

1987

Maria Montessori, A. S. Neill and Marva Collins: educating the human potential

Loretta Powell C. Davenport
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Other Education Commons](#), and the [Other History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davenport, Loretta Powell C., "Maria Montessori, A. S. Neill and Marva Collins: educating the human potential " (1987). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 8527.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/8527>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.
- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.
- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.

8716757

Davenport, Loretta Powell C.

MARIA MONTESSORI, A. S. NEILL AND MARVA COLLINS: EDUCATING
THE HUMAN POTENTIAL

Iowa State University

PH.D. 1987

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Maria Montessori, A. S. Neill and Marva Collins:

Educating the human potential

by

Loretta Powell C. Davenport

**A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

**Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (History, Philosophy and
Comparative Education)**

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

**Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa**

1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Learning to Educate the "Human Potential"	1
Expectations and the teaching/learning process	1
Philosophy and the teaching/learning process	5
Three significant twentieth century educators	10
Purpose of the Study	12
Statement of the Problem	12
Selection of the three educators	13
Selection and treatment of bibliographic sources	15
Significance of the Study	17
Format	18
CHAPTER 2: MARIA MONTESSORI	20
Monograph	20
Family and early development	20
Formal learning experiences	23
Professional development	26
The development of Montessori Schools	30
A Philosophical View of Montessori	32
Educational Views	34
The learner	34
The instructional method	38
The curriculum	40
Summary	41

CHAPTER 3: ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND NEILL	42
Monograph	42
Family and early development	42
Formal learning experiences	44
Professional development	46
The development of Summerhill School	48
A Philosophical View of Neill	50
Educational Views	57
The learner	57
The instructional method	58
The curriculum	60
Summary	61
CHAPTER 4: MARVA KNIGHT COLLINS	65
Monograph	65
Family and early development	65
Formal learning experiences	68
Professional development	70
The development of Westside Preparatory School	74
A Philosophical View of Collins	76
Educational Views	80
The learner	81
The instructional method	83
The curriculum	85
Summary	86
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS	88
Summary of Study	88
Comparison of Subjects	90
Recommendations	96
Suggestions for Further Study	99
Conclusion	101

BIBLIOGRAPHY	102
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	109

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

Learning to Educate the "Human Potential"

Expectations and the teaching/learning process

Learning is the center of educational adventure. As adventure, learning should be experienced with enthusiasm. For young children, learning which is an adventure is exciting and usually long lasting. The majority of young children enter school with joyful expectations, but at some point, usually before leaving sixth grade, a large percentage of these children become bored and lose some of their natural inquisitiveness and enthusiasm for learning. They tend to respond less creatively to classroom challenges and to ask fewer questions. For conscientious teachers of these bored students, stimulating learning becomes a challenge. The challenge becomes one of finding strategies to rekindle, as well as sustain, that initial joy of learning.

Teachers at all levels of schooling are challenged with two major challenges: (1) how to sustain the natural curiosity of learners and (2) how to use students' interests and special talents to enhance the teaching/learning process. The end goal of teaching is to develop productive, creative problem solvers who are fully equipped with the skills necessary for continued positive learning and growth. These

concerns and many similar problems have prompted educators, researchers and philosophers to examine the historical contributions of successful teachers and educators for many years (Cole, 1969; Gross, 1963; Rusk, 1965; Brameld, 1965; Smith et al., 1984). The intent of the investigators included a determination of what philosophies and teaching methods were used with particular success for effectual classroom interaction and to gain a better understanding of the relationship between effective teaching and learning.

Research literature written over several decades includes numerous variables thought to mark the difference between effective and ineffective teaching. These variables include clarity of presentation, enthusiasm of the teacher, variety of activities during the lesson, and encouragement of students' ideas during discussions. All were found to influence academic growth. Donald Medley (1979) probed into teacher effectiveness by examining empirical research on the subject. He identified four phases of effectiveness and found that effectiveness in the final phase depended upon the teacher's mastery of a repertoire of competencies and the ability to use those competencies appropriately. Further insight into teacher effectiveness came from Barak Rosenshine's (1971) research on teaching with the concept of "direct instruction". He concluded that direct instruction increases student learning achievement in reading and mathematics during the early grades more effectively than open approaches. Direct instruction was further discussed in relation to learning by

Penelope Peterson (1979) who suggested that "direct instruction may be effective for attaining some educational objectives or outcomes, but not others. It may be effective for some kinds of students but not for others." She concluded that "the effectiveness of each approach to teaching seemed to depend on the kind of students being taught and the educational outcome to be attained." Additionally, Medley (1979) indicated that effective teachers attended to three main aspects of the teaching/learning process: 1) the learning environment, 2) time devoted to pupils, and 3) methods of instruction. This research concluded that an effective teacher will maintain an orderly and supportive classroom learning climate; increase the amount of time devoted to learning activities, including close supervision of students' seat work; and improve the quality of overall learning activities.

A review of current research on effective teaching also suggests that teacher expectation for and of students influences not only students' learning success but also the curriculum and the instructional strategies used. This is reflected in a summary of studies on teacher expectations by Brophy and Good (1970). Their study indicated that students for whom teachers held low expectations were treated as non-entities. The perceived low achieving students tended to be seated farther away from the teacher, received less eye contact, and were smiled at less often. They also received less instruction, had fewer opportunities to learn new materials, and were asked to do less work. Teachers seldom called on those students and tended to ask them simple

rote-answer questions. They were allowed less time to respond and given fewer clues to the correct answer than perceived high achieving students. Those perceived low achieving students remained low achievers.

As an example, Dershimer (1983) found that, even after training teachers to change their perception of low achieving students, if teachers did not expect students to take part in higher level discussions, those students were not encouraged to participate. Additionally, he found that low achieving students were reinforced for low achievement and high achieving students for high achievement. Consequently, when teachers did not have high expectations for a student's participation and input, the student was not offered an opportunity to express ideas at a higher level. As a result, the teachers were unknowingly creating a low expectancy/low performance cycle in the student.

Similarly, pioneering research by Robert Rosenthal and Lenore E. Jacobson (1968) pointed to the positive or negative effect of teachers' beliefs about students' learning abilities. They concluded that a teacher's beliefs about students' abilities could affect students' academic growth either positively or negatively. If the teacher believed students to be "bright", the students achieved; if they were thought to be "dull", they achieved less.

Ron Edmonds (1979), Lawrence Lezotti (1985), and other researchers have suggested that all educators desiring to operate effective schools should operate from one major premise: "All children can

learn!" Recently, researchers are agreeing with Good, Biddle, and Brophy (1975) that successful teachers (those who obtain better-than-expected achievement gains from students) have belief systems or philosophies which reflect positive attitudes that they can teach and that students can learn. Thus, teachers who plan to be effective should be aware of the connection between philosophy, teaching and learning.

Philosophy and the teaching/learning process

Philosophy has meant the pursuit of wisdom and philosophers have been described as loving and seeking wisdom. Philosophy has provided a way to inquire into ideas and traditions. Philosophers have been observers of the human condition and have articulated their observations in ways that were instructive to people during their times, as well as today. Thus, it is possible to trace the history of ideas by tracing the development of philosophical thought. Philosophy is descriptive of some of humanity's best thinking -- our collective wisdom (Ozmon & Craver, 1981). Runes (1981) formally defines philosophy as "originally the rational explanation of anything; the general principles under which all facts could be explained; the presupposition of ultimate reality." Educationally defined, "philosophy can be understood as the critical pursuit of rationality in human thought, emotions, actions and traditions" (Simpson and Jackson, 1984). Historically the study of philosophy has provided humankind with a

framework from which to pursue the act of living. This is evidenced by various religious doctrines, political movements, economic systems, and social institutions.

Belief systems or philosophies evolved from the human need to ask questions and seek answers. Philosophy has provided prisms of thought through which we may view questions such as: What is real? What is truth and knowledge? What is good? What is of value?

Each of us observes life, establishes views, and ultimately develops a personal philosophy or basic system of beliefs. In education, individual philosophy vitally impacts not only on self, but on the developing minds of students -- thus, a teacher's belief is of cardinal importance to the teaching/learning process. The first step to securing clear, concise answers to life's questions is to "Know thyself". This implies that to receive greater self-benefit, and to effectively teach others, one must first understand self in relation to the overall environment.

Van Cleve Morris (1961) proposes, a traditional "philosophy-to-practice approach" to understanding the relationship between teaching and philosophy. Further, he suggests that each classroom teacher should not only be aware of general philosophy, but should consciously work to develop his/her own "philosophic posture". Indeed, each should be aware of higher expectations for self and others. One approach to clarifying one's beliefs is to study historical figures in comparative and analytical ways.

Volumes of historical works reveal that successful teaching, at all levels has involved people who believed in the learner's innate ability to learn, enjoyed the learning process, were patient yet appropriately demanding and understood that learning was not limited to one field or discipline, or one class of students (Rusk, 1965; Broudy & Palmer, 1965; Cole, 1969; Frost, 1962). Jonas F. Soltis (1981) indicated that there are reasons to believe that one's personal philosophy of education will directly influence one's practice and is crucial to meaningful education. Ralph Tyler (1984) further extended this idea and maintained that the process of education is a continuing one of reflecting upon, testing, extending, adding to, and modifying one's views and educational practices.

Many teachers identified by historians as being successful, in their time, exemplified the ability to develop and act on a philosophy based upon the belief of an inborn capacity for learning on the part of the learner. Historically, famous teachers not only accepted students' innate ability to learn but also actively expected the students to use that ability in the teaching/learning process. They exemplified teaching in that they presented concepts to the learner and produced students who demonstrated an understanding by recombining concepts to "create" new ways of viewing old facts. If the students failed to grasp a concept, the teacher altered the presentations to meet the experience level of the students. The basic technique, that of engaging the natural desire for knowledge in learners, seemed to be

a common thread among these teachers. Their first task was to encourage the students to discover their own ability and then to assist them in using those abilities in ways which enhanced their own development. Some teachers even broke with tradition and advocated the dignity of the individual as being of paramount importance to the learning process.

Throughout history those thinkers able to develop insight into self and others have been able to affect positively the course of events. Those whose philosophy led to positive self-motivation and an understanding of that which motivated others have left indelible marks on the pages of history (i.e., Jesus, Buddha, Plato, Froebel, Dewey). These men who have been emulated for generations acted upon their personal philosophies; but their messages endured because they found ways to appeal to and motivate other people.

The personal ideas of many philosophers are representative of varied attitudes and behaviors. Over the years, their ideas have been collected into identifiable philosophical positions or schools of thought, including Idealism, Realism, Neo-Thomasism, Pragmatism, Reconstructionism, Existentialism and others (Morris, 1961, Brameld, 1955, Ozmon & Craver, 1981). George F. Kneller (1984) identified eight schools of thought: Analysis, Phenomenology, hermeneutics, Structuralism, Positivism, Marxism, Romanticism and conservatism. These new "isms" illustrate the tentative and transitory nature of attempts to categorize or classify schools of educational thought.

While educational philosophy has been dominated for the past quarter century by an emphasis on process rather than product, there remains a need for purpose, order and direction.

These schools of education thought give direction which is especially relevant to educators. They assist the development of goals, objectives and purposes. They offer principles for truth, not fixed answers (Howick, 1971). Realizing that each individual's interpretation of truth is based upon an accumulation of life experiences and study, one can categorize philosophies, note commonalities and dissimilarities, and discuss effects upon individuals and society; however, one cannot justify the belief that a specific philosophy stands above others as the source for all problem solving.

In this study, the traditionally defined schools of thought were used as windows through which three individual teachers were viewed in relation to society as a whole. Rather than being viewed as "stars" who must remain at some fixed point in the constellation of humanity, they were seen as "tides" motivated by their personal and professional environments. Sometimes they were seen rushing to shore with new methods and ideals; and at other times they receded, observed, learned, contemplated and grew. Looking at "Schools of Thought" as boxes -- the teachers were not placed in boxes; rather, they and their contributions were discussed as related to the generally accepted contents of those boxes.

Three significant twentieth century educators

Joining the ranks of exemplary teachers, are three twentieth century educators who also broke with tradition and shared valuable insights into the teaching/learning process. They are Maria Montessori, Alexander Sutherland Neill, and Marva Collins. These three educators represent three countries, three educational orientations, and three cultural perspectives; yet, they all demonstrated that they could be successful with students thought to be deviant or unteachable. Acting upon a philosophical base, each of them went against the grain of the prevailing education system in his or her country in terms of the social class or type of student with whom they initially had academic success.

Marva Collins' Chicago, Illinois public school classes served as a "dumping ground" for students who had been expelled from first and second grades. These students were primarily black and from lower socio-economic families. At Westside Preparatory School, which she established in 1976, Marva's pupils tended to be those who had failed earlier in the traditional system of education -- many had learned to behave as though retarded; some had social adjustment problems; and most had been suspended from public school (Collins & Tamarkin, (1982).

Montessori's initial work in Rome, Italy was with "retarded" children housed in an adult asylum. She studied the works of Sequin and Itard as a basis for her work (Standing, 1957). She also went

back to school in order to learn how to "reach" children who had been deemed unteachable. Even her contact with "normal" children was with impoverished ones who were believed to be genetically inferior because of their heredity. They were not accustomed to order, cleanliness, or any of the opportunities which were supposed to make them sound and educable. From patient observation of them and systematic action, Montessori was able to develop theories about the developmental stages of young children which were termed sensitivity periods. The stages which she observed and recorded are similar to those discussed by J. Piaget (Kramer, 1976).

Neill's involvement with students in Leiston, England began as a reluctant need to earn a living. He had no early intentions of becoming a teacher. He began as an apprentice to his father and others who were head teachers of a school. His reluctance to force "formal" learning upon students as well as his attempts to use learning in a natural sense, that is to make it fun and useful, helped him to develop a philosophy of "freedom." This philosophy has since inspired other "freedom" schools in the United States and Canada (Neill, 1972).

The personal and educational philosophical inclinations of these three educators resulted in their exemplary approaches to the education process. Their strong beliefs not only had a positive influence on their students but also influenced the traditional ways that schools were educating and/or schooling students. The methods of

Montessori and Neill have been copied by other western nations. While Collins' work has not gained international attention, her methods have gained considerable recognition in this country.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to discover, compare and elucidate the philosophical inclinations of Maria Montessori, A. S. Neill, and Marva Collins; to identify the similarities and differences among their views; and to discover any common elements or teaching strategies which might have contributed to their success with the academic, emotional, and social achievement of students thought to be deviant or unteachable. Given common indicators of success, educators will find their study of these elements useful in researching, developing, expanding, and mobilizing their own strong beliefs into effective teaching behaviors.

