

The Roots of Curriculum Integration in Modern Philosophy and Educational Thought

Juliet Aleta R. Villanueva

A variety of views and practices of curriculum integration have grown over the years as documented in researches abroad. However, the need to look into its philosophical foundations is necessary if we are to make sense of its practice and its implications in the local context. This study is based on a historical research which examined the roots of curriculum integration in the works of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Herbart, Kilpatrick and Dewey in modern history. This paper presents findings from this historical research which show that curriculum integration originated from J.F. Herbart who grounded his work on the ideas of Pestalozzi. Curriculum integration reappeared as core curriculum in the 1930's as experimentalism and progressivism have taken root to push forth curriculum reform movements in the United States. The paper points to the fact that the Philippines does not have a history of progressive movement to fuel integrated curriculum and become an accepted and effective practice in the local setting. However, its feasibility and application in the local setting can be further investigated through future studies about local progressive schools.

INTRODUCTION

Since its emergence in the 1930's, curriculum integration has been widely discussed and put into practice in the United States (Lake, 1994). Current researches regarding the integrated curriculum make mention and attribute this educational idea to Dewey and the progressive movement (Lake 1994, Kysilka 1998, Ritter 1999, Wood 2001, Wraga 1997).

These researches pertaining to integrated curriculum prioritize descriptions of models and frameworks, all of which aim to provide historical, psychological, theoretical and practical bases for curriculum integration. These works did not see the need to fully examine doctrines of philosophy or educational thought. This is because at this point, in the history of American education, curriculum integration is already an established practice which will most likely continue to evolve in the United States (Davis 1997).

In the Philippines, curriculum integration found its place in the local curriculum through the 2002 Revitalized Basic Education Program. Major efforts were exerted in support of the RBEC 2002 Revitalized Basic Education Program to make it into a workable and efficient integrated curriculum (Vicencio, 2007). Through this kind of curriculum, the Department of Education aimed to resolve an overcrowded curriculum and push forth much needed reforms in the local educational system so that Filipino learners truly become competent and lifelong learners (Hidalgo in Crisostomo, 2002). This curriculum featured integration of competencies within and across learning areas (Vicencio, 2007). However good and sincere the intent of this curriculum, it met major criticisms and complaints mostly in its idea of integration (Vicencio, 2007).

Presently, integrated curriculum is advocated in progressive schools at the basic education (Villanueva, 2006). These schools

usually have school leaders who are greatly influenced by the works of John Dewey and school practices of the progressive movement, thus; find relevant ways to apply these in the local context (Villanueva, 2006).

Since curriculum integration, obviously a western idea, is already being adapted in the Philippines, the need to revisit its historical roots and philosophical foundations is necessary to make sense of its practice and its implications in the local context. Gutek (1997) explained the value of philosophy in understanding concepts and issues in education:

When educators are unable to recognize the philosophical and ideological perspective from which proposals emanate, they are unable to either criticize or to implement these proposals from a professional perspective ... Philosophical inquiry can aid the educator in examining decisions and problems...an examination of the philosophy of education will aid teachers to recognize that organizational and instructional innovations can be used for many purposes and have many consequences (Gutek, 9-10).

Thus, in the field of educational history and philosophy, one can satisfy his/her quests to gain knowledge and understanding of curricular foundations. An initial review of published books about the history or philosophy of western education shows bases for curriculum integration along with child-centered and activity centered curricula and the core curriculum. Links in the works of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Herbart are discussed in relation to ideas in curriculum and teaching (Rusk 1969, Brubacher 1947, Mayer 1960, Dupuis 1966). William Heard Kilpatrick and John Dewey are also made responsible for promoting a certain type of integrated curriculum in the United States (Fauce and Bossing 1951, Brubacher 1947).

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to revisit and examine the roots of underlying beliefs about curriculum integration in the works of philosophers and educational thinkers in modern history. This research specifically looks into the works of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Herbart, Kilpatrick and Dewey that are relevant to education and including interpretations of these beliefs.

This paper seeks to add to the body of research pertaining to the philosophical foundations of curriculum integration since only a few notable researches have been documented along these lines and mostly analyzed for their own purposes in the United States. Findings from this study reinforce the role of philosophy and historical research in decision-making concerning curriculum and educational practices in our local schools.

Methodology

This paper was based on a historical research which relied on both primary and secondary sources of philosophical works and educational doctrines in modern history. The research was made possible through a few but relevant sources from library archives which provided the works of Pestalozzi, Dewey, Kilpatrick, Herbart and the Herbartians, some of which were found in compiled formats. Secondary resources, from varied time periods, were initially scanned and compared to identify key philosophers and educational thinkers in modern history whose works have directly impacted knowledge views on curriculum, teaching and learning. A few data from internet resources also complemented works from authentic books.

FINDINGS

Current advocates of curriculum integration in literature base their arguments on some common fundamental beliefs about curriculum and its sources. Kysilka (1998) looked

into the work of these advocates and suggested that curriculum integration is precipitated by the following:

1. Genuine learning takes place as students are engaged in meaningful, purposeful activity.
2. The most significant activities are those which are most directly related to the students' interests and needs.
3. Knowledge in the real world is not applied in bits and pieces but in an integrative fashion.
4. Individuals need to know how to learn and how to think and should not be receptacles for facts.
5. Subject matter is a means, not a goal.
6. Teachers and students need to work co-operatively in the educative process to ensure successful learning.
7. Knowledge is growing exponentially and changing rapidly, it is no longer static and conquerable.

Technology is changing access to information, defying lock — step, sequential, predetermined steps in the learning process.

