

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of
Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example
of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal
to a Particular National Context.**

Mary Jane Shuker

A thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at Massey
University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

December 2004

Abstract

There have been two distinct phases of the Montessori method of education in New Zealand. The first began in 1912 and continued into the 1950s. The second phase, starting in 1975, has resulted in over one hundred Montessori early childhood centres being established throughout the country. In this thesis I examined the historical evolution and contemporary status of Montessori schooling in New Zealand, as an adaptation of an alternative educational ideal to a particular national context.

To situate this study, the history of the Montessori movement was investigated, taking into consideration the particular character and personality of its founder, Dr. Maria Montessori (1870-1952). It is argued that the apparent contradictions of Montessori, who claimed to be both a scientific educator and a missionary, help explain the endurance of her method. The thesis further maintains that Montessori became a global educator whose philosophy and pedagogy transcends national boundaries. The middle section of this thesis examines the Montessori movement in New Zealand during the first phase and the second phase, highlighting the key role that individuals played in spreading Montessori's ideas. The major aim was to examine how Montessori education changes and adapts in different cultures and during different time frames. The thesis concentrates on New Zealand as a culturally specific example of a global phenomenon.

The final section of the thesis is a case study of a Montessori early childhood centre examining the influence of Government policy and how the development of the centre supports the ongoing implementation of Montessori's ideas. The perceptions of Montessori teachers, former parents and students regarding the nature and value of Montessori education are also considered. Finally, observations carried out as part of the case study are analysed to further demonstrate the ways in which the original ideas of Montessori have been reworked to suit a different historical and societal

context. It is concluded that Montessori is a global educator whose philosophy and pedagogy transcends national boundaries. Nonetheless, the integration of Montessori education within any country, including New Zealand, does result in a culturally specific Montessori education.

Acknowledgements

I acknowledge the following people for the support that I have received from them while undertaking this investigation:

First, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to all the research participants who gave so willingly of their time and thoughts. A special thanks goes to Binda Goldsbrough who shared so generously with me her memories, opinions and expertise.

I particularly thank my supervisors, Professor Joy Cullen and Professor Roger Openshaw, for their enduring patience and careful scrutiny of various drafts. Your detailed feedback and valued suggestions throughout this prolonged exercise were extremely helpful and much appreciated. I was grateful for your ongoing encouragement and guidance.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge and thank my family, Emma, Cameron and especially my partner, Roy, for his patience and support.

Table Of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction and Methodology.....	1
Research Questions and Method.....	3
Research Design.....	5
A Qualitative Approach.....	6
<i>Historical Research</i>	8
<i>The Case Study</i>	13
Sources.....	15
<i>Archival Records and Documentation</i>	15
<i>Interviews</i>	15
<i>Observation</i>	18
<i>Survey</i>	21
Ethical Considerations.....	22
<i>Informed Consent</i>	22
<i>Anonymity and Confidentiality</i>	22
<i>Participant's Right to Decline to Take Part</i>	23
<i>Interviews</i>	23
<i>Non-Participant Observation of the Administration</i>	23
<i>Direct Observation in the Classroom</i>	23
<i>Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Roles</i>	24
Organisation of Thesis.....	24

Part One: The Historical Background

Chapter 2: Maria Montessori and the Internationalisation of Her Method.....	27
Introduction.....	27
Montessori – The Early Years.....	29
<i>Medical Career</i>	31
An Eclectic Borrower.....	32
Special Education.....	36
<i>Scientist and Mystic</i>	33
Change of Direction.....	38
Establishment of the 'Children's Houses'.....	41
<i>Maternal Function</i>	42
<i>Parents' Obligations</i>	43
Trialling New Ideas.....	43
Conceptual Framework of Montessori's Ideas.....	45
Montessori's Writings.....	45
Fundamental Pedagogical Premises.....	50
The Montessori Method is a Scientific Approach to Education.....	51
<i>Spontaneous Activity</i>	54
The Four Planes of Development.....	55
<i>First Plane of Development – Birth to Six Years of Age</i>	56
The Montessori Programme.....	60

The Prepared Environment.....	61
Motor Education.....	62
Sensory Education.....	62
Language Education.....	63
Interpretation of Montessori’s Method: What is Montessori?.....	64
The Rapid Spread of Montessori’s Educational Ideas.....	66
<i>The Promise of the Children’s Houses</i>	67
<i>The Montessori Method</i>	68
Impact of the Movement.....	70
<i>Endorsement of the Montessori System</i>	71
The Hand of Commerce.....	72
World-wide Interest.....	73
<i>Early Childhood Sector</i>	75
Montessori’s Response to Criticism.....	76
Overseeing the Montessori Movement.....	77
<i>Training Montessori Teachers</i>	78
The “Failure” of the Montessori Method.....	84
Chapter Summary.....	87