Statement of the Problem

A brief look at the teaching methods of the three educators revealed obvious differences -- in social climates, educational practices, personal backgrounds, and types of students taught. Yet, as one noted the reported academic, social, and emotional success rate, of the students involved in each setting, it seemed possible that a common thread could be identified which would offer an explanation for the educators' success in helping students learn. Identification of a

common thread in the methods of these exemplary educators serves to help today's teachers better understand the work of these innovative practitioners.

A comparative study of the family background, the early formal learning experience, the philosophical inclinations, the educational beliefs of the three educators, and the techniques used in their teaching methodology provided new dimension to the following investigative objectives: 1) to identify the strongly stated beliefs of the three educators relative to the learner, the curriculum and the instructional program; 2) to compare the educational views and practices of the three educators and to discuss their philosophical inclinations; 3) to identify and discuss similarities in their respective methods of orchestrating the classroom environment, responding to the learner, and conducting the formal learning experiences for students; 4) to identify and discuss any differences among the three educators in background, methodology or philosophical leanings; and 5) to identify their implied expectations for the students' ability to learn what was taught.

Selection of the three educators

Since it is important that creative and visionary educational ideas be translated into practices, the educators of the study were selected because they were actual practitioners who acted upon their observations of the educational ills of the time and implemented new

ideas to correct those ills. Their methods evolved from the actual process of day to day teaching while responding to the needs of their students.

Evidence that expressed how the selected educators viewed the world and operated within it seemed easily accessible in the literature. Autobiographical and primary sources were selected because the evidence offered the subjective view and lent itself to a study of the articulated intent of each educator. In addition, the ways that each individual understood him/herself and his/her world were studied as evidence of the individual's philosophical inclinations. Historian H. P. Rickman (1962) has made the point that the attempt to see the world as others see it is a worthwhile undertaking for the historian: "By capturing the meaning which individuals, here and there, have perceived in, and attributed to their circumstances, the meaning which informed their actions and became embodied in their creations, the historian can tell a meaningful story" (Rickman, 1962).

A search of the literature revealed that there are two biographies of Maria Montessori written or translated into English. There is no autobiography by Montessori; however, there are many books which represent years of her reported research.

Neill, Neill, Orange Peel (Neill, 1972) is the autobiography of Alexander Sutherland Neill. There is also a wealth of other publications by and about him.

The major source of data for Marva Collins is Marva Collins' Way written by Collins and Tamarkin (1982). Other selected media and news articles concerning Collins are readily available since she is a present day educator.

Selection and treatment of bibliographic sources

Personal documents are the main source for this study. The researcher who uses personal documents as evidence must examine, check, and crosscheck as many such documents as are available in order to insure that what is thought to be factual can be verified by each of the sources. Rickman (1962) proposed that human actions are accompanied by consciousness and are prompted by purpose. He contended that action springs from the way people interpret situations as well as from the values and philosophies they hold. Behind anyone's actions lie ideals, beliefs and feelings that make their observed and recorded behaviors meaningful. Therefore, the task of research is not merely to describe the behaviors, but to understand those behavior as well as the thoughts, feelings, and beliefs from which the behaviors emanate. Consequently, the personal documents utilized in this study were employed primarily to illuminate the articulated educational views and belief systems of the three educators.

The manner of interpreting the articulated philosophical leanings of the educators was suggested by Von Wright (1971) and Olney (1973). They argued that the meaning behind the articulated philosophy can be

ascertained by interpreting it in terms of the concepts and roles which determine reality for the subjects being studied. The description and explanation of the subjects' behaviors must employ the same conceptual framework as the subjects themselves. By utilizing the conceptual framework of the subjects themselves, the researcher can lessen the probability of misinterpretation of behaviors and go straight to the essence of the act. Therefore, the personal documents used in this study were examined for each educator's personal world view in order to discover his or her own way of perceiving, organizing, developing, and implementing his or her own educational philosophy.

The status of each educator as a "key informant" was also recognized. A key informant, as defined by anthropologists, is an "articulate member of a studied culture who is relied upon as a source of ideas about a particular culture" (Paul, 1953). The most helpful informant is an individual who is "in a position to have observed significant events" and who is "quite perceptive and reflective about them" (Whyte, 1960). A principal criterion for the value of the key informants, then, is whether they represent "the condition which is the subject of the study" (Beck, 1960). Acknowledgement of the key informant status of the three educators helped this writer to interpret the subjective evidence offered in the educators' autobiographies and/or personal documents.

Significance of the Study

Historians, students of comparative education, and those persons concerned specifically with the educational views of persons teaching "special" students will find this study significant. Of necessity, our society in the United States today places a premium on creativity, innovation, and information. Currently, data and factual information are increasing at an accelerated rate, making it increasingly more difficult to "keep pace with change". A major technology of the twentieth century has been the use of computers to collect and store information and data. Today's students must acquire different skills than their parents did 20 or 30 years ago. Moreover, skills learned one year for a particular job may be totally inappropriate the following year. Therefore, those persons involved in guiding others must strive to develop methods which will emphasize "how to learn" and use those methods to instruct the students. Those educators who are presently engaged in implementing effective educational programs for learners will benefit from a review of the innovations and strategies demonstrated by Collins, Neill and Montessori as each taught students "how to learn". As John Naisbitt (1982) has pointed out in his book, Megatrends, our society is in the process of restructuring.

We are moving in the dual directions of high tech/high touch, matching each new technology with a compensatory human response We are shifting from institutional help to more self-reliance

in all aspects of our lives We are discovering that the framework of representative democracy has become obsolete in an era of instantaneously shared information From a narrow either/or society with a limited range we are exploding into a free-wheeling multiple option society. The citizens of the 21st century and beyond will need to embody strategies of quickly processing information to producing creative, as well as humane solutions to problems (pp. 1, 2).

The three educators chosen for this study successfully demonstrated their ability to foster and enhance growth in their students. They each discovered a "formula" useful in aiding their students' adaptation to their respective environments. Today's educators, by reviewing the ideas and teaching methods of Montessori, Neill and Collins, may also devise teaching techniques and behaviors which will better equip students for the accelerated changes taking place in our society.

Format

Chapter 2: "Maria Montessori"; Chapter 3: "A. S. Neill"; and Chapter 4: "Marva Knight Collins" are monographs devoted to the respective educators. Each monograph is divided into six parts, as follows:

The first part is a description of the educator's family life and early development. The economic conditions, persons

and institutions which exerted influence on his or her personal development are delineated.

The second part of each monograph is a review of the educator's formal learning experiences. Both positive and negative experiences and their effect on the individual's approach to the teaching/learning process are cited.

The third part is an overview of each person's professional development. A look at how, when and why each pursued his or her teaching career and other employment is presented.

The fourth part of each monograph follows the development of the school founded or educational approach used by each individual. It is here that one views the unique approach of each person expressed to the fullest and gains an understanding of his or her contribution to education.

In the fifth part of each monograph the educator's beliefs are discussed as related to both general and educational philosophies.

The sixth part sets forth their educational views by reviewing their concepts of "The Learner", "The Instructional Methods", and "The Curriculum."

The fifth and final chapter is "The Conclusion." Here the educators are further compared. The commonalities among the three educators and the primary elements which led to their successful teaching/learning experiences are further explained. Conclusions relative to the major objectives are discussed and suggestions for further study are noted.

CHAPTER 2:

MARIA MONTESSORI

Monograph

Facts about Maria Montessori's early life are scanty, although anecdotes were recorded about her by biographers who interviewed friends and former students. Since these were written after she had become famous, there was likely an element of bias present (Kramer, 1976).

Family and early development

There are strong indications that Maria's developing personality was greatly influenced by adult family models. She was born at Chiaravalle, Italy, August 31, 1870, to parents of comfortable social class. Both Alessandro and Renilde Stoppani Montessori were respected for their views and involvement in the social reform movement of their day.

Cavaliere Alessandro Montessori earned his title as a soldier in the war which led to the unification of Italy. He had faith in the revolution and actively worked for reform with dignity. "He was a typical conservative of old stock, a military man" (Kramer, 1976). "To the end of his life he was dignified and soldierly in his bearing and well known for his politeness" (Standing, 1957). For Maria, he served

as a well-mannered and gracious model. It also seems no coincidence that Maria showed an aptitude for math. Alessandro worked for many years as an accountant and manager of government affairs (Kramer, 1976).

The conservative aspect of Alessandro's character shows clearly in his resistance to his daughter's career choices. Although he did not approve of her choice of a technical education, and later medicine, he accompanied her to and from her classes. It was not socially acceptable for a young woman to be seen unaccompanied in public. It was later revealed that, secretly, Alessandro was interested in his daughter's successes. He put together a scrapbook of the news clippings noting her progress and success at attacking the social evils of the day.

While her father was a potentially limiting element to Maria's personality development, her mother provided unwavering support. Renilde Stoppani was well-educated for a female of her day. She was a "girl who devoured books during a time in which it was a matter of pride to be able to write one's name" (Standing 1957). She was also fiercely patriotic, devoted to the ideas of liberation and unions for Italy. Maria's mother displayed strength of will, and supported inner growth and self-discipline. In addition, Renilde demonstrated a tolerance for, as well as a belief in, the duty to help one's less fortunate neighbors.

From her mother's example, Maria was no stranger to work and self-discipline. She learned early in life to help with the daily practical chores of the household; she even assigned herself a certain number of floor tiles to scrub (Kramer, 1976). In later life she used this same type of physical activity to "clean" out emotional or mental challenges in her life. The "Physical-Practical Exercises", described as necessary for children's development in her later works, can be traced to her own childhood method and solution for working out problems (Montessori, 1964b).

Renilde actively directed her daughter's developing social consciousness. From an early age Maria was assigned a weekly quota of knitting for the poor. When Maria's involvement with a severely deformed friend became hurtful to the friend, Renilde tactfully diverted her child's attention and actions toward less painful endeavors (Kramer, 1976). She provided a more insightful method for her child to contribute, one which would encourage the trait of sharing of self without causing envy or self-reproach on the part of the receiver. Both of her parents believed in respect for all life, regardless of physical or social conditions. Renilde was an open and innovative person with strong personal convictions. Alessandro was tempered by conservative and dignified restraint.

The environment provided by Alessandro and Renilde Montessori was one which encouraged intellectual curiosity, and systematic and persistent growth for self and others.

Formal learning experiences

The Montessoris were concerned that their only child be reared in a more stimulating intellectual environment than that of Chiaravalle. With that idea, as well as better employment opportunity for Alessandro in mind, the family moved to Rome when Maria was five years old (Kramer, 1976).

Maria attended state schools that were typically crowded and dirty. Most teachers were men struggling to make their way out of the peasantry and gain footing in the lower middle class. The major teaching method consisted of teacher presentation and student drills.

Unlike the schools in Chiaravalle, the Elementary schools in Rome went beyond third grade. The students were drilled in history, geography, elementary science and some geometry. Beyond the third grade boys and girls were taught separately. While there was not a requirement for religious training in public schools, religious views and dogma were present.

Maria was not a precocious child. According to her grandson, "she was considered a sweet, not especially bright girl, and that was how she thought of herself" (Kramer, 1976). In first grade she received a certificate for good behavior; in second grade, an award for sewing and other needlework. Indeed, early formal education reports would indicate few leanings toward academics or science. As a child, she aspired to become an actress as did most of her female peers.

Though she agreed with her female peers about possible careers, as an elementary student her personality was developing toward more individualistic behavior. In that day, such behavior was thought to be aggressive and masculine. In games with her peers, she was usually the leader. Those she disapproved of she dismissed with, "You, you aren't born yet" or "please remind me that I've made up my mind never to speak to you again" (Standing, 1957). With adults as well as with children she demonstrated traits of inflated self-confidence and a strong will--perhaps learned from her mother. When a teacher objected to the expression in "those eyes," Maria responded by never raising her eyes in that teacher's presence again (Kramer, 1976). And upon being asked by a teacher, "Would you not like to become famous?" Maria replied dryly, "Oh, no I shall never be that. I care too much for the children of the future to add yet another biography to the list" (Standing, 1957).

Maria's firm beliefs in her own capabilities seem to have been encouraged by her interactions with her peers, but were tempered by the parenting of Renilde and Alessandro. Renilde insisted upon patience, persistence, and practice; Alessandro, upon analytical thinking.

Most girls educated beyond elementary school chose the classical course of study which culminated in a profession of teaching and home-making. Maria was adamant about a career of teaching: "She was not going to become a teacher" (Standing, 1957). Maria chose the technical course of study in order to pursue her interest and aptitude for mathematics.

At the age of 13, Maria decided to enter the Regia Scolva Technical Michelango Buonarroti in 1883. In her first year, she took Italian literature, history and geography, mathematics, drawing and calligraphy. She graduated from the technical school in the spring of 1886, with high marks in all of her subjects. Her final grade was a score of 137 out of a possible 150 points (Kramer, 1976).

From 1886 to 1890, Maria attended the Regist Institute Tecnico Leonardo DaVinci. There she studied modern language and natural science. Her favorite subject was mathematics; however, she developed an interest in biology which was soon to overtake her interest in mathematics as a subject. Her interest in engineering as a career also waned.

Maria had experienced opposition to her career decision of becoming an engineer rather than a teacher; however, not to the extent prompted by her announcement of plans to become a medical doctor. This option was unheard of for a young woman of her generation. Standing (1957) describes Maria's decision as "jumping out of the pan into the fire." Even her father was caught up in the social opposition for such a career decision for a young woman. Through Maria's determination and persistence and Renilde's unwavering support, Alessandro and tradition bowed to progress.

Maria entered the University of Rome in 1890. Two years later she entered the four year medical program. Once admitted to medical school, she encountered many difficulties. The male students subjected

her to a series of persecutions for many months. When attending lectures she had to be accompanied by her father. While taking her human anatomy labs she had to learn to work alone at night.

Maria recalled later, "In those days ... I felt as if I could have done anything." As a young adult student, Maria worked hard. She won a series of scholarships year after year. She further augmented her income by giving private lessons to students. Records indicate that she "very largely paid her own way through the university" (Standing, 1957). As the first female doctor in Italy, she had certainly won a victory for social reform and the rights of women (Standing, 1957). In 1896 she graduated with a double honors degree in medicine and surgery.

Professional development

Shortly after graduation Montessori acquired the position of Chair of Hygiene at one of the two female colleges in Rome. She also was appointed assistant physician at the University of Rome psychiatric clinic. In the same year (1896) she was chosen to represent the women of Italy at a feminist congress held in Berlin. She eloquently and convincingly discussed the plight of working women, continuing the family tradition of working toward social reform (Kramer, 1976).

From 1896 to 1906 Dr. Montessori's career was characterized by hard work. Because of her upbringing and former school experiences she was no stranger to hard work; in fact, she seemed to thrive on it. She

worked as a lecturer, practicing physician, teacher, and teacher of teachers.