From the above, common underlying beliefs about education and curriculum integration can be culled. These are:

1. the concept of child-centered or learner centered education
2. the idea that interests and experiences are the sources of curriculum
3. the idea that education is experience
4. the view that knowledge is dynamic, interrelated, and connected
5. the view that curriculum is a process involving change and experience

This paper revisited these underlying beliefs in modern philosophy and essential findings are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Before the 1800's in modern history, education was focused on the transmission of knowledge society found valuable. Education served the purpose of cultural and skills transmission which the society deemed important. Thus the main aim was to develop children to become responsible adult members of society. It seemed very logical then to classify such large body of knowledge to ensure success in transmission. Subject matter were organized in orderly fashion resulting in an adoption of a ready made curriculum and all the child had to do was to follow.

Brubacher (1947) observed that this was acceptable to the larger society until the end of the nineteenth century and with a strong following until the 20th century. It was during the rise of child-centered and activity-based curricula that educators started to rethink the validity and implications of having a traditional subject-centered approach (Brubacher, 1947).

Organizing curricula in terms of child experiences went by various names which were known as "integrated", "experience" or "activity unit" and "project curricula" (Brubacher, 1947). Other terms used to represent this kind of curriculum are called broad fields, correlated, core curricula, common learnings (Vars, 1991). What is common among their ideas and practice is that curriculum emanated from the immediate life activities of the child. Some have managed to develop curriculum around goals which emerge from the child's interest and needs, thus education is said to be learner-centered.

Even before the term child-centered or learner-centered was coined, there were already distinct philosophers as early as the 1800's who attempted to revolutionize education by focusing on the child and his/her needs and interests as valuable sources of the curriculum. From the works of Jean Jacques Rousseau and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi we can find this emphasis on the child and his/her nature.

Rousseau

Brubacher (1947) identified Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) as a pioneer of a radically new approach to education and curriculum. "To him the child reflected the order of nature as well as the curriculum." (Brubacher, 1947, 300) Rousseau's most important ideas pertaining to education can be found in his work known as *Emile*. Rusk (1969) looked into *Emile*, Rousseau's major work, and observed that:

The main concern of early educators was to assist pupils to acquire the contents of a prescribed course of study. The outstanding feature of Emile is the complete abandonment of a predetermined curriculum. Emile was to be educated entirely through activities and first hand experiences (Rusk, 1969, 187).

Earlier philosophers namely Comenius and Locke were first to emphasize the use of senses in learning (Brubacher, 1947). Locke was known for developing the notion of practical learning through play while Comenius acknowledged the importance of the senses in gaining a better understanding of the world. To these philosophers, teaching happens from simple ideas to complex ones in accordance with the nature of development among children (Brubacher, 1947). However, Rousseau went furthermore by emphasizing that these sensuous enjoyments are the driving force behind the learning among children (Brubacher, 1947). Gutek (1997) described how Rousseau was able to relate motivation and interest to learning and stated that:

"Rousseau emphasized the importance of the individual's direct experience with the natural environment. Sensations and emotions, the human's own personal contact points with nature were to be trusted and enjoyed rather than being bridled by prescrip-

tions from theological political and literary authorities.” (66)

In these transition years, Rousseau (in Rusk 1969) recommended learning by doing:

“Teach by doing whenever you can, and only fall back upon words when doing is out of the question. Let all the lessons of young people take the form of doing rather than talking; let them learn nothing from books which they can learn from experiences.” (199)

The doctrine of learning through senses was much advocated by educators since Rousseau’s time. Some progressive educators of American education in the 19th century definitely advocated such an idea. Nature study was encouraged through field trips and excursions. Children were provided with several opportunities to have direct, hands-on experience with objects in the environment. Activities, experiments and projects were done through the active participation of children in their own learning. Kilpatrick’s project method also drew from these Naturalist perspectives. (Gutek, 1997)

Dupuis (1966) further discussed Rousseau’s important contribution to curriculum theory:

The important point in Rousseau’s philosophy of the curriculum is not so much the specific activities which he recommended but rather that these activities reflect the natural living of the pupil at every step of his development. The curriculum is something the pupil does, not something that is done to him. It is living as well as a preparation for life. (105)

Rousseau developed several themes that had pronounced effect on educational reform based on Naturalism and

on progressive education 1) childhood, as an intrinsically valuable period of human growth and development has its own educational timetable; 2) education best occurs in a prepared environment which while remaining its natural features, is designed to cooperate with the child’s readiness to learn by presenting situations that stimulate his or her curiosity and bring about action; 3) the child learns in permissive atmosphere in that he or she makes the basic choices regarding one’s actions but must also enjoy or suffer their consequences. (66)

Rousseau’s insights regarding children and learning certainly made major contributions to the changing philosophy of education during his time from which modern educators grounded their practices and approaches to teaching, learning and curriculum.

Pestalozzi

Although Rousseau initiated an educational theory grounded on Naturalism, it was Pestalozzi who was able to concretely realize this in practice. Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1872) based his practical pedagogy through an activity-centered program based on Rousseau’s conceptions of curriculum (Brubacher 1947, Dupuis 1966, Mayer 1960, Henson 2003). Tomlinson (1996) described Pestalozzi’s work which revealed his adherence to naturalistic views. “Two insights supported his arguments: learning must take place within a loving environment, and teaching practices should be grounded in the laws that govern children’s development” (Ibid, 237). Pestalozzi’s concept of education was grounded on years of work with children from unfortunate families, thus moral development as the aim of education was central to his work.

Clearly, Pestalozzi advocated for a child-centered education. He likened a child's development to a plant that when left unattended, will fail to grow in its full potential. Pestalozzi (in Green 1914) believed in the necessity of nurturance and proper guidance from adults, so children can grow up to be moral citizens. "The development of human nature, the harmonious cultivation of its powers and talents, and the promotion of manliness of life; this is the aim of education." (Pestalozzi in Green 1914, 22)

Pestalozzi (1818) discussed the teacher's role in creating experiences and opportunities to fit in the nature of the child's learning are as important, as evident in the following:

The teacher usually finds his starting-point in his subject; your mother will find it in your child. The teacher has a fixed form of instruction through which he puts the child; you will subordinate the course to the child's needs, adapting it to him as you adapt yourself to his physical demands. (in Green, 1914, 25)

From the above statement, Pestalozzi clearly saw the child as the one capable of directing his learning and as the source of what to teach based on his needs, abilities and potential.