Part Two: The Growth of Montessori in New Zealand – Past and Present

Chapter 3: The Montessori Movement in New Zealand – The First Phase.....	90
Introduction.....	90
Montessori’s Ideas Reach New Zealand.....	91
<i>Trialling Montessori’s Ideas in Australia</i>	92
<i>Travels to Europe and England</i>	94
Simpson’s Montessori Experiment at Blackfriars and its Impact on New Zealand.....	99
<i>Simpson’s Report on the Montessori Method of Education</i>	100
<i>Montessori’s Method Suitable for Older Children</i>	103
<i>Teacher Training</i>	103
<i>The Notion of Freedom for Children and for Teachers</i>	104
<i>Distribution of Simpson’s Report</i>	105
Implementing Montessori’s Method in New Zealand.....	105
<i>Kelburn Normal School</i>	105
<i>Wellesley Street Normal School, Auckland</i>	107
<i>Attaining the Montessori Didactic Materials</i>	109
The Wanganui Education Board.....	110
<i>Montessori Model Schools</i>	113
Other Education Board Districts.....	122
Catholic Montessori Schools.....	123
<i>Teacher Training</i>	125
Montessori’s Reception in the Early Childhood Sector.....	128
The ‘Failure’ of the Montessori Method in New Zealand.....	129
Chapter Summary.....	131
Chapter 4: Montessori – The Revival.....	132
Introduction.....	132

The North American Revival.....	133
The New Zealand Revival.....	142
Binda Goldsbrough and Her Role in Promoting Montessori Education in New Zealand.....	143
<i>Small Beginnings</i>	146
<i>Montessori Association of Christchurch (MAC)</i>	148
The Montessori Association of New Zealand.....	149
<i>Montessori Teacher Training Options</i>	152
Continued Growth of Montessori Schooling.....	157
Situating Montessori Within a Generic Degree Programme.....	163
Upgrading to a Degree or Diploma.....	164
<i>Implementing Te Whāriki</i>	165
Chapter Summary.....	167

Part Three: Montessori in Contemporary New Zealand

Chapter 5: The National and the Local: Government Policy and One Montessori Early Childhood Centre.....	168
Introduction.....	168
Education Policy Developments During the 1970s.....	168
The Establishment and Development of A Montessori Early Childhood Centre.....	172
<i>Early Beginnings</i>	174
<i>Montessori Gaining Momentum in New Zealand</i>	178
‘Playgroup’.....	181
Recruiting a Montessori Teacher.....	183
<i>Purchasing the Montessori Didactic Materials</i>	188
The Montessori Centre Opens.....	191
<i>Professional Staffing Policies</i>	193
<i>Other Concerns</i>	194
<i>Report on Early Childcare and Education</i>	195
Looking Ahead.....	196
<i>Major Fundraiser</i>	196
<i>Professional Development for Teachers</i>	197
<i>Promoting Montessori in the Wider Community</i>	197
<i>Montessori Workshop</i>	198
<i>Finding Qualified Staff</i>	199
New Directions.....	200
<i>Funding for the New Premise</i>	201
<i>Impact of Government Policies</i>	201
Montessori Events in the Wider Community.....	203
New Premises.....	205
More Changes.....	207
<i>Writing the Charter</i>	210
<i>Impact of the Charter</i>	212
<i>Another Staff Change</i>	214
<i>Life Member</i>	215
<i>The National Montessori Association</i>	216
New Ideas.....	216
<i>Second Classroom</i>	217

<i>Increase in Fees</i>	217
Reorganisation of the Management Structure.....	220
<i>Long Term Direction</i>	222
<i>Sub-Committees</i>	223
Administration Structure Addressed.....	224
Primary School Plans.....	225
Board of Trustee Model.....	228
Chapter Summary.....	233
Chapter 6: The Views of Teachers, Parents and Pupils.....	235
Introduction.....	235
How Parents Learnt About Montessori.....	235
How Montessori Teachers Learnt About Montessori.....	238
Reasons for Becoming Montessori Teachers.....	240
Selecting a Montessori Centre.....	241
Location of the Centre.....	243
Number of Children Per Class.....	244
Teacher-Child Ratio.....	245
The Montessori Philosophy, the Structured Environment and Specialised Materials.....	246
Age of Entry and Completion of the Programme.....	247
Advantages of Attending the Montessori Centre.....	248
Disadvantages of Attending the Montessori Centre.....	249
Teachers' Perception of How Successful Montessori Education Is.....	250
Montessori Teachers' Feedback from Parents.....	251
Feedback from Former Pupils.....	254
Former Pupils' Voices.....	255
Montessori Teachers' Interpretation of the Montessori Method.....	257
Discussion.....	261
Chapter Summary.....	262
Chapter 7: <i>Te Whāriki</i> and Its Impact on Montessori.....	264
Introduction.....	264
<i>Te Whāriki</i> – The Early Childhood Curriculum.....	264
Montessori Teachers' Response to <i>Te Whāriki</i>	269
The Impact of Quality in Action on Montessori Centres.....	271
Professional Development.....	277
The Case Study Montessori Programme.....	281
<i>The Learning Environment of the Case Study Centre</i>	282
<i>Teacher Records</i>	284
The Areas in a Montessori Centre.....	285
<i>Practical Life</i>	285
<i>Sensorial Education</i>	288
<i>Language Education</i>	290
<i>Mathematics</i>	292
<i>Cultural Area</i>	294
Discussion.....	294
Chapter Summary.....	296