As part of her duties as Assistant Physician at the University of Rome Psychiatric Clinic, she visited various insane asylums looking for suitable subjects for the clinic. At this period in history, the social conscience of the society had just begun to be awakened to the needs of the mentally ill. People were just beginning to be more compassionate toward adult sufferers. As there was very little compassion for "normal" children in schools, even less attention was directed toward children suffering from mental or emotional problems. So it was that Dr. Montessori came into contact with children considered deficient, who were housed in adult asylums. The young doctor was deeply touched by the plight of these children. Her scientific training in objective observation coupled with natural intuition led her to hypothesize that their condition could be just as much environmental as hereditary:

In one of the lunatic asylums she came across a number of these children herded together like prisoners in a prisonlike room. The woman who looked after them did not attempt to conceal the disgust with which she regarded them. Montessori asked her why she held them in such contempt. "Because," the woman replied, "as soon as their meals are finished they throw themselves on the floor to search for crumbs." Montessori looked around the room and saw that the children had no toys or materials of any kind. Montessori saw in the children's behavior

a craving of a very different and higher kind than for mere food She realized, one path, and one only, toward intelligence and that was through their hands ... (Standing, 1957, p 28).

The more she came into contact with these youngsters and contemplated their condition, the more convinced she became that their mental deficiency was a pedagogical problem rather than a medical one. She felt that with special education treatment, their mental condition could be immensely enhanced. She stated, "That form of creation which was necessary for these unfortunate beings, so as to enable them to reenter human society to take their place in the civilized world and render them independent of the help of others -- placing human dignity within their grasp -- was a work which appealed so strongly to my heart that I remained in it for years" (Standing, 1957).

After Maria gave a series of lectures on the feebleminded, she was asked to direct the newly established orthophrenic school for deficient children. She served as director from 1899 to 1901. During these two years Montessori directed the training of a group of teachers "in a special method of observation and in the education of the feebleminded" (Standing, 1957). In addition to training the teachers, Montessori "gave herself up entirely to the actual teaching of the children" (Standing, 1957). All day long -- from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. -- she would spend with the children; and then, at night she would sit up late to make notes, tabulate, compare, analyze, reflect, and prepare new

materials. She remarked, "Those two years of practice are indeed my first and only true degree in pedagogy" (Standing, 1957). Under her skillful guidance and modeling, the inferior mentalities of the defective children developed to unexpected extent. A number of the "idiots" learned to read and write so well that they successfully passed a public exam taken together with "normal" children. The public was pleased, but Montessori was puzzled. She stated, "Whilst everyone was admiring my idiots I was searching for the reasons which could keep back the healthy and happy children of the ordinary schools on so low a plane that they could be equalled in tests of intelligence by my unfortunate pupils." She continued, "I became convinced that similar methods applied to normal children would develop and set free their personality in a marvelous and surprising way" (Standing, 1957).

Seven years passed before Montessori was able to put her theories into action. However, the years were not void of action. In these seven years she felt a need for more study. Therefore, she re-entered the university to study philosophy and anthropology. In addition she more thoroughly studied the works of Dr. Edouard Sequin and Jean Itard. She continued to avail herself of experiences designed for growth and learning. She made a special study of the nervous diseases of children and published the results; visited and observed children in other European countries; practiced medicine in private as well as in the clinics and hospitals of Rome; delivered an address as the Italian representative to a feminist congress at Berlin; addressed a pedagogi-

cal congress on moral education and wrote her first major volume, Pedagogical Anthropology (Smith et al. 1984).

The development of Montessori Schools

In 1907, Dr. Montessori had the opportunity to practice her approach on normal children. She was asked to head a school to be located in the San Lorenzo quarter Rome, Italy. At that time, San Lorenzo quarter abounded in crime, poverty, and a disregard for hygiene. The building society of Rome resurrected two blocks of new tenement housing which were immediately inhabited by over 1,000 families who promised to observe the rules of decency and hygiene. Most adult members of these households worked, leaving their young unattended. Maria was asked to take up the daily care of these preschoolers. She consented, and her first Casa dei Bambini was founded. Her first class consisted of 60 children. Teacher and frightened, tearful children began their teaching/learning experience in a barren room in that tenement house. Montessori's description of her first experience was "... I set to work like a peasant woman who, having set aside a good store of seed corn, had found a fertile field in which she may freely sow it. But I was wrong. I had hardly turned over the clods of my field, when I found gold instead of wheat; the clods concealed a precious treasure. I was not the peasant I had thought myself, rather I was like foolish Aladdin who, without knowing it, had in his hand a key that would open hidden treasures" (Standing, 1957).

Montessori had in fact operationalized a scientific laboratory. Her most important tool was that of careful observation. She used the observed data collected to develop materials and work in cooperation with the children in their own instinctive learning process. The materials that grew out of her observation and cooperation with the children were called didactic teaching materials. In other words, this was truly "on the job" training, both for the children and Montessori. It is a well known fact that a scientist must have good observation skills, the ability to record his/her data, and the skills to synthesize these data. Throughout the experiment, she maintained the open-mindedness of a true scientist. Montessori's motto was to wait and to observe while waiting. The important thing was that there was no "pain" to her experiment. The specimens did not die; in fact, they lived--they were introduced to a truer definition of the meaning of the words "live" and "life".

The conclusion reached by Montessori (1964b) was, "Just as the deprived environment contributed to the spontaneous display of deficient behavior by the children, so a prepared environment allowed for the exhibition of the students' innate abilities which then encouraged a spontaneous degree of self-discipline." Self-discipline then led to continuous and systematic learning of formal subjects.

A Philosophical View of Montessori

Montessori can best be described as a philosophical eclectic, in that she exhibited evidence of the influence of more than one philosophical tradition. Her belief in God or a Universal Spirit that incorporates all of life in the process of continuous creation and development, and her belief that both adults and children should work in cooperation with cosmological absolutes give evidence of her idealistic perspective. Evidence of a Neo-Thomastic view of the learner as a rational and spiritual being is found in her strong belief in the innate essence or potential for learning in each individual gave powerful direction to her educational theory and practice. She stated that "All human victories, all human progress, stands upon the inner force Everyone has a special tendency, a special vocation, modest perhaps, but certainly useful The poem must spring from the soul of the poet ..." (Montessori, 1966). She also gave powerful support to the theory that children could be trained to utilize an inner potential for the betterment of themselves and their families. Montessori believed, as did Sequin and Itard, that knowledge comes through the soul from "God." This belief was the guiding principle used by Montessori as she extended the work of Sequin. She stated that, "Sequin led the idiot from . . . the education of the senses to general notions; from general notions to abstract; from abstract thought to morality ..." (Montessori, 1966). Montessori indicated that her strong belief in the natural ability of children was based

upon religious faith as well as scientific observation. She believed the child possessed the necessary curiosity or desire for knowledge. She explained that,

The child is a body which grows, and a soul which develops. These two forms, physiological and psychic, have one eternal font -- life itself. We must neither mar, nor stifle the mysterious powers which lie within these two forms of growth, but we must await from them the manifestations which we know will succeed one another. Further, the environment is undoubtedly a secondary factor in the phenomena of life; it can modify in that it can help or hinder but it can never create The origins of the development, both in the species and in the individual, lie within. The child does not grow because he is placed in conditions of temperature to which he is adapted, he grows because the potential life within him develops, making itself visible; (Montessori, 1967b, p. 127).

In developing methods to draw forth the latent potential of children, Montessori counseled that "... it is necessary for his (the child's) physical life to place the soul of the child in contact with creation, in order that he may lay up for himself treasure from the directly educating forces of living nature ..." and, furthermore, "The spirit aids the body in its growth; the heart, the nerves and the muscles are helpful in their evolution by the activity of the spirit, since the upward path for the soul and body is one and the same." (Montessori, 1967b). Montessori's major philosophical assumption is

"... all things are part of the universe, and are connected with each other to form one whole unity" (Montessori, 1948a). Therefore, the teacher is instructed to "wait and watch" for the child to indicate, through action what is needed to guide his or her formal education.

Despite her philosophical affinity for perennialist beliefs, Montessori gave evidence that she was also influenced by developments in psychology and modern realism. Her early proclivity for mathematics and science may have made this approach very natural for her. Observing that the child was also influenced profoundly by his/her surroundings and that the child interacted intimately with its environment, she found considerable support in scientific observation and experimentation for her educational practices.

Montessori's methods of teaching and related learning theories have exerted considerable influence on contemporary education, as evidenced by the number of teachers and schools that have employed her methods. This provided evidence of the skillful blending of her educational theory and practice under the eclectic umbrella of both idealism and modern/realism.

Educational Views

The learner

The common (public) schools of the day were designed to impart knowledge and information to the student. The student's primary role

was to remember the information given and be able to pass the examinations. The students were viewed as little adults in need of humanization. A few educators and philosophers had made attempts to change the treatment of young students, but the old ways and beliefs were hard to change. Montessori discovered that the young learners had more to offer to the teaching-learning process. She described the characteristics of childhood: "They are the normal characteristics of childhood hitherto concealed under a mask of 'deviations'. Montessori discovered that children possess different and higher qualities than those usually attributed to them. She explained, "It was as if a higher form of personality had been liberated, and a new child had come into being" (Standing, 1957).

Montessori suggested that from birth through the age of eighteen, children go through a mental metamorphosis that can be divided into three epochs. The first epoch has two stages--from birth to three years and from three to six years of age. During the first epoch, the mind acts like a sponge, absorbing impressions from the environment surrounding it. Part of this period is considered an "unconscious" period since the child is not consciously aware of what it is doing. During the first three years of this six year period, the mind operates unconsciously. The child simply takes in the environment with an absorbent but unconscious mind. Montessori explained that "an unconscious mind does not mean an inferior mind. You will find this type of intelligence everywhere at work in nature. Every insect has it

for instance; but theirs is not a conscious intelligence, even though sometimes it appears to be so In those first few months of the child's life, before he is able to move, he takes in the whole of his environment by means of the absorbent power of the unconscious mind. The child seems to take in these things, not with his mind but with his life. The absorbent mind works rapidly, taking in everything without effort and without conscious, will ... it begins deep down in the darkness of the subconscious mind; it is developed and "fixed" there; and finally emerges into consciousness, where it remains a fixed and permanent procession" (Standing, 1957). With the "developed" skills learned during this period, the child continues his/her development in a more conscious effort through the conscious period (from three to six years). The faculties such as memory, thinking, writing, and other processes, are now available for expansion.

The first epoch can be viewed as the period when the human individual develops and perfects new functions (faculties). By the time the child is six, she/he has been transformed from a rather unconscious, immobile creature into a new psychic individual. This process is described by Montessori as "revelation of the child" (Standing, 1957).

During the second epoch (6-12), the child shows great stability as physical and psychic growth continues along the same line. There is very little transformation or metamorphosis during the second state. Montessori believes much mental work can be accomplished, (i.e., storing a great deal of cultural information). Mentally, a great devel-

opment of reasoning abilities is also taking place. Socially, the child develops an individual ego strength as well as group consciousness (i.e., the gang stage or herd instinct). In addition, a great interest in fairness and right versus wrong will surface. Montessori's prepared environment for this group would be different from that of the first stage of development. However, one would provide opportunities for the child to practice the developing mental, social, and psychic skills at each stage.

The third epoch (ages 12-18) is another period of transformation and was subdivided into puberty (12-15) and adolescence (15-18). According to Montessori's theory, growth ceases after 18, and the individual simply becomes older. New psychological characteristics emerge such as doubts, hesitations, violent emotions, discouragement, and an unexpected decrease in intellectual capacity. During the period there is also a tendency toward creative work and a need for the strengthening of self-confidence. The more introverted adolescent will emerge as a socially conscious adult; not just an individual or a group member but a separate member of the human society. As with each of the epochs, a specially prepared environment is needed so that feelings of dependence, inadequacy, and inferiority do not develop and endure for years.

Specifically, Montessori concluded that children: (1) had powers of mental concentration; (2) loved to repeat over and over again those tasks which held their attention; (3) could understand and grow

accustomed to order; (4) given choices, preferred certain activities to others; (5) preferred to work with didactic (self-correcting) materials rather than to play with toys; (6) could exhibit a great deal of motor control when they themselves were allowed to discover their own clumsiness; (7) enjoyed working in silence rather than commotion; and (8) needed neither reward nor punishment to engage in sustained learning activities. These were extraordinary findings and resulted in changes and practices which are still in effect today.

At the turn of the century, she proclaimed "The Century of the Child." Her proclamation was followed by actions resulting in child-size furniture, self-correcting teaching materials and equipment, in addition to the concept of a "prepared environment." The latter allowed children the dignity of discovery, self-discipline and growth without harmful interference by adults. Children were encouraged to organize and systematize the learning experience according to their own inner urging.

The instructional method

The role of the teacher or directress was to observe the child and assist when necessary. Acting as an observer, the teacher learned to understand child behavior and consequently accept the child as the unique person he/she is. After careful observation and study of a child's feelings, needs, desires and competencies, the teacher introduced learning materials and experiences. Each learning experience was

introduced by means of sensorial and perceptual-motor task. All of the senses were systematically stimulated: visual exploration of size, form, color, texture cues; auditory experimentation with rhythm, tones; olfactory and gustatory comparisons of tastes and odors. All sensory-motor experiences were tied to the child's language via Montessori's "Three Period Lesson." The instruction of morphology, semantics and syntax was integrated with object manipulation in order to provide sound percepts and concepts. During the first period the teacher associated the quality and its label; in the second period the child demonstrated his/her association of quality with its label by selecting the correct object from a choice of objects differing in one way; and, in the third period the child identified verbally (or in the case of non-verbal children, the response was with gesture) the object chosen by the teacher.

Montessori brought to the world theory and practices which more fully identified and described the developmental stages of children. She further noted that students displayed a sensitivity towards learning particular concepts during certain stages of development, which she termed the sensitivity period. Her instructional method and teaching materials evolved as a result of meeting the needs of her students. She not only influenced other teachers ("directresses") to adopt her method but early childhood centers throughout the world adopted many of her practices. The engineered classrooms in many 1960s "Headstart" kindergartens were patterned after the "Prepared Environment" concept. These centers are organized and designed to

encourage order. A given classroom may have a combination of the following centers: Housekeeping, Manipulative, Story, Water and Sand, as well as a place for special one-on-one instruction.

The concept of providing individualized instruction rather than total group instruction can be traced to her innovations. Another Montessori contribution was the concept of non-graded or ungraded classrooms. Her ideas and actions opened the way for more humanistic approaches to the education of all children.