Pestalozzi (1818) also hinted that knowledge begins with experience. In his work entitled "How Gertrude Teaches Her Children," Pestalozzi was able to demonstrate such lessons, examples of which are explained in the following:

He taught a new concept of geography. Often he would take children on walks and in this way they would become conscious of their environment. He used clay models to portray mountains and rivers and he tried to make

this study as dramatic as possible. While doing mathematics, he started with concrete objects. (Mayer 1960, 266)

Dupuis (1966) observed that the work of early liberals such as Pestalozzi and Rousseau recognized the value of the child's natural interests, but attributed to Herbart the unitary doctrine of interest. He also found the work of these earlier philosophers to be limiting when it comes to solving educational problems. He went on to mention the important work of Herbart in the early nineteenth century in developing the science of education. "...Herbart viewed science as the main source of knowledge about man, the world and educational theory and practice" (Dupuis 1966, 125). Followers of Herbart believed that from the work of Pestalozzi, educators must be grounded on a scientific application of psychology in order to sort out a curriculum suited to the times. From their works, one finds the initial emergence of an integrated curriculum.

Herbart and the Herbartians

Kilpatrick (1951) attributed to the Herbartians the introduction of the doctrine of interest in American education. He explained in simple terms the ideas of Herbartians as related to learning:

Learning was the name given to this process by which the old takes in the new to make it part of itself. As the new was being understood and accepted by the learner, the process of taking it in and fitting it in into the existing apperceptive mass not only added this new item to the existing mass, but would, in the course of the process, otherwise modify that mass as the better to assimilate the new. This readiness and willingness on the part of the old thus to take in the new was what the Herbartians called inter-

est. As they saw it, there would be no learning without some prior interest on the part of the old for the new, some "inviting in" of the new, as it were, by the old as needed for its own completion (Kilpatrick 1951, 272).

Such ideas from the Herbartians were derived from the work of Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841). Herbart in his work *Chief Classes of Interests* explained that there are two groups of interests, interests which arise from knowledge and interests which emerge from social intercourse. He went on to discuss different forms of interests and gave caution against one-sided development of interest taking place.

Baskin (1966) related Herbart's theory of apperception and his goal of education which is to systemize prior knowledge and to stimulate a variety of interests among children as they are exposed to many experiences. "Young people should be given the broadest possible range of experience so that they will develop many-sidedness of interests." (Baskin 1966, 262)

Besides promoting the role of interest and experience, Herbart's doctrine of apperception also reinforced the idea of correlation. The words below show how Herbart (1898) hinted on the idea of correlation.

"It must not be expected that all these various kinds of interest will develop equally in each individual, but on the other hand we may expect to find them more or less amongst a number of pupils. The required many-sidedness will be more perfectly attained, the more closely each individual approaches the standard of mental culture in which all these interests are aroused with equal energy." (Baskin, 1966, 261)

Later on Herbart, together with Tusikon Ziller planned an integration of subject matter through correlation and concentration. "The basic idea in correlation and concentration was to arrange subjects in the curriculum so that instruction in one was made to bear constantly on instruction in the others (Brubacher, 1947, 310)." According to De Garmo (1896), it was Ziller who interpreted and put into extensive practice the ideas of Herbart. In an effort to explain how the mind works and how thoughts progress, Ziller went on to develop his theory of concentration of studies. Moreover, the Herbartians promote the idea of coordination of subjects to be taught in order to achieve unity and consistency in the learner's mental life (De Garmo, 1896). The followers of Herbart also mentioned another psychological reason to justify his theory of correlation. De Garmo (1896) discussed this as follows:

Every child is sure to be interested in something, so that if he can see that other things are related to his favorite ones, life at once broadens before him. This basis of interest in study is laid when the child finds in the subject-matter of instruction that which appeals to his own thinking is valuable... consequently, that coordination of studies promises to increase rapidly the pupil's power of apprehension and to promote his direct interest in what the school has to offer him, it seems worth working for (115-116).

Another reason, as promoted by the Herbartians, was a practical one which De Garmo (1896) discussed as follows:

It is universally acknowledged that our present curriculum, if not already badly congested, is likely soon to become so. Subject after subject has been added, not from any demonstrated pedagogical need, but in obedience to popular demands or to the

professional zeal of specialists. The process is still continuing. Not only each newly-developed branch of useful knowledge, but even every popular social reform demands a representation in the school-room. The result is often a detrimental atomization of the pupil's time and attention. Not having time to digest any subject, thoroughly, he soon becomes a mere taster in all learning...it seems that we are still following our instincts to put into the school everything good in itself, but that we are taking little heed of the effect upon the child. (117)

To achieve the correlation of studies advocated by the Herbartians, Ziller devised his theory of concentration. His plan was to unite the areas of study under a core of cultural material (De Garmo, 1896). He chose a core which consisted of the greatest moral content or practical value. The content of these were treated in successive grades. Ziller chose history and literature naturally to become the core of concentration (De Garmo, 1896).

