant in a postmodern world, and therefore in immediate need of deconstruction.

The increased politicization of the educational debate from the late 1970s has therefore served to intensify division. There now seems little comfort either for progressive child- or subject-centred advocates, since the official mid-1990s revisions of the National Curriculum have favoured a limited, "dumbed-down" (to use the American terminology) curricular provision, within a prescriptive and moralistic set of social purposes. Although a subject-centred structure will remain, it will be as part of an attenuated "back to basics" training agenda, and one reminding its advocates of missed opportunities of achieving something more broad, balanced, and liberal. Child-centred proponents may look back even more plaintively to a world they have lost. The idea of a constructive synthesis in which the subject content, pedagogic processes, and social purposes of education are seen as complementary and not in conflict appears an increasingly hazy prospect.

#### NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> For part of its existence, this journal was entitled *The Teachers' Times and Kindergarten Gazette*.
- <sup>2</sup> A fuller account of the work of Louisa Walker may be found in Marsden (1990); Marsden (1991a) offers a broader study of the social context of the London school at which she was headmistress of the infant department.

#### REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. (1984). *Primary teaching*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bailey, M. E. (1876). *Hints on introducing the kindergarten system into English infant schools*. London: E. Philip and Son.
- Blenkin, G. M., & Kelly, A. V. (1981). *The primary curriculum*. London: Harper and Row.
- Blyth, A., Cooper, K., Derricott, R., Elliott, G., Sumner, H., & Waplington, A. (1976). *Place, time and society 8-13: Curriculum Planning in history, geography and social science*. Glasgow/Bristol: Collins/ESL Bristol for the Schools Council.

- Board of Education [U.K.]. (1931). *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Primary School* [The Hadow Report]. London: HMSO.
- Bown, E. (1931). *The approach to geography*. London: Christophers.
- Darling, J. (1994). *Child-centred education and its critics*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Department of Education and Science. (1967). *Children and their primary schools* [The Plowden Report]. London: HMSO.
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Forsyth, E. M. (1936). "Geography for pupils under eleven." *Child Life* [New Series], 2 [Special issue on geography], 98–100.
- Froebel, F. W. A. (1888). *Mother's songs, games and stories*. London: W. Rice.
- Hamilton, H. A. (1952). The religious roots of Froebel's philosophy. In E. Lawrence (Ed.), *Friedrich Froebel and English Education* (pp. 166–178). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Heerwart, E. (1888). Introduction. In F. W. A. Froebel, *Mother's songs, games and stories* (pp. xxviii–xxxvi). London: W. Rice.
- Holmes, E. G. A. (1911). *What is and what might be*. London: Constable.
- Kelly, A. V. (1982). *The curriculum: Theory and practice*. London: Harper and Row.
- Kelly, A. V. (1988). The middle years of schooling. In A. Blyth (Ed.), *Informal primary education today: Essays and studies*. (pp. 98–122). London: Falmer Press.
- Lynch, A. J. (1924). *Individual work and the Dalton Plan*. London: George Philip and Son.
- McMurry, C. (1899). *A course of study in geography for the grades of the common school*. Supplement to the Fourth Yearbook of the National Herbart Society for 1898. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marsden, W. E. (1990). "Mrs. Walker's merry games for little people": Locating Froebel in an alien environment. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 38, 15–32.
- Marsden, W. E. (1991a). Educating the respectable: A study of Fleet Road Board School, Hampstead, 1879–1903. London: Woburn Press.
- Marsden, W. E. (1991b). Primary geography and the National Curriculum. In B. Gorwood (Ed.), *Changing Primary Schools: Aspects of Education*, 45, 38–54.
- Mathieson, M. (1990). English progressive educators and the creative child. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 38, 365–380.
- Orford, E. J. (1936). Geography through literature. *Child Life* [New Series], 2 [Special issue on geography], 101–103.
- Ronge, J., & Ronge, B. (1855). *A practical guide to the English kindergarten*. London: A. N. Myers.
- Selleck, R. W. (1968). *The New Education: The English background 1870–1914*. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons.
- Steedman, C. (1985). "The mother made conscious": The historical development of a primary school pedagogy. *History Workshop Journal*, 20, 149–163.
- Ventum, H. (1802). *Surveys of nature: A sequel to Mrs. Trimmer's Introduction*. London: John Badcock.
- Young, M. F. D. (1971). Knowledge and control: *New directions for the sociology of education*. London: Collier Macmillan.