The curriculum

The Montessori curriculum simulated "practical life experiences." Children engaged in "play"-work activities such as washing, cleaning, polishing, and woodworking. Equipment used for these activities was miniaturized to accommodate the child's strength and size.

The curriculum evolved as a result of close observation of the children and their needs. Activities and materials were designed to be practical as well as appeal to the developmental level of the children. The curriculum addressed the senses, motor, language, writing, reading and moral development. Montessori (1964b) wrote, "The technique of my method as it follows the guidance of the natural physiological and psychical development of the child, may be divided into three parts: Motor education. Sensory education. Language." The prepared environment was designed to address motor education while sensory and language education was addressed through the didactic materials.

Summary

For over 40 years Maria Montessori lectured and trained people -- teachers as well as students -- in ways of allowing the child to share his/her gifts with humanity. Montessori felt that the child's inner abilities needed an atmosphere of freedom to fully develop.

By the time of her death in May 1952, the Montessori Method was known in all "civilized" countries (Standing, 1957). She wrote approximately 15 volumes and numerous articles about education. Her ideas and suggestions for helping children to learn are firmly entrenched into many of today's classrooms. Indications are that her influence will extend far into the future as educators prepare children for the 21st century.

CHAPTER 3:

ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND NEILL

Monograph

Family and early development

Alexander Sutherland Neill was born in Farfar, Scotland, to George and Mary Sutherland Neill. While George Neill was described professionally as a "good teacher," his son considered him to be timid as a man and non-caring as a father. George Neill valued scholarship and had little patience for slow learners. The young Neill had few of the qualities valued by his father and many of the characteristics which tried his father's patience.

In describing the relationship between himself and his father, Neill stated: "Father did not care for me when I was a boy Often he was cruel to me and I acquired a definite fear of him ..." (Neill, 1972). This fear lasted until adulthood.

Mary Sutherland Neill was from a hard working family of "low standing"; she urged her family to be snobbish and to imitate the upper class. "She was a proud wee woman...she was a snob and made us snobs" (Neill, 1972). According to Neill, his mother's behavior grew out of her impoverished background. Mary Sutherland Neill was the daughter of a servant girl who took in washing to support her family after her husband's death.

"Granny" Clune Sinclair was one of a family of about twenty sons and daughters. She was the only one of the farm children to survive tuberculosis. Neill described his grandmother as very religious. "Her faith was a simple one of sheep and goat with no doubts, no skepticism whatever" (Neill, 1972). He attributes his early fear of hell to her. Neill stated, "I think what older folks say to a child may have a great effect on later behavior and thought." Though he felt that he acquired an early fear of hell from Granny Clune, he still felt that he was her favorite grandchild.

Neill's childhood was plagued with both fears and unreasonable demands from his mother and father. While the mother insisted upon proper behavior, speech and attire, his father held unreasonable scholarship expectations of him. Neill's self-esteem suffered greatly from his inability to successfully meet these demands. In addition, he seemed to unconsciously absorb his father's fears and added many of his own which included a fear of God, the dark, animals, and other people larger than himself. It was only after years of work with analysts that he was able to discuss these fears openly. He realized that "standards were set at an unattainable height", and that most of the adults surrounding his life were hypocritical (Neill, 1972).

George and Mary Neill wanted their children to be socially accepted, as well as educated. They reasoned that to achieve, an approved education was a must. An approved education meant a matriculation from a recognized academy and university. Neill's brother

Willie was the scholar of the family, and the young Alexander tried to pattern his academic aspirations after him. For a brief period, he planned to become a minister like Willie.

The Neill clan consisted of thirteen children with eight surviving past childhood. Neill's favorite sibling was his younger sister Clunie. Together Clunie and Neill discovered, discussed, and experimented with life in their environment. Together, they discovered the physical differences between girls and boys. Their exploration led to feelings of extreme guilt for Neill. The parents punished them severely for the "sex" exploration. Perhaps, this incident also contributed to Neill's later search for freedom and his written criticisms in regard to society's stand on sexuality.

Formal learning experiences

Neill went to school at age five. He walked the four miles daily with his father. The entire experience seemed to be one of frustration for him. His little legs were not long enough to keep pace with his father - nor were his intellectual abilities strong enough to meet his father's approval. Kingsmuir School was a two room building. Neill described it as a "happy school mostly." He said that his father was a good teacher and fair most of the time. Neill suggested that his father tended to use the strap in direct proportion to the need to look good for the school inspectors. When he did use the strap, it was because his salary depended upon the number of Standard V students he passed.

The strap was used primarily as an exigent means with the "dunces." Neill noted, however, that his father punished his family as harshly as he did the other students. Indications are that Neill was not his father's favorite pupil nor his favorite son. Neill hated the homework assigned by his teacher/father and could not seem to learn, even with tutoring from his mother and grandmother.

Neill was a child who understood that going to church was a social function. The Calvinist religion had provided clear milestones of what would lead to destruction according to Neill, "sex, stealing, lying, swearing, and profaning God's day," were sins. He learned that engaging in one or all of these activities would lead to horrible consequences punishable not only by human beings but also God. This seemingly clear and concise knowledge provided great anxiety for Neill's childhood and a backdrop for his later literary and educational thesis. In addition, Neill spent many years in therapy trying to clear up misconceptions presented by the representatives of the church.

Neill's formal education was wrought by persistent questioning of self as well as those educators he grew to respect as a young man. In addition, his private fantasy of being a scholar, like his brother Willie and other heroes, probably added to his being able to acquire the skills necessary to teaching. He proved to be relentless in his bid for self-acceptance and the "freedom to be".

Professional development

At fourteen Neill became a clerk in a manufacturing plant near Edinburgh. The experience was a very unpleasant one for him. He suffered from homesickness. After seven months, he returned home to study for the civil service examination. His study was frustrating because he found that he could not remember what he had read. He then worked for a draper shop in his hometown for a while before a second attempt to study for the civil service exam. Again, he experienced failure. At that point, his mother suggested that he become a pupil-teacher in his father's school. That was a low paid official position which lasted four years. "I think I learned my profession well; for I copied my father, and he was a good teacher -- good in the sense that he could draw out rather than stuff in," wrote Neill many years later (Neill, 1972).

The pupil-teaching position involved two examinations, one at the end of the second year and the other at the end of the fourth year of teaching. The best candidates went on scholarship for two years of formal training at Glasgow or Edinburgh and then to good teaching positions. However, Neill did poorly and had to settle for the designation of ex-Pupil Teacher, which allowed him to become an assistant teacher. At the age of nineteen he began his career and for three years worked in two different schools as assistant teacher.

Working as assistant teacher allowed Neill to develop many of the skills neglected while he was a student. He saved his money and studied for the university admission examination. He entered Edinburgh University as a student of Agricultural Science when he was 25, but switched his major to English and received a M.A. degree in 1912. He later earned a M.Ed. degree with specialization in psychology from Newcastle College.

While a student at Edinburgh, Neill had an active social life. He also served for two years as editor of the school's literary newspaper, "The Students." After three years he graduated with the equivalent of a "B" average. Neill did not feel that he had gained a great deal from the experience and was critical of the methods used:

I held then, and do now, that it is better to write a bad limerick than be able to recite Paradise Lost. That is a fundamental thing in education. But the university never asked us to compose even a limerick; it did not ask from us any original opinions about Shakespeare or anyone else I was compelled to concentrate on whether a blank-verse line had elision or not, or whether one could trace the rhythm of "Christable" in "The Lotus Eaters." It was all piddling stuff, like taking Milan Cathedral to pieces stone by stone to discover where the beauty lay. I had to read so glorious a thing as The Tempest with annotations, painfully looking up the etymological meaning of some phrase that did not matter a scrap (Neill, 1972, p. 511).

Neill felt he was taught neither to exercise independence of thought in relation to literature, nor to care about its content.

At the age of twenty-nine he took his first trip to London in hopes of finding a career in journalism. He enjoyed the big city life, but his career in journalism was short lived. He worked briefly as editor of an encyclopedia and for an even shorter time as editor of a magazine. World War I was the major cause for the brevity of these positions.

In 1917, Neill was drafted into the Army but was able to serve only briefly because of the flu, bad feet, and a bout with neurasthenia. The manifestation of mental and physical fatigue accounted for his early discharge from the service.

While Neill's early personal and professional development were filtered through trials and tribulations, his later living served as a demonstration of positive yet controversial learning-growing in spite of adversities. His first vocation ultimately was delegated to that of an avocation. Journalism provided him with an avenue for many publications, the majority of which were based upon his experiences as an educator. He often pointed out failures of the major institutions of society.

The development of Summerhill School

Though his own education had been one of many failures, Neill was able to create an educational environment for others that was designed

to encourage individual growth through freedom rather than autocratic restrictions and humiliations. His major success was the Summerhill school.

Once out of the army, he worked briefly at King Alfred School in Hampstead and in 1921 helped to set up an international school in the Helleran suburb of Dresden, Germany. The Neve Schule was moved to Vienna, and then to Liston, England, the present site of the Summerhill school.

In 1924, Neill moved with some of the students to a rented house in Lyme Regis, Dorset, England. The name of the house was Summerhill. The school was designed for children from preschool through secondary age. Summerhill got more than its share of problem children initially. At first, Neill welcomed these. "At that stage, I was a proper fool. I thought that psychology could cure everything, barring a broken leg" (Neill, 1972).

Neill's school differed from the traditional ones of his day and was founded on four of his strongest beliefs:

1. Schools are for the "living" rather than for "learning."
2. Teachers and adults are not superior to children but should strive to develop equal treatment because the adults may not know what is best for the child.

3. Schools should work toward individual development rather than group conformity for democratic living.
4. Children are capable of democratic living and self-government (especially older children).

Summerhill evolved into a school which allowed Neill to put into practice his beliefs about what and how children should learn. While serving in various subordinate positions in schools devoted to the "existing learned order of things", he acquired a wealth of methods of "what not to do". These discoveries were implemented for over fifty years in his school.

A Philosophical View of Neill

Neill's writings, as well as the writings of others about him, suggest an existentialist philosophy. Existentialists answer the ontological question "What is real?" with "I Am." With the realization of existence, the existentialist then begins the struggle to develop his/her essence. Neill's entire life demonstrates a struggle to first find self, then to identify the meaning of and for being. For him, the goal of life and education is happiness, and the most viable vehicle for experiencing happiness is that of freedom. He states, I hold that the aim of life is to find happiness, which means to find interests. Education should be a preparation for life" (Neill, 1960).

The second phase of answering the question, What is real?, is that of recognizing that with life comes the necessity and the responsibility for choice. Once past the stage of denial of responsibility of one's being (i.e., I didn't ask to be born), the human being must make choices that determine the quality of his/her being, and must then accept responsibility for those choices.

Life then becomes the only reality, and one begins to participate actively in directing the quality of existence for self and others. The process is concentric as well as spiral in its growth. It begins with self and grows to encompass more complex states of being.

Neill believed in controlling an individual only for his/her own good. Examples of such situations include: serious threats to the health and safety of very young children and times when the individual does not understand the dangerous consequences of his/her actions.

"Know thyself," is the major epistemological direction of the existentialist. The knowing is from the standpoint of the individual and involves choice.

Neill's educational philosophy is often compared to that of Rousseau. Both opposed the idea of original sin and insisted that humans are basically good; that humans are corrupted by society. Both advocated freedom and self-expression for the child and that freedom should be allowed the child from birth. They each agreed that the child should be helped to self-reliance; that the child should be doing what it desired to do as long as it did not hurt others; that natural

consequences, not adult authority, should teach the child what desires might be harmful to itself; that only when the child's desires would lead to great harm should the child be interfered with.

Neill believed that the child and teacher are equal and deserve corresponding respect. The teacher must be honest with self as well as the child if the necessary degree of trust is to be developed. The teacher has more responsibility in setting up the conditions for trust, but only because of having lived longer -- not because he/she is better or more intelligent than the child. One's experiences are to be used to protect (in the physical sense) the child's development, not to manipulate or to control.

Neill not only approached education from the standpoint of the interest of the child, but he also stressed the importance of love. Neill saw himself as "being on the side of the child" (Neill, 1972). He believed in providing the child with freedom, with only the aforementioned restriction.

Educators have also compared Neill's philosophy to that of Maria Montessori, especially their concepts of freedom. Freedom for children meant something very different for Montessori than it did for Neill. Montessori meant physical liberty and spontaneous activity for the child. She states "Thus, when we speak of 'free children', we generally imply that they are free to move, that is, to run and jump" (Montessori, 1964). Montessori not only believed that "free movement" should be carefully guided; she emphasized that an individual only

attained social liberty or freedom when he/she had developed the knowledge and abilities that enable him/her to make intelligent choices (Montessori, 1964b). Montessori sought to liberate the child by guiding him/her to independence. Neill would give the child independence from its beginning. Neill also disagreed with Montessori's belief in the need to teach the child socially acceptable behavior, "good breeding." Montessori states,

The liberty of the child should have as its limit the collective interest; as its form, what we universally consider good breeding. We must, therefore check in the child whatever offends or annoys others, or whatever tends toward rough or ill-bred acts (Montessori, 1964a, p. 176).

There are many values Montessori felt important to instill in children by discipline. As she summarized it, "our aim is to discipline for activity, for work, for good" (Montessori, 1964a). She also felt that some of the natural tendencies in children should be eliminated by education. For example, she felt that the vivid imagination of the child tends too much to "the fantastics, the supernatural, and the unreal", and that by teaching by the scientific method, education should help the child to overcome it (Montessori, 1948b). Neill agreed only to the extent that a child should be stopped from infringing on the rights of others. Thus, Montessori's concept of freedom included the importance of careful guidance (manipulation) of each child's development. It was towards the development of a care-

fully structured environment to provide such guidance that Montessori dedicated most of her effort. The major differences between the two lie within the extent to which the school environment, the teacher, and the didactic materials Montessori developed were meant to control and guide the child's development.

Neill was aware of his differences with Montessori:

A visitor asked me to explain the differences between Summerhill and a Montessori school. My reply: A kid can say fuck in Summerhill, but not in a Montessori school. As long as parents and teachers insist on forming a child's character, all the free activity in the world will not produce free people (Neill, 1972, p. 480)

Theoretically, Neill did not sit down and identify through scientific steps his educational philosophy. Rather, it was through reflections upon personal events and situations that he was able to conclude that total freedom was the vehicle necessary for the education of children.

Neill felt that he had been influenced in his adult development, but not by educators. He states, "Many have influenced me ... H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Freud, Homer Lane, Wilhelm Reich, but not, by the way, the educationists. I have often been called a disciple of Rousseau but I never read Rousseau. I have tried reading John Dewey with little success. Montessori with her fitting the child to the apparatus taught me nothing ..." (Neill, 1972).