Another Herbartian named Dr. Karl Lange summarized his ideas regarding concentration and correlation after elaborating and building on Herbart's theory of apperception. In the following, Lange (in De Garmo 1896) outlined how this kind of curriculum can be done:

1. *Such materials of knowledge must be chosen as to lie close to a child's experiences in general, and likewise to the consciousness of the people, i.e., the subject-matter of national culture.*
2. *They must, as regards content and form, take into consideration certain peculiarities of the child's intellectual development.*
3. *They are to be arranged in such a manner that every topic shall create*

for the following ones numerous strong aids to apperception; i.e. according to historical sequence (Law of Propaedeutics)

4. *The various parallel subjects of the curriculum are to be arranged in such a manner that in each grade, as many as possible allied topics may be associated, so that what is related in fact, may be related in the consciousness of the child (Law of Coordination or Concentration of Studies). (177-178)*

The Herbartian theory of correlation and concentration gave way to the idea that curriculum can be organized into units beyond the traditional subject-matter scheme (Brubacher, 1947). Such an idea gradually became of importance in the twentieth century as educational innovations sought to formulate a curriculum with the child's center of experience as the integrating factor (Brubacher, 1947). A new angle of integration was emerging which was quite different from how the Herbartians conceived it to be. Whereas in Herbart's theory, integration was done externally by the teacher organizing curriculum in a correlated manner, another proposed that it was the child who acted on his environment and organized his learnings in an integrated manner. This kind of integration was characteristic of Kilpatrick's philosophy and his project method, which will be discussed later on in this paper.

Though Herbart's work found its way in America, it was not without criticism. John Dewey (1915) in his work *Democracy and Education* examined Herbart's work and acknowledged how he was responsible for laying out a definite method and procedure to education. Dewey (1915) commented that:

Herbart undoubtedly has had a greater influence in bringing to the front questions connected with the material of study than any other edu-

cational philosopher. He stated problems of method from the standpoint of their connection with subject matter: method having to do with the manner and sequence of presenting new subject matter to insure its proper interaction with the old (83).

Dewey, who grounded his philosophy through an initial critical analysis of traditional notions of curriculum, also rejected aspects of Herbart's works. On Herbart, Dewey (1915) commented that:

The fundamental theoretical defect of this view lies in ignoring the existence in a living being of active and specific functions which are developed in the redirection and combination which occur as they are occupied with their environment...The conception that the mind consists of what has been taught and that the importance of what has been taught consists in its availability for further teaching, reflects the pedagogue's view of life. The philosophy is eloquent about the duty of the teacher instructing pupils; it is almost silent regarding his privilege of learning. It emphasizes the influence of intellectual environment upon the mind; it slurs over the fact that the environment involves a personal sharing in common experiences. (83-84)

Dewey

John Dewey (1859-1952) who grounded his work on scientific method and Darwin's theory of evolution rejected the recapitulation or cultural epoch theory which dominated the 19th century work on education. To this theory's insistence on the study of the past, Dewey (1915) stated, "The study of past products will not help us understand the present, because the present is not due to the products of the past, but to the life of which they were the products"(88). He went

on to criticize earlier philosophies and how their fundamental beliefs in the aims of education are themselves obstacles to meaningful learning. He grounded his works on the idea that man has the capacity to evolve in a society and transform what is around him. His philosophical works not only impacted on education but he also elevated the role of education in society.

Like Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Herbart, Dewey (1897) showed genuine respect for the child and his experiences as the sources of curriculum:

Education therefore must begin with a psychological insight into the child's capacities, interests and habits. It must be controlled at every point by reference to these same considerations. These powers and interests and habits must be continually interpreted—we must know what they mean (in Garforth, 1966, 48).

Compared to his predecessors, Dewey (1897) looked into the social context of the child, its interplay with experiences and the role of education in the child's life:

I believe that the only true education comes through the stimulation of the child's powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself. Through these demands he is stimulated to act as a member of a unity, to emerge from his original narrowness of action and feeling, and to conceive of himself from the standpoint of the welfare of the group to which he belongs. Through the responses which others make to his own activities he comes to know what these mean in social terms...I believe that knowledge of social conditions, of the present state of civilization is necessary in order to properly interpret the child's powers. The child has his

own instincts and tendencies, but we do not know what these mean until we can translate them into their social equivalents. We must be able to carry them back into a social past and see them as the inheritance of previous race activities. We must also be able to project them into the future to see what their outcome and end will be (in Garforth, 1966, 45-46).

Dewey (1897) criticized the traditional notion of curriculum and the role of the school. Beyond these criticisms, Dewey more importantly offered his ideas on what should comprise a child's education and what should be prioritized in curriculum-making. In his work *My Pedagogic Creed*, Dewey (1897) stated that:

I believe that the social life of the child is the basis of concentration or correlation, in all his training or growth. The social life gives the unconscious unity and the background of all his efforts and all his attainments... I believe that we violate the child's nature and render difficult the best ethical results, by introducing the child too abruptly to a number of special studies of reading, writing, geography, etc., out of relation to this social life. I believe, therefore, that the true center of correlation on the school subjects is not science, not literature, nor history, nor geography, but the child's own social activities...I believe accordingly that the primary basis of education is in the child's powers at work along the same general constructive lines as those which have brought civilization into being...I believe that the only way to make the child conscious of his social heritage is to enable him to perform those fundamental types of activity which make civilization what it is. I believe therefore, in the so-called expressive or con-

structive activities as the center of correlation...It cannot therefore be true that the proper studies for one grade are mere reading and writing, and that at a later grade, reading or literature, or science may be introduced. The progress is not in the succession of studies but in the development of new attitudes towards and new interests in, experience (in Garforth, 1966, 51-53).

Dewey primarily agrees with the idea of children and their interests as the source of curriculum. However, Dewey believed that these should not be treated as an end in itself. Dewey was worried that too much focus on the needs and interests of the learner can lead to nonsense activities. Thus, he emphasized the interaction of the person with the environment. Beyond an activity centered curriculum, Dewey suggested that educators should strive to direct these to problem-solving and purposeful curriculum which will ultimately lead to intellectual and social growth in the learner (Gutek, 1997). Thus, here we find the early beginnings of problem-based learning, a kind of method that works through an integrated curriculum design.

Besides recommending the use of problem solving, Dewey, through his laboratory school, made concrete offerings with regards to curriculum. He suggested that school life be as close to home life and the social activities in a larger society. The child's experiences or what he normally does and chooses to engage in thus becomes the center of the curriculum.

...the primary subject matter of knowing is that contained in learning how to do things of a fairly direct sort. The educational equivalent of this principle is the consistent use of simple occupations which appeal to the powers of youth and which typify general modes of social activity. Skill and information about materials,

tools and laws of energy are acquired while activities are carried on for their own sake. The fact that they are socially representative gives a quality to the skill and knowledge gained which makes them transferable to out of school situations. (Dewey, 1915, 241)

Clearly Dewey offered us a whole new way of looking at education which was never before achieved by other philosophers in modern history. "I believe finally that education must be conceived as a continuing reconstruction of experience; that the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing." (Dewey in Reed, 2000, 97)

It is for such ideas that Dewey became known to be one of the proponents of pragmatism and experimentalism. Pragmatism as a philosophy challenged ways of thinking about education, its process and aims. It relied heavily on the scientific method to solve human problems. In this philosophy, Gutek (1997) explains, "Ideas were to be judged by their consequences when acted on: truth was warranted assertion, a tentative statement based on the application of hypotheses to solving problems..." (78). This in essence makes Dewey's method of philosophy experimental as he made efforts to solve problems in education. Dewey's pragmatism was timely to the emergence of the Progressive movement which reacted strongly to the traditional schooling. Progressive educators point to the works of Kilpatrick as one of its major sources.

Kilpatrick

William Heard Kilpatrick (1871-1965) found much inspiration from Dewey's works. He interpreted much of Dewey's ideas in developing his methodology and philosophy of education. To Kilpatrick's work, this was what Dewey had to say:

In the best sense of the words, pro-

gressive education and the work of Dr. Kilpatrick are virtually synonymous. I say in the best sense because of the phrase "progressive education" has been and is frequently used to signify almost any kind of school theory and practice that departs from previously established scholastic methods. Many of these procedures, when they are examined, are found to be innovations, but there seems to be no sound basis for regarding them as progressive... The aims and processes of learning, which have been so fully and concretely stated by Dr. Kilpatrick, form a notable and virtually unique contribution to the development of a school society that is an organic component of a living, growing democracy (in Tenenbaum, 1951, vii,x).

Like Dewey, Kilpatrick (1921) believes that "education is a dynamic process of growth through the reconstruction of existing behaviors and attitudes" (in Childs, 1956, 190). Education is not mere preparation for a future way beyond the child's life and instead, it is a meaningful response to the demands and possibilities of the present. Growth happens through the reconstruction of experience. In Kilpatrick's own words:

...education concerns itself with life, to make life better. To the discerning look education is not something outside of life, applied as a tool, a lever say, with which to push life forward or higher. No, education is inside life, inherent in life, part of the very life process itself so far as life is worth while. Each step forward in living involves learning...each significant learning experience in some measure re-makes subsequent experience, in some measure gives a wider outlook as to the possibilities of life and deeper insight into its processes; gives

also differentiated attitudes and appreciations with respect to the different new things seen and felt; gives also increased technique, power of control over the experience process, to bring it more under conscious direction. (Kilpatrick, 1926, 130)

In the above, it is quite obvious how Kilpatrick adheres to progressive educational ideas. Like others involved in the progressive movement, Kilpatrick went against what to him seemed to be an aimless, book dependent, subject-centered curriculum which forces adult constructs on the student's life in school, thereby leaving schoolwork to children unsuitable. Thus, like predecessors mentioned in this paper, Kilpatrick was very much concerned with the child and how he should be "accepted as a person and treated with respect that is due a person." (Childs, 1956, 201)

Thus in the process of criticizing the subject-centered curriculum, Kliebard (1995) discussed Kilpatrick's position with regard to the source of the curriculum:

Kilpatrick proposed instead a curriculum that deemphasized the acquisition of knowledge in favor of a curriculum that was synonymous with purposeful activity...Kilpatrick proposed that curriculum planning start with life (or at least what was increasingly being called the problems of living) with subject matter brought in only incidentally as it bears on those problems. (143-144)

With these ideas, Kilpatrick devised his 'Project Method'. He put into action a philosophy and method which makes him one of the influential pragmatist educators in America. Kilpatrick (1921) stated that:

I had felt increasingly the need of unifying more completely a number of

important related aspects of the educative process. I began to hope for some concept which might serve this end. Such a concept I found, must so I thought, emphasize the factor of action, preferably wholehearted vigorous activity. It must at the same time provide a place for the adequate utilization of the laws of learning, and no less for the essential elements of the ethical quality of conduct. The last named looks of course to the social situation as well as the individual attitude. Along with these should go, as it seemed, the important generalization that education is life—so easy to say and so hard to delimit...there came increasingly a belief—corroborated on many sides—that the unifying idea I sought was to be found in the conception of wholehearted purposeful activity proceeding in a social environment or more briefly, in the unit element of such activity, the hearty purposeful act. It is to this purposeful act with the emphasis on the word purpose that I myself apply the term "project" (in Childs, 1956, 192).

Thus Kilpatrick believed that the purposeful activities are central to the child's life and of human nature. "Kilpatrick perceived that if the school is to nurture persons, it must provide its pupils with opportunity to act as persons, and he was seeking to make the opportunity central through his emphasis on the "project" or functional curriculum" (Childs, 1956, 202). Through this project method, he believed that the ultimate aim of the schools in a democratic society can be achieved, and this aim is character development (Childs, 1956, 202).

Kilpatrick's work had a large following in the United States, as his disciples, namely, Ellsworth Collings, John A. Stockton and Junius L. Meriam published books advocating the project method (Kliebard, 1995). It was

inevitable then that Kilpatrick made major impact in the school practices in America so that by the 1930's, "the movement had grown to such proportions that it outgrew its original identification with the project per se and came to be more grandly advertised as the activity curriculum or the experience curriculum" (Kliebard, 1995,145).