Ultimately, Neill's growth was like that of the slow development of an earthen pot upon a potter's wheel. The wheel revolves from an outside force but the clay is shaped from inside out, layer upon layer with patient but consistent molding. The ridges are not complete circles in that one can tell where one ends and another begins. So too, the psychological development of Neill's philosophy grew layer upon layer.

Neill's ultimate development symbolized a tough struggle of personal trial and error. The conflicts were many and seemed to have developed in a spiral/circular motion; a reaction to the imposed circumstances from without himself. There was a time of "treadmilling -- trying to make sense of life, living and how he was to fit into the process. His early home life contributed greatly to his uncertainties. There seemed to be the tendency to accept "blacks and whites"; then the stage of rebellion and rejection; then a stage of self-worthlessness, which was stubbornly resisted -- a determination to prove his value to himself, his parents, and society. From these experiences, he learned his own inner strength and was surprised to discover that he had actually contributed to society by virtue of his pseudo-passive, though persuasive, writing style. He shocked the reader into serious thought about the system and how society's young members might be affected. The articles written by Neill in later life not only expressed his angry rejection of the systems that had so badly hurt him (schools, churches, and social institutions), but also shared ways of improving the system for the betterment of humankind.

"I was conditioned by religion, authority, middle class morality, social mores, and broke away from them" (Neill, 1960). The institutions of society were perceived by Neill as anti-life. His philosophy was an active manifestation of his need to cope with perceived rejection.

Neill showed his disdain for religion as demonstrated by humans. He said, "I could tolerate it if its adherents lived their religion and turned the other cheek I just sit and wonder why Christ's followers become so anti-life; ... Jesus gave out much love and charity and understanding but among his followers were John Calvin who had his rivals roasted over a slow fire, St. Paul who hated women, the Calvinist Church of South Africa, which supports apartheid ..." (Neill, 1972).

While Neill showed disdain for the recognized institutions of society, he demonstrated an unfaltering belief in the intrinsic goodness of young children. Summerhill was conceived and operated upon the premise: that given freedom, students will ultimately choose what is best for them; with appropriate guidance, each student will learn not to infringe upon the rights of others. For over 30 years, the graduates of Summerhill proved that they understood freedom as defined by Neill. They were able to, given absolute freedom and self-government, become contributing members of society. Neill described them as "pro-life" rather than "anti-life".

Educational Views

The learner

Neill believed that the individual learner is born good, and capable of determining what makes for happiness. He said, "My view is that a child is innately wise and realistic. If left to himself without adult suggestion of any kind, he will develop as far as he is capable of developing" (Neill, 1960). Neill felt that each individual was in the process of searching for a "... sense of balance, a feeling of being contented with life." Further, he felt that to obtain contentment with life, one needed freedom (Neill, 1960). Allowing freedom did not mean that an individual was to be abandoned. One needed help and supportive love. Supportive love was defined as love without control. Supportive love enabled the individual to develop and flourish. Specifically, Neill suggests that:

The happiness and well-being of children depends on the degree of love and approval we give them. We must be on the child's side. Being on the side of the child is giving love to the child -- not possessive love - not sentimental love -- just behaving to the child in such a way that the child feels you love him and approve of him (Neill, 1960, p 5).

Neill cautions adults that supportive love in no way implies control of the individual's quest for happiness, because what is "good" for one may not be good for another. Adults have no right to impose their notions of good and evil on children.

There is no need whatsoever to teach children how to behave. A child will learn what is right and what is wrong in good time -- provided he is not pressured. I believe that to impose anything by authority is wrong. The child should not do anything until he comes to the opinion - his own opinion -- that it should be done (Neill, 1960, p. 360).

The instructional method

Prior to instruction, Neill felt it important to establish or re-establish a child's sense of freedom; the time frame for this depended upon the child's previous experiences. "Private lessons" (actually sessions where the child interacted with Neill on a one-to-one basis) where the first steps in building trust and a sense of personal freedom within the school environment.

Neill felt that educational activities should deal with life in general, not merely the process of acquiring "book knowledge." He emphasized the "affective", dealing first with feelings and emotions. The instructional process at Summerhill was designed to follow student interest, stimulate student participation, and encourage self-government. The use of the students' imagination and sense of humor were viewed as essential elements in the instructional process.

Classes met the formal education requirements of the period, to the extent required to ensure that students passed standardized examinations required by higher institutions of learning. The Summerhill environment, when compared to a typical educational institutional

environment, was an equitable one. An integral part of the instruction was a closeness between student and teacher which recognized the importance of the individual as a "person" as opposed to simply a "student" required to take certain steps in order to meet specific goals.

The methods of instruction could be summarized as follows:

1. Build or restore the individual's acceptance and love of self and establish a sense of freedom.
2. Create a learning environment which stimulated students' natural love of learning, by making learning activities a matter of free choice.
3. Measure progress not by testing; but by the individual's ability to adapt to his post-educational environment. To quote Neill, "Education should be a preparation for life" (Neill, 1960).

Neill's overall attitude about instructional methods is best described in his words:

The children have classes usually according to their age, but sometimes according to their interest. We have no new methods of teaching, because we do not consider that teaching in itself matters very much. Whether a school has or has not a special method for teaching long division is of no significance, for long division is of no importance except to those who want to learn it. And the child who wants to learn long division will learn it no matter how it is taught (Neill, 1960, p. 47).

The curriculum

The 3-R's were viewed as the absolute essential elements of the Summerhill curriculum. Other subjects were taught, but the emphasis was on these basics: arts, crafts, music, theater (planned and impromptu) were viewed as relevant and important outlets for student creativity and repressed unconscious longings. The opportunity to play was considered a child's right to be exercised to the fullest. Neill felt that a curriculum of the basics with time for play led to a mentally healthy adulthood. The success of Summerhill graduates at the university level and in the work world lends credibility to his ideas. The following quote provides a glimpse and summary of Neill's approach to the curriculum.

I don't want children to be trained to make pea-soup and picture-frames, I want them to be trained to think. I would cut out History and Geography as subjects They'd come in incidentally. For instance, I could teach for a week on the text of a newspaper report on a fire in New York I would keep composition and reading and arithmetic in the curriculum. Drill and music would come into the play hours, and sketching would be an outside hobby for warm days Technical education would begin at the age of sixteen Suppose a child is keen on mechanics. He spends a good part of the day in the engineering shop and the drawing room -- mechanical drawing I mean. But the thinking side of his education is still going on. He is studying political economy, eugenics, evolution, philosophy. By the time he is eighteen he has read Nietzsche, Ibsen,

Bjornson, Shaw, Galsworthy, Wells,
Strindberg, Tolstoi, that is if ideas
appeal to him (Neill, 1972, pp. 442-443).

Summary

For over fifty years A. S. Neill dreamed of the way the world could be. He shared his dream through his writings (over 21 books and numerous articles), lectures, teaching and as headmaster of Summerhill. Summerhill became a model of an idea. The idea of education based upon freedom in a democratic setting. Neill felt that "Summerhill aimed at a democracy of free citizens who would not follow any leader". Further, he reasoned that, until children were no longer molded into "castrated sheep", democracy would remain a fake and a danger.

Neill admonished parents and educators from the early 1900s to the early 1970s with his simple common-sense suggestions for restoring "... a love of life to children who had learned to be 'life haters' ". He was particularly critical of American educators who, he felt, "... seemed to be always looking for the educational panacea ... and band-wagons" to jump on to, such as the "testing bandwagon". He posed the following questions about testing:

How do you measure the development of self-worth and the loss of self-hatred in a child?
How do you measure a discipline imposed from within as opposed to a discipline imposed by the classroom teacher, principal and the community?
(Matthias, 1980b, p 56).

He insisted that self-worth, responsibility, dignity and equality have value to the educational and parenting process. Herb Snitzer (1983) wrote, "He had a passionate desire to connect life with learning, thinking with feeling".

Neill's criticisms and ideas were responded to by Americans with varying levels of enthusiasm. He has been counted among modern "radical educational critics" such as: Paul Goodman, John Holt, Jonathan Kozol, Herbert Kohl, James Herndon, and Ivan Illich.

In the book Summerhill: For and Against (Hart, 1970), fifteen writers in education, sociology, and psychology evaluated the concepts of A. S. Neill. Harold H. Hart publisher, described their opinions as varied: Max Rafferty, (then) California State Superintendent of Public Instruction, wrote, "I would as soon enroll a child of mine in a brothel as in Summerhill". While John Culkin, Jesuit Priest, regarded Summerhill as "a holy place".

Erich Fromm, who wrote the forward to Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Childrearing (Neill, 1960), stated, "I believe in Neill's work as a seed which will germinate. Within time his ideals will become generally recognized in a new society in which man himself and his own unfolding are the supreme aim of all social effort".

Throughout Neill's ninety years, he looked to life to find life. He gathered inspiration from those persons whose lives were full, dynamic, insightful, despairing, and painful (H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Freud, Reich, Homer Lane). His friendship and study with Wilhelm Reich

and Homer Lane helped him to sift through his own painful life experiences, while formulating the governing foundation of Summerhill. (Homer Lane's "Commonwealth" was based upon self-governance by students.)

Neill feared that Summerhill would not last after his death. He said, "One day, some history of education will have a footnote about a man called S. A. O'Neill, an Irishman who ran a school called Summerville, and I won't be there to laugh" (Neill, 1960).

At this writing, Neill was partially right. L. Glenn Smith (Smith et al., 1984) described the significance of Neill in the following fashion:

Neill's ideas appealed strongly to the "youth movement" of the sixties. For hundreds of thousands of people -- especially in American and Germany -- who felt their freedom had been abridged by "the establishment", Summerhill became a manifesto for individual liberty. A small school that had been known in the thirties (mainly by intellectuals) as one of a small number of "goddam and fornication at five schools", had become an item of substantial curiosity. Then, almost as quickly as interest had sprung up, it disappeared Twenty years after a majority of undergraduates on American campuses could speak casually about the book (Summerhill), few had even heard of it (p. 334).

Though Neill was worried that upon his death the Ministry of Education would step in and close his school, his major concern was with the survival of the Summerhill idea. He insisted,

The future of Summerhill itself may be of little import. But the future of the Summerhill idea is of the greatest importance to humanity. New generations must be given the chance to grow in freedom. The bestowal of freedom is the bestowal of love. And only love can save the world (Neill, 1960, p. 92).

CHAPTER 4:

MARVA KNIGHT COLLINS

Monograph

Marva Collins is one of the most controversial American educators of recent years. The Reagan Administration reportedly offered to make her Secretary of Education; a variety of media hailed her as a super-teacher; CBS television featured Cicely Tyson in a 90-minute docudrama depicting her teaching. Then critics, some of them the same people who had originally praised her, charged that neither Collins nor her Westside Preparatory School in Chicago, Illinois, were as good as the claims. What is the real story?

Family and early development

Marva Knight Collins was born on August 31, 1936, in Monroeville, Alabama. She was reared in the "colored" section of that small Alabama town, where "everyone knew and trusted each other" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). The economic status of her family was different from the majority of her peers. Her family was considered wealthy because of a history of family-owned and operated businesses. Both of her grandfathers were small business owners and well respected by the community, as was her father.

She was born during the Great Depression and remembered hearing the grown-ups talk about "hard times", but she did not have direct knowledge of those times. Her father, as well as her grandfathers, were described as "doers and achievers" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). In fact the "moving force" in Collins' early childhood and adolescence was her father, Henry Knight, from whom she acquired drive and determination as well as a strong sense of self-worth.

During a time when few blacks had financial security, Henry Knight was a successful and respected merchant. Collins' close association with her father enabled her to make observations about people in need-- blacks and whites. She learned to believe in her own ability and possibilities of succeeding in a not-so-friendly environment. Her father demonstrated that "if you believe in what you do, then, you don't ever have to fear anyone" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

While Collins' father provided economic and emotional support, her mother taught her emotional independence. Collins admits to not being close to her mother; she surmised, "Mother was very prim and proper -- not as free with the hugs and kisses as my daddy. I knew she loved me, but I missed hearing her tell me that she did" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). She now tells her students, "I love you" often, because she realizes how important it is to a young person's developing self-esteem.

Family played a decisive role in Collins' educational life and ultimately her teaching success. One grandmother taught her how to read by sounding out words. The other grandmother recited poems to her

from her own school days and was "forever reciting proverbs" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). Before she entered school, Collins had learned to read. An aunt introduced her to Shakespeare. Her father allowed her to read to him from the newspaper regularly. Each of these techniques has been used extensively by Collins in her teaching. Her students have received the benefits Collins derived from her own learning experiences.

Although there were few libraries for black children in Alabama, Collins managed to develop a love for reading. She sought books wherever she could find them. Her reading began with the Bible and ranged from works of Shakespeare to God's Little Acre by Erskine Caldwell.

Though Henry Knight had only a 4th grade education, he provided his daughter with practical business math and a strong business sense. Marva was allowed to help him in his store as well as to accompany him on his cattle buying trips. He provided her with a look at both the commercial and human relations aspects of the business world. Paramount to his training was the development of respect -- respect for himself as well as for his customers and neighbors. He used his financial wealth to make life easier for his family and his neighbors. More importantly, he used his wealth of experience and determination to teach Marva how to interact successfully in a segregated society. Collins says of her parents and the education process, "My parents never stressed college -- they stressed learning" (Collins & Tamarkin,

1982). Marva Collins uses most, if not all, of the 'tips for living' demonstrated by her parents in her day-to-day teaching.

Formal learning experiences

Two types of formal teachers strongly influenced Collins' approach to teaching: those who modeled productive behaviors and those who demonstrated what 'not to do'. In the latter category was Collins' first grade teacher who punished her for not making the numeral 2 correctly. In later years, counter to this behavior as a teacher, Collins demonstrated that "an error means a child needs help, not reprimand or ridicule for doing it wrong" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). In the 'how to' category were Collins' 4th and 10th grade teachers and the principals of the schools where she held her first two teaching positions. From the 4th and 10th grade teachers she learned to effectively use the blackboard for the explanation as well as the practice of concepts. She emulated their speech in order to develop a clearer speech pattern. Collins' first principal (employer) taught her "how to teach." He observed her for two months and gave her helpful as well as supportive feedback, both in and after class. In addition, her tenth grade teacher provided a sophisticated role model. Collins imitated her manner of dress, articulation and enunciation. Her present teaching method incorporates this lesson in that she insists that students use proper speech and pronunciation. Consistent with these lessons, Collins now requires her students to read aloud daily. She

uses this technique to check the students' pronunciation and comprehension, to build vocabulary, to develop appropriate voice inflections, and to transpose the written punctuation marks to oral usage for clarity. Collins contends that comprehension is lessened by students' erroneous use of reading (i.e., reading individual words as opposed to reading groups of words or phrases). Her students must read everything orally--whether literature, science, or their own compositions -- to the entire class.