The Emergence of the Core Curriculum

Timely as it is, in the 19th century, when American educators were in search of their own philosophy of education, educators drew from the works of the three European educational thinkers, Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Herbart. Butts (1955) explained that their ideas coincided with other external influences such as the rise of capitalism, frontier democracy and the psychology of individual differences. In the works of Rousseau and Pestalozzi, educators in America found relevance in the development of individual capacities crucial to functioning in a democratic society. It was not a surprise that their ideas found its way in the lower levels of schooling and moved up to the higher levels of schooling. The ideas of Pestalozzi and Herbart were likewise adapted to American practices in elementary education (Butts, 1955). Curriculum was designed to emphasize the study of nature and concrete objects as well as applications of geography, drawing, music and home economics (Butts, 1955). Even Froebel, who drew from the works of Pestalozzi, penetrated the American system and resulted to the establishment of numerous kindergartens from the 1850's to the 1890's.

Alongside the formation of the American system of education was the marked growth of pre-service training for teachers in America in response to the growing population of children and migrant families. The period of 1823 to 1898 witnessed the emergence of normal schools in American states which were patterned after the normal schools in Europe. This was mainly under the

leadership of Horace Mann who was also responsible for the establishment of non-sectarian, free, coeducational public schools in America in the spirit of democracy and equality. In the 1890's, Herbartianism became popular in these teachers' colleges through the influence of Charles De Garmo, Frank McMurry and Charles McMurray and the National Herbart Society (1895) which later became the National Society for the Study of Education (Butts, 1955).

From this period onwards, the American educational system witnessed a variety of movements in reaction to traditional education as well as arguments within the new education movement. Dewey's pragmatic ideas had such profound effects on educational thinkers in the United States and fueled a variety of discussions about the sources and nature of the curriculum. Arguments among the Herbartians took the form of whether history and literature versus geography should serve as the primary concentration for the curriculum. The cultural epoch was also being questioned as the basis for the selection and sequence of units of study. Alongside these varied arguments and stances came the movements which may be one in reaction to the subject-centered curriculum.

Thus, came the inevitable rise of the activity curriculum through laboratory and experimental schools such as the Dewey Laboratory School (1896) and Meriam Laboratory School (1904). Later on, the activity curriculum taking the influence of Kilpatrick's the Project Method (1918) reached the public school in the 1920's through the Collings' Experimental School (Smith, Stanley and Shores, 1957). From these schools, ideas such as 'common learnings', 'centers of interests' and 'cooperative planning' came into play as the scope, sequence and methods in the curriculum were being determined.

Another type of curriculum came into being as a reaction to the subject-centered

curriculum. Smith et al (1957) found in the 1896 National Department of Superintendence in America, the initial definition of the core curriculum:

Complete unification is the blending of all subjects and branches of study into one whole, and the teaching of the same in successive groups or lessons or sections. When this union is effected by making one group or branch of study in the course, the center or core, and subordinating all other subjects to it, the process is properly called the concentration of studies.
(White in Smith, 1957, 312)

From the earlier notions of the core curriculum found in the work of Herbart came different perspectives of what should comprise the core. Several interpretations were offered through the works of Herbart's followers, namely Ziller (cultural studies, history and literature as core), Rein (culture epoch, with its limits) and Colonel Francis W. Parker (nature and science study). Later on, Parker (1895) insisted that what he truly meant was the child to be the center of study, though he insisted that nature study should have a place in the curriculum (in the NSSE 26th Yearbook, 1926, 201).

Later developments of the core curriculum emerged as a result of studies on society and its diagnoses of needs and problems in the 1920's. According to Smith, et al (1957) these studies which were patterned after studies in cultural anthropology, looked into the common activities of men and how these were carried out. Findings in these studies gave rise to the need for the curriculum to re-emphasize social problems and social processes. This new conception of the core curriculum was embodied in the Virginia State Curriculum in the 1930's. Different versions of the core constantly resurfaced as a variety of explorations to what the core should contain and how the other areas of

learning should relate to the core. The concept of the core curriculum was also extended until the secondary education in America.

Clearly, curriculum integration continued to evolve in ways American educators found it useful. Brubacher (1947) observed that this kind of curriculum was generally accepted in progressive schools in America in the 20th century. In some school systems which found this to be too difficult to do, settled for a curriculum which became known to be as "broad fields" and "core curricula" (Brubacher, 1947).

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

In the works of Herbart and the Herbartians, Rousseau and Pestalozzi, Dewey and Kilpatrick, this research found a common thread which binds their philosophies of education. For these philosophers, the sources of curriculum were the child, his interests and experiences. Rousseau's work though, said to be purely theoretical deserved much credit for looking into the innate abilities and natural process of learning in children. These ideas were truly revolutionizing at a time when the dominant philosophy rested on perennialism and the tendency towards the subject-centered curriculum. Pestalozzi built on the naturalist ideas but he was able to enrich his thoughts on education through actual experiments, instruction and practice. Thus beyond the philosophy, he was able to suggest an enduring methodology with practical applications to education.

Herbart, on the other hand, provided the balance any educator would look for. He was able to develop approaches to teaching which utilized Pestalozzi's principles. (Dupuis 1966, Butts 1955, Burbacher 1947, Knox 1975) In his works, this research found the notion of child-centeredness and interests in a social context such as experience. It was probably for these reasons that Herbart's ideas' had far reaching impact enough to be

given such consideration when it finally transplanted to the United States.