Early formal education for Collins was basically the same as that for most black children growing up in the South. High schools for blacks were based upon the segregationist notion that blacks did not need 'education'; rather they needed training. Marva states that she "found (her) own way around the inequities." She did not take home economics. This was in defiance of a system which was "whitefolks way of saying all black women would never be anything more than homemakers or domestics" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

Young Marva Knight attended Clark Collage in Atlanta, Georgia, an exclusive, all-black liberal arts school for girls. Everything at Clark was very southern and very proper with a certain finishing-school mentality. Collins remembers, "How a student dressed was just as important as what she learned. My housemother made certain I wore hats and white gloves, and she once sent me back to my room to change because I had made the mistake of wearing suede shoes with a leather

jacket. To this day, I am very conscious of clothes and appearance" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

Collins' father had insisted upon her attendance at this school in spite of the pressure from members of the community. His neighbors had been conditioned to believe that a formal education was a waste of money -- especially for a black girl. Collins admits, "I learned very little at college." She took education courses out of curiosity but she had no intention of becoming a teacher. Her expectation was to become a secretary upon graduation, and so her major course of study was designed to accomplish this dream.

Professional development

It was in June, 1957, that the realities of a segregated society began to penetrate Collins' sheltered life. She stated, "I discovered that the only office positions available to blacks were civil service jobs. None of the private companies wanted to hire a black secretary" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). After much searching, she found a job teaching typing, shorthand, bookkeeping and business law at Monroe County Training School. Along with the job began a realization that, as a black woman, she would need to contend with double discrimination. She realized that the teaching profession was more than just a proper occupation for a woman; teaching was one of the few possible occupations at the time for an educated black woman.

Marva reported that she "felt comfortable teaching from the first." The fact that she did not know theory worked to her advantage. She stated, "I was forced to deal with my students as individuals, to talk, to listen, and to find out their needs." She was forced to follow her instincts and teach according to what felt right, as well as what had felt good to her as a child and student. Her first teaching assignment was with 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students, and she was constantly learning along with them. Her colleagues were very helpful and provided much inspiration. They shared techniques and suggestions about how to present concepts as well as how to demonstrate their caring for the students' education. In addition to the help given by the other teachers at Monroe Training School, the principal served as an instructional mentor. Collins described him as being "hard on new teachers" but responsive and ready to "teach them how to teach." His method was to observe the teachers for months giving immediate feedback after each observation. During the observation, he provided non-verbal cues such as nodding in agreement or disagreement with how the lesson was being conducted. He trained Collins to watch the students' faces and discern from their eyes whether or not they understood. She says, "I learned that a good teacher knows the students, not just the subject" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

For two years, Collins taught at the training school. Though she enjoyed the learning atmosphere and had developed an appreciation for the teaching profession, she was not yet ready to commit herself to

teaching as a career. She went to Chicago in 1959 for a visit, but after two weeks as a tourist, she decided to look for employment there as a secretary. She found a job as a medical secretary, rented an apartment, and later met her husband. After her marriage to Clarence Collins, she continued to work as a secretary, but began to miss teaching.

Collins' public school teaching in Chicago was at Calhoun South Elementary and Delano Elementary schools. She taught one year at Calhoun and thirteen years at Delano, which was located in Garfield Heights, a block from the house Marva and Clarence bought shortly after their marriage. Her initial experiences as an elementary teacher were very positive. She was one of a dedicated staff of teachers assisted by a helpful principal who was a scholar as well as a guide to the teachers' development. He encouraged the teachers to read poetry as well as to continue their own scholastic enrichment. He often read portions of various classical works in faculty meetings and expected the teachers to be able to recite or complete quotes from the works. The young teacher, Marva, enjoyed his leadership and scholarship. She states, "I learned a lot from him, and I began teaching poetry and classical literature to my students. Above all, the principal taught me that a good teacher is one who continues to learn along with the students" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). The teachers at Delano also helped Marva. One from Arkansas helped her to develop ways to stimulate her students' interest in reading. She learned to involve the

children in the story by role playing the characters as well as writing letters to the characters in giving stories. She indicates, "To this day I find these are excellent ways to get a child excited about a story" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

As the years went by, the community where Collins lived and the school where she taught began to change. The new principal of the school paid less attention to scholarship and more attention to "quiet classrooms and completed reports." The other teachers also began to spend more time discussing the faults of the children rather than sharing means of helping them to maintain a love of learning. Ultimately, Collins became one of the few teachers insisting upon scholarship by and for her students. The school atmosphere at Delano became one of hostility, and the students responded by fighting and being very disruptive. A teleplay based on Collins' life depicted the school as exemplifying a sharp contrast between the behavior of the students in and outside of Collins' 2nd grade classroom ("The Marva Collins Story", CBS Television, 1981). Because she insisted upon teaching and respecting the students, her colleagues began to ostracize her and to talk about her "superior attitude." Collins recalled, "At Delano the hardest battle I every fought was to be me. Somehow everything I did annoyed my colleagues, from the way I dressed to the way I taught" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). She eventually was forced to isolate herself from her colleagues who then charged her with being "standoffish." Each year she became more and more discontented at

Delano and by 1975 was convinced that she could no longer work there and maintain her sanity. For a short time she entertained the idea of resigning from the position and finding another job. Her students, their parents, and her devotion to teaching persuaded Marva to finish the semester at Delano; but, she was resolved not to go back to Delano in the fall. Over the summer she conceived the idea of opening her own school. Collins recalled, "After spending the past fourteen years learning how (to teach) I wasn't about to give up on teaching" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

The development of Westside Preparatory School

On September 8, 1975, Daniel Hale Williams Westside Preparatory Schools was opened. This school grew out of the dissatisfaction, felt by Collins and some of her Garfield Heights neighbors with the quality of education available to their children. The school was organized under the direction of the Alternative Schools Network (ASN), an organization of community-participation schools in and around Chicago. These ASN schools evolved in the early seventies as part of the back-to-basics movement. They were government-funded, and these funds paid Collin's salary. The ASN Network people showed her how to open and operate a private school. When the doors opened to the Daniel Hale Williams Westside Preparatory School, there were four students, one of whom was Cindy, Marva's youngest child. The School was housed in the basement of Daniel Hale Williams University. By January, 1976, Marva's

class size had doubled. By the end of the year, Collins had begun to entertain thoughts of financing her own school. She stated, "I appreciated the free space they had given us to get the school going, but I wanted to be independent. The university disbursing the funds was involved too much in politics, and I thought it best to separate the school from that environment" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

Marva finally decided, after months of searching for an appropriate site, to "use what I had." Clarence converted the vacant upstairs apartment in their home into a new Westside Preparatory School. Collins used her \$5,000 teacher's pension to partially finance the school. In September, 1976, Westside Prep began official operations with an enrollment of eighteen students.

By 1977 Collins had experienced remarkable success with student achievement. And Westside Prep was discovered by the Media. The press hailed her as a "super-teacher" who taught "ghetto" students to read Shakespeare and Chaucer in a makeshift school. She was featured on television's 60 Minutes, offered several prestigious jobs in education, presented large donations, and was the subject of a made-for-TV movie, "The Marva Collins Story" (Marshall, 1985). Five years later, Collins was assailed by the same press that had praised her. She was questioned as to the legitimacy of her teaching methods and credentials.

Initially, Collins was bothered by the assault but refused to be stopped by the press or disgruntled parents. She received far more praise and support for her efforts with children than criticism.

Ten years after beginning her school with an enrollment of four students, the school enrollment was 200 students with 800 on the waiting list (Marshall, 1985).

Educators, as well as nationally known entertainment personalities, have shown their support for her methods of teaching students. Educators pay her as much as \$10,000 per engagement to speak on educational topics. Rock star, Prince, serves as co-founder and honorary chairman of the National Teacher Training Institute. The N.T.T.I is an organization to assist Collins with her plans to train 1200 teachers from across the nation in her methodology. Another celebrity, Mr. T of television's A-Team is sponsoring 60 students from Cabrini-Green public housing project. The future looks promising for Collins continued progress. She no longer teaches individual classes but keeps a close watch over all her students. Her plans are to train more teachers to provide the same kind of learning opportunities to children all over the United States.

A Philosophical View of Collins

Like Montessori, Collins' philosophical inclinations are also eclectic and contain strands of idealism, realism, classical humanism, essentialism and progressivism. Like Aristotle, she feels that humans should be viewed from the perspective of a progression from "potentiality" toward a greater degree of "actuality"; however, for the growth to occur, one must think there is a purpose to life which

transcends physical reality. For one to develop, emphasis should be placed upon both the intellect and the spirit. This can be done through language, logic and familiarity with the classical heroes.

The overt behavior that dominates Collins' practice stems from her belief in her own abilities as well as those of her students. Many qualities evidenced by Collins can be ascribed to the essentialist school of thought. Soltis (1981b) discussed the essentialist position and its relation to teaching. He noted that there might be a contradiction between the fundamental theory and actual practice of the essentialist teachers and counselors. The theory emphasizes mind, ideas, self, and the need to develop independence and self-sufficiency, while in practice there appears to be considerable pressure on the pupils to give willing acceptance to what is taught or advised. He described teachers' and counselors' behaviors as "therapeutic" discrimination. Teachers teach based upon personal bias and counselors advise based upon the dominate cultural needs, rather than upon the students' innate potential contributions to society as whole. Sewall believed that there is an unconscious belief on the part of those educators in the inability of some students to learn certain subject matter and make valuable contributions to society. He suggests that "all adults, especially those in schools, should hold high expectations for the young" (Soltis, 1981b). Though influenced by essentialism in some respects, counter to that school of thought, Collins firmly believes that all her students can learn. She believes that "children

become addicted to learning and they have the desire to learn forever" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

Consistent with the classical humanist perspective, Collins insists that there is a need for a core of knowledge, which can be accessed by reading and discussing the "Great Books." She contends that once children have learned to read, they can derive much pleasure and knowledge from the works of Aristotle, Milton or Dante. She insists upon "disciplining" the minds of her students while guiding them toward critical thinking; and facilitating their ability to analyze behavior and its consequences.

Her method of orchestration reminds one of what John Dewey and Kilpatrick had in mind for the "Progressive" educators. She certainly makes allowances for individual rates of development and interests; however, she is more prone to use authoritative methods to accelerate the progress of her students than most progressive educators. She also uses "spontaneous" lessons to teach according to the interests, and to "spark", the interests of her students. She values the individual enough to insist upon his/her development. She, in effect, encourages her students to develop their potential through persistent coaching and encouraging words.

There is a sharp departure in behavior by Collins from the existentialist stand. She contends that freedom is not free and that one must expect to earn freedom and then work to maintain that freedom with dignity. In answer to criticism of her methods of dealing with

black English, jive talk and self-proclaimed leaders of the inner city people, she states, "Instead of teaching black pride, I taught my children self-pride" and that "ghetto is a state of mind." She is quick to point out the fallacies of our system by suggesting that "mis-education is not a function of a child's race, of neighborhood, but of the teaching method he or she is exposed to from kindergarten on" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

Clearly, Collins values pride, order, cleanliness, beauty, learning, and hard work. Within education she values her dedication to children and society through the schooling process. She feels that "the legacy I want to leave behind is a generation of children who realize that you can't get something for nothing, who are proud and resourceful enough to take care of their own" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

By looking at her manner of dress, her adherence to clearly defined grooming codes for herself and her students, Collins' other values are clear. She insists upon staying in the "ghetto" instead of giving up and running to the suburbs. She feels that the real solution to a slovenly mentality and attitude is education. She knows that one has to be present to effect any kind of lasting change. She also encourages each of her children to obtain higher education and return to help their neighbors.

Marva Collins believes that once one learns true self-control and the basic skills, one can be or do anything he/she wants. She models

this behavior often; for example, she never studied Latin or biology, but can teach the subjects to her students. Much of her philosophy is based on established wisdom (Plato, Cicero, Voltaire, Emerson, The Bible, etc.). She, therefore, exposes her students to the great philosophies, myths, legends and fairy tales (The Great Books). She has been adamant about her belief in each student's ability to learn as well as their right to knowledge.

Educational Views

Teaching for Collins has become a full-time job. Jane Hale said in the Chicago Tribune (1981), "Marva Collins has become the personification of what Americans can remember and want in an educator" (Chicago Tribune, 29 Nov 1981). Indeed, Collins exemplifies traits which may deter the weak-minded and lazy person from seeking a career in teaching. She believes that a teacher's desk is unnecessary, that blue jeans and pants suits have no place in the classroom. She demonstrates how every moment can be used to teach. Collins has articulated some rather "old fashioned" ideas about the art of teaching and learning. From the moment the children enter the classroom, she teaches and the children learn. They learn to do homework by choice, rather than to watch television late into the night. She insists upon scholarly work from her students -- all students, 2nd graders, 6th graders, or students preparing for high school and college entry exams -- as well as from herself. To learn and to enjoy learning is her primary

goal for herself and her students. She views the teacher's role as one of believing in the student's ability until the student is ready and capable of believing in him or herself. She tells her students, "I will not let you fail ... you will read hard books ... memorize a poem every week ... you will write a composition every two weeks and most of all, you will learn to think for yourself" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

The learner

Foremost in Collins' belief system is her faith in the students' ability to learn and her respect for them. She makes this belief clear from her first encounter with them. Every day thereafter she reminds them of her commitment to them and to their development. She demonstrates a respect for them as capable human beings regardless of their past public school failures and labels. She concludes that her honesty in dealing with the children contributes to her, as well as their, success: "I just deal honestly with the children. They know I don't turn my nose down at them. They listen to me because I'm not some outsider who comes over here and talks down to them about what it is like to be poor" (Collins and Tamarkin, 1982). A ghetto child learns in the same way as any other child and is equally capable of reading Dante, Homer, Pascal, or Chaucer" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

Collins thinks students are capable of providing support as well as trust for each other and the teacher. She illustrates to the children the importance of support and trust in the teaching/learning

process. She helps them to support each other in the process while at the same time being careful not to rob others of their self-respect and dignity. She states to her students emphatically, "We have to pass on what we learn in here. We are all responsible for one another" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). And, "We all have a good me and a bad me inside us, and I know that you will help me find it (the good me)." Thus, she encourages each student to actively participate in his/her own growth process as well as that of his or her peers. The children learn to be tolerant of mistakes as well as to see them as learning tools. She tells them exactly and clearly what is expected of them and then follows up her words with a definite attitude of expectation. There is very little doubt exhibited by Collins as to the students' ability to succeed. Before the student remembers to say, "I can't," Collins has already proven that he or she can by her teaching method.

The major assumption under which Collins operates seems to be to teach the children self-reliance and self-respect (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). Given belief in themselves, the children become their own teachers. They turn to Collins for guidance and directions; however, they do not learn dependence; they learn to be independent in thought and deed.

The instructional method

The instructional method used by Collins is a combination of (1) information-filled lectures with rhythm and repetition, a call-and-response old southern Baptist Church method of audience participation; (2) Socratic questioning; (3) much praise and encouragement; (4) large group instruction which Collins says "makes them more attentive than individual seat work;" (5) a climate of high expectation coupled with the freedom to make mistakes while learning; and (6) large doses of oral presentations, memorization and drill (Hollins, 1982).

The process and the content of Collins' instruction is as varied as the needs of the students she teaches. The most consistent part of her instruction is that of learning to read by the phonetic method and the total involvement of the teacher in all that is going on around her.

Phonetics are used to teach reading, writing and spelling, concurrently. She not only teaches the children how to attack a word phonetically, but she also teaches them how to analyze the meaning of the stories read as well as the implications the main theme may have upon their own lives. When teaching arithmetic, she not only teaches them to add and subtract, but she teaches about the etymology of unfamiliar words and about "pythagoras, who believed that mathematics made a pupil perfect and ready to meet the gods ..." (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

The children in Collins' class are quite familiar with spontaneous lessons. Collins uses every available moment and event to teach. One

of the students in her public school classroom was concerned that Collins was beginning to teach before the bell rang signaling the beginning of class. She ask him, "Do you need a bell to tell your brain to start working?" Then followed a lesson about Pavlov and his experiments with dogs. The students learned how to spell "Pavlov"; to become more critical thinkers; to identify the word "associate" and to use it in a sentence. She then assured the child that he was "too bright to need a bell to tell him when to begin thinking, like Pavlov's dogs." She used parables and analogies to teach the children morals and critical thinking skills. They were encouraged to apply knowledge gained from books in their daily lives.

Collins suggests that the teachers' first task of instruction is to know the students. This knowledge will come with sincere observation. The next major task is to equip the student with the tools for learning -- the ability to read. To teach reading, she suggests that one teach the phonetic skills first. She also emphasizes the importance of not teaching facts in isolation. Students must see the relevancy of what they are learning with the act of day-to-day living. Other suggestions to teachers include: become an actor or actress; give eye contact; and learn the needs, interests, and uniqueness of each child in the classroom. She sums the advice to teachers by saying, "If you believe in children ... all you really need for teaching is a blackboard, books, and a good pair of legs that will last through the day" (Lowenthal, 1982).

The curriculum

Marva Collins thinks that the curriculum should consist of reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic, and recitation. Since Collins began her school on a very limited budget, the curriculum materials are varied. Her basal reader (The Open Court Series) was rescued from the trash cans of Delano Elementary School. The other textbooks were gathered from various sources, mainly from secondhand bookstores and/or the library. Her students had little use for the public School reading series because, after about two months of phonetic drill, they could read books written at a much higher level.

Science and social studies content were taught as a part of the "spontaneous lessons" and by the use of the book reports given by the students. Artistic talents were used to illustrate the students' compositions. Field trips were taken as needed to further extend lessons taught in class.

According to Collins, the curriculum should be designed to expose the children to as much knowledge as possible. The teacher should then pool as much established information as possible. This information should be used to bombard the children with names, facts, and anecdotes that they can draw upon later for reflecting and writing their own compositions. Research is a necessary tool for learning, even for younger children.

The children use the steps of research to formulate questions, explore alternative solutions, document, and report their results. In addition, they make and discuss predictions in relation to their own experiences and their findings.

The first phase of curriculum implementation is the teaching of basic phonics. All children are taught to attack words phonetically. Collins uses drill, rhythmic hand clapping, and rhymes to get the children ready for reading the stories in the Open Court Reading books. Once reading, the children are encouraged to analyze the stories. Questions are asked in a way to "get the children to think, to use, not only book knowledge, but common sense" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982). "The children are also given questions without enough information so that they learn to say that not enough information is given to answer the questions. Children are guided to the point of learning for the sake of learning" (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982).

Summary

Close family association played a decisive role in Collins' philosophical and educational development. She learned from her family members to love learning and to respect the dignity of human beings. Of equal importance, she learned how to become involved in helping others to develop their own potential. From dedicated educators, Marva learned how to use the practical skills of teaching. She has become an

educator who refuses to allow the words "can't" or "failure" to enter her life or to remain in the lives of her students. She has been described as a "Super-Teacher ... Teaching" (Hale, 1981).

CHAPTER 5:

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Study

The purpose of this study was to discover, compare, and elucidate the philosophical inclinations of Maria Montessori, A. S. Neill and Marva Collins; to identify the similarities and differences among their views and to discover any common elements or teaching strategies which might have contributed to their success with the academic, emotional, and social achievement of "deviant or unteachable" students.

Biographies, autobiographies, and other documents were reviewed in order to determine how their expectations about learners influenced their classroom behaviors. The following objectives guided the writer in her efforts to compare and to discuss their personal beliefs, educational views and teaching methods.

Specifically the study was designed to:

1. Identify the strongly stated beliefs of the three educators relative to the learner, the curriculum and the instructional program.
2. Compare the educational views and practices of the three educators and discuss their philosophical inclinations.
3. Identify and discuss similarities in their respective methods of orchestrating the classroom environment,

responding to the learner and conducting the formal learning experiences for students.

4. Identify and discuss any differences among the three educators in background, methodology or philosophical leanings.
5. Identify their implied or stated expectations of the students' ability to learn what was taught.

The educational beliefs of each educator were compared to selected schools of educational philosophy. An examination was made and tentative conclusions were drawn as to the major philosophical inclinations and behaviors of each educator. These comparisons were made by examining each educator's personal background, approach to the curriculum, articulated views of the learner, and primary instructional methods.

The significance of philosophical orientation was highlighted by Ozmon (1972) who pointed out the close interrelationship between a person's belief system and his/her educational philosophy. He noted that, "with most philosophers, their ideas on education are intrinsically and integrally related to their basic philosophy, and are either an essential part of its development or an outgrowth of it." What is more, one's attitudes and ideas as well as actions may simultaneously reflect many different philosophies.

Comparisons of Subjects

It is herein concluded that Montessori acted from an eclectic viewpoint incorporating both religious idealism and progressivism; Neill's epistemological stance rested clearly with the existentialist; and Collins can be described as a complex melding of several philosophical schools of thought. These statements are in no way meant to confine these educators to the defined philosophic schools of thought. They each displayed characteristics typical of more than one school of thought. It is rather, as stated in the Introduction, an attempt to view personal and professional attributes of each from a philosophical standpoint.

While the three educators appear quite different in educational philosophy, methodology and background, close examination revealed the following common elements:

1. The belief in the innate ability of the learner.
2. The belief that his or her method would lead to student success as evidenced by academic achievement and ability to adjust socially and intellectually to the demands of adulthood.
3. The belief that an education should be oriented to the child, and each demonstrated that belief through his/her practice.

4. The use of techniques designed to encourage physical, emotional, social and intellectual growth simultaneously.
5. The ability to risk; that is, use methods counter to the existing accepted education system.

Though this study shows similarities in the overall sense, major differences appear in the educators' methods of implementation. The educators' backgrounds, their ethnic heritage, their socioeconomic status, and their personal ideas as to what and how best to 'educate', all differ.

Montessori's beliefs and practices suggest that children, themselves are the best indicators of what is needed for their growth; that, when allowed sensory and physical freedom with structured guidance, children follow a natural learning progression. Her structured guidance included a carefully arranged environment designed to coincide with the child's development stage. She felt that the structure and order of nature could be used as a model for structuring the classroom.

The teacher's primary role was to serve as a facilitator or 'directress' whose main task was to observe the child and create learning activities based on the readiness of the child. The materials developed were to meet the needs of the child as he or she entered into specific identifiable sensitivity periods.

Montessori's ideas had a widespread and lasting effect upon schools throughout the world. The large number of publications and the almost universal acceptance of her methods have extended her influence further than that of Neill or Collins. Despite initial problems, the number of Montessori schools in the United States experienced a surge in growth in the late '50s and early '60s. Many other schools are patterned after her ideas. Her instructional materials are frequently found in today's early childhood classrooms.

Neill's philosophy may be viewed from the existentialist frame of reference. He felt that self-knowledge is of paramount importance because it is one of the key factors which determine how one relates to others. The vehicle used for gaining and sharing knowledge is to be "freedom without license." His students were encouraged to develop self-discipline through self-knowledge.

On the other hand, Montessori opted for structured freedom for her students. She reasoned, after many hours of observation, that the students were searching for ways to express their desire for order, the order which is equal to that of the "order set forth by the cosmos" (Montessori, 1948a). For Montessori the primary job of the teacher, school and society was that of providing an atmosphere conducive to that discovery, and that of serving as guides to the child as he/she became developmentally able to explore more advanced concepts.

The guiding principle for Neill was that in order to educate learners one should "educate the emotions and the intellect will take

care of itself" (Neill, 1960). He felt that educators must trust children and believe in their innate goodness. Further, he felt that what is right is what works for the individual, barring acts which physically hurt someone.

Neill took the position that the school environment should be basically value-free and that it was generally wrong to impose values upon students. He felt that learning should be an organic experience, that it should grow from within the child and be spontaneous. In his opinion the learner knew best, and the teacher only needed to facilitate the learning process. Neill felt that his school had to renounce all discipline, all direction, all suggestions, all moral training, and all "religious instruction" in order to produce "pro-life" graduates rather than "life-haters." Further, Neill stated that "all any child needs is the three R's, the rest should be tools and clay and sports, theater, paint, and freedom" (Neill, 1972).

Marva Collins believed in using a more directed approach to freedom in order to activate the innate potential of her students. She reasoned that, since guidelines for success had been determined by others through recorded history and many 'masters' had provided models of behavior, the teacher should use those guidelines and models to further the specific goal of developing educated, productive citizens.

Marva Collins' philosophy reflects her early environment and her attempt to "fit" within the identified structure. She benefited from her experiences and clearly identified her reasons for emphasizing

certain behaviors in the classroom. Her own success, through education and love for learning, led her to believe that these concepts would also work for her students. She feels that given a positive self-image, the basic subjects, education in the classics along with common sense, and a strong belief in their own ability, her students will succeed.

Neill's Summerhill reflected his belief that for optimal growth the child must be afforded total freedom. The secluded location of the school facilitated a sense of freedom -- freedom to decide to attend class, be clean, to eat or not to eat. The limits placed were designed to protect the child from hurting self or others physically.

While the environment and government at Summerhill were set up by the students themselves, the environment and government at Westside Preparatory School are strictly directed by Collins and reflect her image. Collins feels it is her responsibility to behave in a manner which students can emulate, and to direct their behavior until such time as they are able to assume that responsibility for themselves.

Neill emphasized freedom in dress and behavior while Collins insist upon directed behavior and conservative dress. Neill showed rebellion; Collins demonstrates controlled restraints -- a holding onto the "tried and true." Neill criticized that type of manipulation and pointed out the hypocritical nature of most institutions -- family, religious, educational and governmental.

Neill seemed to have little trust in the ability of established systems to serve the real needs of students. Both Collins and Montessori operated in a more respectful manner toward the system. Collins criticized it but in a more suggestive and positive manner than Neill. Neill's strict religious upbringing and traumatic childhood experiences may have accounted for his attitude toward traditional educational systems.

Montessori was able to work more closely with the system and yet effect change in the way children were educated. Her scientific training, enhanced by a liberal upbringing and her own belief in human potential, allowed her to be objective and nonjudgemental in her observation of children. Her willingness to rearrange the environment to meet the developmental needs of the learner was an innovative approach for that time period. Rousseau, Pestalozzi and others had had similar ideas but did not follow through with systematic implementation. Montessori felt that children naturally worked in cooperation with "the cosmos" to learn. For the first time, a total method of early childhood education was operationalized using the scientific method of problem solving. She moved beyond Itard and Sequin in that her vision seemed to be clearer and more positive regarding the possibilities and dignity afforded to the less fortunate. Itard and Sequin operated from a foregone conclusion about the inherent inferiority of some students, while Montessori operated from the assumption that all students brought valuable native ability to the education process.

Collins' method seems to have acceptance from those American educators who prefer a "back to the basics" approach. In addition, she is admired for her insistence that ghetto children should and can be taught the classics and simultaneously "pull themselves up by their bootstraps." She has earned much respect from those who feel that her approach is a better solution to improving the socio-economic position of disadvantaged Americans than simply pouring money into ghettos.

Neill gained notoriety primarily because he was vociferous in expressing his opinion that the traditional education system was not the most conducive environment for learning; that it was, in fact, producing emotionally and intellectually crippled adults. Neill's idea of "freedom of growth" can be found in those western nations and schools that operate a more humanistic version of education sometimes associated with the "open" school movement so prevalent in the late '60s and most of the '70s in the United States.

Recommendations

The educators cited in this study demonstrated that the act of teaching can be a positive act of self-expression. Both Montessori and Collins were encouraged by family members to become self-actualized and to share themselves with others. Neill's self-actualization process demonstrated that one can become more aware in spite of adversity and without direct family encouragement. For the three educators, expanding the self involved becoming aware of and accepting the

existing or actual self and being willing to work at evolving the possible or potential self. They each had human, vocational, religious and recreational learning experiences which enabled them to develop themselves as well as generate healthy personal growth and development in their students. This study is a small illustration of the larger belief that "each one of us is both actuality and potentiality. As persons, we can become more adequate, more fully functioning, more psychologically whole, more creative, and more loving. Our world needs people who are more adequate, fully-functioning, psychologically whole, creative, and loving; and indeed, our survival may depend upon the ability of our schools to produce such people" (Boy and Pine, 1971). The writer, as an individual teacher, often wondered about her contribution to the overall scheme of education. This study brought renewed enthusiasm for the teaching/learning process. It also brought a realization that much personal growth can take place through studying the lives of others who have taught, or are presently teaching.

The two main "challenges" (how to sustain the natural curiosity of learners, and how to use student's interests and special talents to enhance the teaching/learning process) mentioned in the Introduction will most likely make special demands on teachers indefinitely -- and that's good, because these challenges provide the impetus for continued teacher growth. If our democratic society is to survive, and if we are to maintain our position of world leadership, both teachers and students must develop patterns of growth that move from actuality

toward potentiality. That is, schools must have teachers who have become more real and more whole, through balanced integrated and continuous involvement in major learning experiences. Teachers should seek and create the therapeutic experiences which will stretch and expand them as people; and create conditions in schools whereby students also can grow and become more fully functioning persons.