Dupuis (1966) raised the points to show the implications of the works of the earlier philosophers to the growing perspectives in America which relate to curriculum and its sources:

In summary, it can be noted that two somewhat different, but not completely opposing, views of the curriculum are found among nineteenth and twentieth-century liberals: 1) one group defines the curriculum as an organized and integrated sequence of useful subjects; 2) the other group regards the curriculum as a meaningful sequence of activities growing out of the pupil's social life. (144)

The first view clearly, took roots in Herbart's doctrines. Thus, among these 18th century philosophers, this study found the beginnings and extensive discussions of integrated curriculum as a curriculum design in the works of Herbart and the Herbartians. Through their influences in American education, the concept of integration made concrete applications to curriculum, particularly through a method of instruction and content recommendation. From the substantive evidences gathered, this historical study found steady ground in Herbart as his work demonstrated that the child, his interests and experience are central to the curriculum. His work gained a major following in the U.S., even when John Dewey's groundbreaking ideas can not help but criticize his work.

Findings from this study also pointed to how Dewey's ideas, along with the progressive movement, fueled the evolution of Herbart's ideas beyond curriculum integration as a way to organize educational experiences. This led the research finding support to the second view on curriculum mentioned earlier, that the curriculum was a set of meaningful activities coming out of the child's social life.

It took a John Dewey to remind educators that the only true source of the curriculum was the child and his experiences, and not some kind of historical pattern or cultural epoch the Herbartians strongly adhered to. Dewey noticed that the work of the Herbartians gave priority still on the content of the curriculum, how it should be arranged and organized without due consideration to the child as an active participant to his learning. Thus, in the integrated curriculum from the standpoint of the Herbartians, the research examined and found that the subject matter or content may have been rearranged or reconstructed to the point that it was actually being prescriptive and without much consideration to the role of the child in the curriculum.

Clearly, Dewey did not discuss the concept of curriculum to the point of prescribing as to how curriculum should be organized. Instead, he remained loyal to the belief that the child constantly adapted to his ever-changing environment in a democratic society. Unlike his predecessors, Dewey put major emphasis on the context of the child and his social activities where one found the true sources of the curriculum. The role then of the curriculum was to embody and represent situations in school where children can best think, function and learn together in a democratic way. Dewey was able to see the bigger picture, look beyond the classroom and the curriculum as he envisioned how schools should be. If in Pestalozzi and Rousseau's work, the beginnings of child-centeredness was found and in Herbart's work the beginnings of an integrated curriculum, it was in Dewey's work this research found a meaningful synthesis as to how curriculum integration can happen as a means to have better education happening in schools.

Thus, in Dewey's work, it was highly possible that educators found a philosophical base for an integrated curriculum acceptable in America during the time when liberalism

and democratic ideals were taking root. From this point forward, integrated curriculum as a knowledge view to designing a curriculum evolved with its constantly evolving source, which were the child, his experience and environment. The varied views of curriculum integration advocates throughout the decades were concrete examples to Dewey's ideas of curriculum and the child ever adapting. Therefore, even the concept of integration which began in Herbart's works continued to evolve over the decades until these views have influenced its interpretations and practices in today's schools. Despite these changes, what remained to be constant was the underlying belief that the child and his experiences were the sources of curriculum. In summary, this reality was perfectly expressed by Beane (1995):

Curriculum integration is not simply an organizational device requiring cosmetic changes or realignments in lesson plans across various subject areas. Rather it is a way of thinking about what schools are for, about the sources of curriculum and about the uses of knowledge. (616)

CONCLUSION

This research provided worthy support for the underlying beliefs of curriculum integration as traced in modern philosophies applied to education. Thus, to view curriculum integration as a mere educational idea or simply a curriculum approach which can be easily adapted for the local school setting is not as feasible given the traditional nature of most school systems. Its underlying beliefs point to the fact that it is grounded on a long history of philosophical ideas and thus deserves to be truly understood if one is bent on developing and implementing it, especially if this involves a wider population such as the case of our current public school system.

For the integrated curriculum to thrive in our local schools, certain conditions and fundamental beliefs should be met with regards to who children are, what knowledge is and how curriculum should be organized. At the core of planning for its implementation down to classroom level is a philosophy and knowledge view about children and learning, the role of the school and the aims of education. Adapting an integrated curriculum in the Philippines definitely questions hard held beliefs and traditional ideas about the sources of our curriculum. These have definite implications to the ways and means curriculum is constructed and implemented in the local setting.

For one, the Philippine educational system was a product of a history of colonial education geared towards a subject and teacher-centered curriculum with traditional approaches. The United States, however, had a history of a progressive movement similar to the one which fueled curriculum integration to become an acceptable practice in American schools. This study surfaced the fact that integrated curriculum thrived in America because of experimental educators, the progressive movement, and historical antecedents rooted in the works of modern philosophers. Even from the onset of the progressive movement in the United States, the integrated curriculum continued to evolve in conditions which were present abroad.

One might ask then, is curriculum integration the way to go for most of our schools in the Philippines? One finds integrated curriculum already at work in some local private schools in the Philippines which claim to be alternative, non-conventional, progressive, and attest to have nontraditional knowledge views of children and learning grounded on the works of Piaget, and Dewey. Possibly, these schools will be able to evolve its own identity, meaning and practice of curriculum integration viable to our school contexts and our society's needs and

culture. This study thus recommends further research in the processes of curriculum construction and implementation in local progressive schools which can perhaps provide us with insights and effective ways to make integrated curriculum meaningfully happen in Philippine schools.

References

- Anderson, Lewis Flint. *Pestalozzi*. New York, Mc-Graw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1931
- Balinsat, Isabel. *The Core Curriculum in The Baguio City High School: A Description and Evaluation of Its Program*. MA Diss. University of the Philippines. 1966
- Beane, James. "Curriculum Integration and the Disciplines of Knowledge." *Phi Delta-Kappan* **76**(1995): 616-622.
- Brubacher, John Seiler. *A History of the Problems of Education*. New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1947.
- Butts, Robert Freeman. *A Cultural History of Western Education: Its Social and Intellectual Foundations*. 2nd Ed, New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1955
- Cahn, Steven. *The Philosophical Foundations of Education*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Childs, John Lawrence. *American Pragmatism and Education Interpretation and Criticism*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1956.
- Davis, O. L. . "The Personal Nature of Curricular Integration." *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* **12**(1997): 95-97.
- De Garmo, Charles. *Herbart and the Herbartians*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.
- Dewey, John. "The Child and the Curriculum". *John Dewey Selected Educational Writings*. Francis William Garforth. London: Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd., 1966.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. New York: Text-Book Series, 1915.
- Dewey, John. "My Pedagogic Creed". *John Dewey Selected Educational Writings*. Francis William Garforth. London: Heinemann, 1966.
- Drake, Susan. *Planning Integrated Curriculum The Call to Adventure*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1993.
- Dressel, Paul Leroy. "The Meaning and Significance of Integration". *The Integration of Educational Experiences, the 57th Yearbook of National Society for the Study of Education*. Nelson Henry. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Dupuis, Adrian Maurice. *Philosophy of Education in Historical Perspective*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.
- Ellis, Arthur and Jeffrey Fouts. "Interdisciplinary Curriculum: The Research Base." *Music Educators Journal* **87** (2001): 22-27.
- Erickson, H. Lynn. *Stirring the Head, Heart and Soul: Redefining Curriculum and Instruction*. California: Corwin Press, 2001.
- Faunce, Roland Cleo and Nelson Bossing. *Developing the Core Curriculum*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.
- Fogarty, Robert. "Ten Ways to Integrate Curriculum". *Educational Leadership*. **49** (1991) : 61-65
- Green, Jane Andersen. "The Educational Ideas of Pestalozzi". *Textbooks on Education*. Froebel Archives, Roehampton Digital Library. London: University Tutorial Press, 1915. <http://core.roehampton.ac.uk/digital/froarc/greenedu/index.htm>
- Guttek, Gerald. L. *Philosophical and Ideological Perspectives on Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1997
- Henson, Kenneth. T. "Foundations for Learner-Centered Education: A Knowledge Base." *Education* **124**(2003): 5-16.
- Herbart, Johann Friedrich. "Chief Classes of Interest". *Classics in Education*. Wade Baskin. London: Vision Press Limited: 261-267, 1966.
- Hidalgo, Fe. In Crisostomo, Shiela. 7 June 2002. "DepEd Curriculum: Boon or bane?" *The Philippine Star*. Retrieved May 22, 2008 from <http://www.hartford->

- hwp.com/archives/54a/220.html
- Jacobs, Heidi Hayes., Ed. *Interdisciplinary Curriculum Design and Implementation*. Alexandria, Virginia, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1989.
- Kilpatrick, William Heard. Statement of Position. *The 26th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. G. M. Whipple. Bloomington, Illinois, Public School Publishing Company, 1926.
- Kilpatrick, William Heard. *Philosophy of Education*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1963.
- Kliebard, Herbert M. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958*. New York, Routledge, 1995.
- Knox, H. M. "The Progressive Development of J.F. Herbart's Educational Thought." *British Journal of Educational Studies* **23** (1975): 265-275.
- Kysilka, Marcella. "Understanding Integrated Curriculum." *The Curriculum Journal* **9** (1998): 197-209
- Lake, Kathy. Integrated Curriculum, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (accessed 2005) www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/8/c016.
- Lange, K. Apperception, a Monograph on Psychology and Pedagogy. *Herbart and the Herbartians*. Charles De Garmo. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.
- Lipson, Marjorie Y., Valencia, Susan W., Wixson, Karen K. and Peters, C.W. Integration and Thematic Teaching: Integration to Improve Teaching and Learning." *Language Arts* **70**(1993): 848-853.
- Mathison, Stewart., and Freeman, M. *The Logic of Interdisciplinary Curriculum*. Annual Conference of the American Research Association, Chicago, 1997.
- Mayer, Frederick. *A History of Educational Thought*. Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1960.
- Panaritis, Philip. "Beyond Brainstorming Planning an Successful Interdisciplinary Program." *Phi Delta Kappan* **76**(1995): 623-629.
- Parker, Colonel F. W. "Parker on Nature Study vs. The Child as the Correlating Center of the Curriculum". *The 26th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. G. M. Whipple. Bloomington, Illinois, Public School Publishing Company, 1926.
- Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich. Pestalozzi's Address to His House. *Pestalozzi*. Lewis Flint. Anderson. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc, 1931.
- Reed, Ronald F., and Johnson, Tony W., Ed. *Philosophical Documents in Education*. New York, Addison-Wesley Longman, Inc., 2000.
- Rusk, Robert Robertson. *The Doctrines of the Great Educators*. London, Macmilland St. Martin's Press, 1969
- Smith, Bunnie Othanel., Stanley, William O., and Shores, J. Harlan. *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development*. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1957.
- Tennenbaum, Samuel. *William Heard Kilpatrick, Trail Blazer in Education*. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Tomlinson, Stephen. "From Rousseau to Evolutionism: Herbert Spencer on the Science of Education." *History of Education*, **25** (1996), 235-254.
- Vars, Gordon. "Integrated Curriculum in Historical Perspective". *Educational Leadership*, **49** (1991), 14-15.
- Vicencio, Evelyn. "Curriculum Integration". *Manila Bulletin* (February 2, 2007). Retrieved May 22, 2008 from <http://www.mb.com.ph/issues/2007/02/11/OPED2007021186855.html> May 22, 2008.
- Villanueva, Juliet Aleta. "A Model of an Integrated Social Studies Curriculum". A paper presented at the NOTED Tri-level Conference of Teachers and Educators, Manila, Philippines October 26-27, 2006.
- Wood, Karilyn E. *Interdisciplinary Instruction: A Practical Guide for Elementary and Middle School Teachers*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 2001.
- Wruga, Wilson. "Patterns of Interdisciplinary Curriculum Organization and Professional

Knowledge of the Curriculum Field." *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* **12**(1997): 95-97.