Each of the educators studied took personal responsibility for themselves and their students. They insisted upon a classroom environment that facilitated learning. The environments they created specifically:

- Encouraged students to be active.
- Promoted the individual's discovery of the personal meaning of ideas.
- Emphasized the uniquely personal and subjective nature of learning.
- Promoted the idea that differences are good and desirable.
- Consistently recognized the right of human beings to make mistakes.
- Tolerated ambiguity.
- Promoted the idea that evaluation is a cooperative process, with emphasis on self-evaluation.
- Encouraged openness rather than concealment of self.
- Encouraged self-trust as well as trust in others.
- Allowed students to accept and respect self and others.

- Permitted confrontations and allowed free and open communication in a non-threatening way.

Each of the three educators created conditions that allowed them to learn as well as teach. Thus, the writer makes the following specific recommendations to present and future teachers.

- o Understand the importance of adopting a personal and educational philosophy that will enhance rather than detract from the teaching/learning process.
- o Believe in and respect the potential of students, and reinforce that potential.
- o Protect and preserve the individuality of students.
- o Provide an environment that changes in line with individual needs and tolerance for freedom.
- o Do not blindly adhere to an instructional method. Analyze its effectiveness and make changes based upon the results.
- o Communicate with students in a manner which stimulates them to seek knowledge independently, as well as to absorb direct instruction.
- o Strive to encourage self-discipline by example and direction.
- o Value reciprocity as a part of the learning experience (teachers and students learning from each other). Determine to use this reciprocity in a productive and creative manner.

Suggestions for Further Study

The given recommendations suggest the need for further study, in both an individual and collective sense. Teachers need to adopt a

posture which will allow them to discover more about themselves, their students, their profession, and the world as a whole.

Additionally, other professional educators need to continue their inquiry into the teaching/learning process. Future studies are needed which address the specific relationship between teacher expectations and student achievement. Continuing research is needed relative to the impact of the classroom environment on the learning process, i.e., physical environment, psychological climate, and cultural climate.

Followup evaluations are needed to better determine the long-range effects of various learning environments upon students, for example, monitoring the sociological and intellectual development of individuals taught in an atmosphere of freedom as compared to more restricted environments. Such evaluations would provide teachers with a scientific basis for implementing changes.

A prerequisite to the above would be the development of a stronger, more direct partnership between practicing teachers and professional researchers. A definite commitment between the two professional groups could provide greater credibility for both. Research conducted with the total cooperation of the educational community would provide a living laboratory. Contributing to the assimilation of data would provide classroom teachers with an outlet for sharing their experiences and discoveries in a dignified and scientific manner.

Conclusion

Based upon study of the three educators, this researcher concluded that one's personal philosophy exerts direct influence upon the teaching/learning process. Further, having a philosophy that includes an unshakable belief in the intrinsic capability of the learner, and consistently using formal and informal instructional methods that are responsive to and considerate of the learner, promotes the social, emotional, spiritual and intellectual growth of both the teacher and the learner.

Montessori demonstrated that very young children can be taught to be in charge of their own learning. The work of Neill and Collins with older children, who had experienced failure and rejection by the established systems, demonstrates that "it is never too late" to effect positive change. It can be concluded from their experiences that teachers, desiring to contribute to the advancement of our society, will take the steps necessary to teach students to free themselves, to be independent rather than dependent learners, and to accept the responsibility of moving from actuality to their highest potentiality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, N. W. (1970). Summerhill: For and Against. New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc.
- Adams, R. N. & Preiss, J.J. Eds. (1960). Human Organization Research: Field Relations and Techniques. Homewood, Ill: The Dorsey Press.
- Alien, J. (1975). "As a Man Thinketh" Pamphlet. Marina del Rey, Calif.: DeVorss and Co.
- Barrientos, T. (1985, March 11). "Teachers Urged to Spend More Time With Students" Dallas Times Herald. (p. 6B).
- Beck, K. W. (1960). "The Well-Informed Informant". In R. N. Adams and J. J. Priess (Eds), Human Organization Research (p. 188). Homewood, Ill: The Dorsey Press.
- Bestor, A. (1953). Educational Wastelands, or The Retreat from Learning in Our Schools. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Bock, D. R. (1978). "Summerhill: It's Alive and Well" Educational Leadership, 35 (5) 380-3.
- Brabacher, J. S. (1950). Modern Philosophies of Education 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brameld, T. (1955). Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective. New York: Dryden Press.
- (1965). Education as Power. New York: Rinehart & Winston.
- Brubacher, J. (1950). Modern Philosophies of Education 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Brophy, J. E. & Good, T. L. (1984). Looking In Classrooms 3rd Ed. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1970). "Teacher's Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance" Journal of Educational Psychology, 61: 365-74.
- Broudy, H. S. & Palmer, J. R. (1965) Exemplars of Teaching Method. Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Burns, Sister Alicia (1970). An Analysis and Evaluation of the Montessori Theory of Inner Discipline. (ERIC ED040746).
- Boy, A. V. & Pine, G. J. (1971). Expanding the Self; Personal Growth for Teachers. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown Co.
- Clatworthy, J. F. (1982). "Homer T. Lane's Legacy of Self-Government: An Inquiry into Organizational Synecology at the Boys Republic, 1909-1982." Draft Essay presented at the American Educational Studies Association Conference, Nashville, Tenn., November 5, 1982. (ERIC ED225965).
- Cole, L., Ph.D (1969). A History of Education: Socrates to Montessori. New York: Rinehart & Co.
- Collins, M. & Tamarkin, C. (1982). Marva Collins' Way. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, Inc. distributed by Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.
- Collins, M. (1981). "Teacher Preparation: Problems and Prospects" Hearing Before the Sub-Committee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session (Sept. 9-10, 1981). (ERIC ED217019).
- Cooper, H. (1979). "Pygmalion Grows Up: A Model of Teacher Expectation Communication and Performance Influence." Review of Educational Research 49, 389-410.
- Dershimer, G. (1983). "Instructional Strategy and the Creation of Classroom Status". American Educational Research Journal, 20 (4) 645-661.
- Deutscher, I. (1973). "What We Say". American Sociological Review - 354-367.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor" Educational Leadership, 37, (1) 15-24.
- Farrow, E. and Hill, C. (1975). Montessori On A Limited Budget: A Manual for the Amateur Craftsman, Deposit, N.Y.: Valley Offset.
- Frankena, W. K. (1956). "Toward a Philosophy of the Philosophy of Education" Harvard Educational Review, 26, (2) 76-80.
- Frost, S. E. (1962). Basic Teachings of the Great Philosophers; A Survey of Their Basic Ideas. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.

- Good, T., Biddle, B. & Brophy, J. (1975). Teachers Make A Difference. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Good, T., Cooper, H. & Blakey, K. (1980). "Classroom Interaction as a Function of Teacher Expectations, Student Sex and Time of Year". Journal of Educational Psychology, 72 (6) 378-385.
- Gross, R. (Ed.) (1963). The Teacher and the Taught: Education in Theory and Practice from Plato to James B. Conant. New York: Dell Publishing Co.
- Hart, H. H. (Ed.) (1970). Summerhill: For and Against. New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc.
- Hale, J. (1981). "For 'Superteacher' Marva Collins, Fame Just Gets in Her Way". Chicago Tribune. Sec. 12, (Nov. 29) pp. 1,4.
- Hainstock, E. G. (1968). Teaching Montessori in the Home: The Preschool Years. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Hemmings, R. (1973). Children's Freedom: A. S. Neill and the Evolution of the Summerhill Idea (ERIC ED076937).
- Hollins, E. R. (1982) "The Marva Collins Story Revisited: Implications for Regular Classroom Instruction" Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (1) 37-40.
- Hopkins, R. L. (1976) "Freedom and Education: The Philosophy of Summerhill" Educational Theory, 26 (2) 188-213.
- Howick, W. H. (1971). Philosophies of Western Education. Memphis, Tennessee: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.
- Kneller, G. F. (1984). Movements of Thought in Modern Education. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kramer, R. (1976). Maria Montessori, A Biography. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Lezotti, L. (1985). Video of "An Effective Schools Training Workshop" presented in Little Rock, Ark., May, 1985.
- Lowenthal, J. (1982). "The Marva Collins Story". Newsweek, March 8, 1982.

- . (1983). "Report Card on Marva Collins" Newsweek, June 27, 1983.
- Marshall, M. (1985, February). "Marva Collins: Weathering the Storm". Ebony, XL, (4).
- Matthias, W. (1980a). "An A. S. Neill/Summerhill Chronology. Contemporary Education, 52 (1) 50-54.
- . (1980b, September). "A Memorable Day at Summerhill". Teacher; 98, (n2) 56-57.
- . (1979, Apr-May). "Whatever Happened to Summerhill" Childhood Education, 55 (5) 265-67.
- Mayer, F. (1960). A History of Educational Thought. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Medley, D. (1979). "The Effectiveness of Teachers" In Research on Teaching: Findings and Implications. Edited by Penelope L. Peterson & Herbert J. Walberg. Berkley, Calif: MuCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Montessori, M. (1946) Education for a New World. Madras, India, Kalakshetra Publication.
- . (1948a). To Educate the Human Potential, Thiruvanniyer, Madras 41-India: Kalakshetra Publications Press.
- . (1948b). The Discovery of the Child. Adyar, India: Kalakshetra Publications.
- . (1964a). Spontaneous Activity in Education. Translated by Florence Simmonds. Original Copyright 1917. Cambridge, Mass.: Robert Bentley, Inc.
- . (1964b) The Montessori Method. Translated from the Italian by Anne George, first published in English in 1912. New York: Schocken Books, Inc.
- . (1965) Dr. Montessori's Own Handbook. New York: Schocken.
- . (1966). The Secret of Childhood. Translated by M. Joseph Costelloe. New York: Ballantine Books. New York.
- . (1967a). From Childhood to Adolescence. Translated from the Italian by Claude A. Claremont, New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.

- (1967b). The Absorbent Mind. Translated from the Italian by Claude A. Claremont. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.
- (1972). Education and Peace, Chicago: Henry Regnery Co.
- Montessori, M. M., Jr. (1978). Education for Human Development: Understanding Montessori. (ERIC ED136940).
- Morris, V. C. (1961) Philosophy and the American School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Naisbitt, J. (1982). Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives. New York: Warner Books, Inc.
- Neill, A. S. (1960). Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- (1966). Freedom-Not License. New York: Pocket Books, Simons Schuster Div. of Gulf & Western Corporation.
- (1969). The Last Man Alive, New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc.
- (1971). Talking of Summerhill. London: Victor Gallanz Ltd.
- (1972). Neill, Neill Orange Peel, An Autobiography. New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc.
- Ognibene, R. (1981). "Crisis At Summerhill: An Educational Simulation", Improving College and University Teaching. 29 (4) 159-61.
- Olney, J. (1973). Metaphors of Self: The Meaning of Autobiography. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
- Oren, R. C. Ed. (1974). Montessori: Her Method and the Movement. What You Need to Know. (ERIC ED103124).
- Ornstein, A. C. (1977) "Critics and Criticism of Education" Educational Forum. 42 (1) 21-30. (ERIC AJ174962).
- Ozmon, H. (1972). Dialogue in the Philosophy of Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

- Ozmon, H. A., & Craver, S. M. (1981). Philosophical Foundations of Education (2nd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Paul, B. D. (1953). "Interview Techniques and Field Relationships" In A. L. Kroeber (Ed.), Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory (p.443) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Peterson, P. L. (1979). "Direct Instruction Reconsidered" In Peterson and Walberg (Eds) Research on Teaching Concepts, Findings and Implications. McCutchan Publishing Corporation (pp. 57-69).
- Rickman, H.P. (Ed.) (1962). Pattern and Meaning in History. New York: Harper and Row.
- Rickover, G. H. (1959). Education and Freedom. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc.
- Rosenshine, B. (1971). Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement. Slough, England: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales.
- Rosenshine, B. & Furst, N. (1973). "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching", In Robert M. W. Travers, (Ed) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, (pp. 156-157).
- Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pgymalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Runes, D. D. (Ed.) (1981). Dictionary of Philosophy. Totowa, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams & Co.
- Rusk, R. R. (1965). The Doctrines of the Great Educators. New York: Macmillan.
- Sciarrà, D. Jr & Dorsey, A. (1976). Nine-Year Follow-up Study of Montessori Education. (ERIC ED12929).
- Shafer, R. J. (Ed.) (1974). A Guide to Historical Method, rev. ed. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- Simpson, D. J., & Jackson, M. J. B. (1984). The Teacher As Philosopher: A Primer in Philosophy of Education. New York: Methuen.

- Smith, L. G., Smith, J. K., Perko, F. M., Ihle, E. J. L., Dalton, B. C., Campbell, J. K., Belok, M. V., Gutek, G. L., Tevis, M., Lauderdale, W. B., Strauss, C., & Travers, P. (1984). Lives in Education: People and Ideas in the Development of Teaching. Ames, Iowa: Educational Press.
- Snitzer, Herb (1983, October). "A. S. Neill Remembered". Educational Leadership. 41 (2).
- Soltis, J. F., Ed. (1981a). "Philosophy and Education", In Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.
- (1981b). Philosophy of Education Since Mid-Century. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Standing, E. M. (1957). Maria Montessori: Her Life and Work. New York: Mentor-Omega Book.
- Truswell, H. A. (1975). Made in Summerhill. New York: Hawthorne Books, Inc. Publishers.
- Tyler, R. (1984). "Curriculum Development and Research" In Using What we Know About Teaching. Philip L. Hasford, Chairperson and Editor, Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Von Wright, G. H. (1961). Explanation and Understanding. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ward, F. E. (1913). The Montessori Method and the American School. New York: The Macmillan Co.
- Whyte, W. F. (1960). "Interviewing in Field Research", In Richard N. Adams and Jack J. Preiss, Eds., Human Organization Research: Field Relations and Techniques. (p. 358). Homewood, Ill: The Dorsey Press.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have guided the preparation of this manuscript. Each in his or her own way has allowed me to grow toward a better understanding of myself. I am particularly grateful to:

Dr. William A. Hunter, who "looked beyond my faults and saw my need to be";

Dr. L. Glenn Smith, who ignited and encouraged my will to learn; knew when to protect and when to push me forward;

Dr. Elaine McNally-Jarchow, who would not allow me to give up and rescued me from my fears;

Dr. Theresa McCormick who focused my vision on the "light" within; and saw this dissertation through to completion.

Dr. George Kizer who encouraged me to continue my exploration of ideas, and

Dr(s) Robert Bernard, Marilyn Peterson, Tom Wieble, and Barbara Matthies, who assisted me as committee members.

I offer a special thanks to my family and friends: Verda's patience, Joe and Tony's belief in me, and all the friends who reminded me often with "You can do it!"