Chapter 8: Conclusion: Montessori in Change: Towards a Theory of Cultural Adaptation.....	297
Introduction.....	297
Globalising Montessori: The First Phase.....	298
The Second Phase: Montessori Revived.....	302
New Zealand Montessori Experience.....	305
<i>The Role of Key Individuals</i>	306
<i>Government Policies</i>	307
<i>Programme Success/Appeal</i>	308
<i>Montessori Teachers</i>	309
Limitation of the Study and Future Directions for Research.....	310
<i>Primary and Secondary Montessori Education</i>	310
<i>Impact of Situating Montessori in a Generic Degree Programme</i>	311
General Conclusion.....	311
Bibliography.....	313
Appendices.....	349
Appendix A: Interview Schedules (Former Montessori Teachers, Parents and Pupils) – Information Sheet.....	349
Consent Form (Former Montessori Teachers and Parents).....	350
Consent Form (Former Pupils).....	351
Former Montessori Teachers’ Interview Schedule.....	352
Former Parents’ Interview Schedule.....	354
Former Pupils’ Interview Schedule.....	355
Appendix B: Survey of Current Montessori Teachers.....	356
Survey of Current Montessori Teachers.....	357
Appendix C: Information Letter for Experienced Montessori Teachers.....	361
Consent Form for Expert Group.....	363
Appendix D: Permission Forms for School Administrators – Information Sheet.....	364
Consent Form.....	366
Appendix E: Permission Forms to Observe Children – Information Sheet..	367
Consent Form.....	368
Appendix F: Permission Forms to Observe Teachers – Information Sheet..	369
Consent Form.....	371
Appendix G: Some Highlights in the Life of Dr. Maria Montessori.....	372
Appendix H: Rules and Regulations of the “Children’s Houses”.....	375
Appendix I: Montessori’s Critics and Advocates.....	376
Appendix J: Montessori Didactic Material.....	378
Appendix K: Winter Schedule.....	379
Appendix L: Montessori Training Institutes – Historical Perspective and Current Status.....	380
Appendix M: Binda Goldsbrough – A Life in Montessori.....	386
Appendix N: Agenda for National Montessori Meeting 1982.....	401
Appendix O: Montessori Schools Established by 1982.....	403
Appendix P: Montessori Topics.....	405
Appendix Q: List of Montessori Equipment.....	406

Chapter 1

Introduction and Methodology

This study examines the historical evolution and contemporary status of Montessori schooling in New Zealand, as an example of the adaptation of an alternative educational ideal to a particular national context. The examination of the Montessori method and its history in New Zealand and overseas provides an opportunity to investigate professional and public reactions to a specific early years curriculum model in relation to changing historical and societal circumstances and shifting educational thought. Moreover it allows for the examination of the circumstances that have supported the continuation of Montessori's early years curriculum over time.

The concept 'alternative', when applied to schools and educational systems implies a break with established practices characterising bureaucratised state and national systems of schooling. There has been considerable interest in how such alternatives are established and developed within contexts still dominated by State schooling (See Ignas & Corsini, 1979; Lucas, 1984).

The alternative method of education developed by Dr. Maria Montessori was first implemented in Rome, Italy in 1907, making it the oldest enduring early years curriculum model (Goffin & Wilson, 2001). Montessori's approach to early years education has survived despite challenges made to its underlying assumptions and practices. In New Zealand, like most other English speaking countries, Montessori's ideas and method were embraced with initial enthusiasm, followed by a gradual decline in interest over some decades, and then revived again in the mid-1970s. Petersen (1983) states that Montessori is the only method of education that has enjoyed two 'vogues'.

The history of the Montessori movement must also take into account Maria Montessori's particular character and her personality. She was an extremely

vain woman, regarding her method of education as a "personal triumph" (Cohen, 1972, p. 372). Montessori felt that her curriculum was complete as it was based on scientific results. She was a charismatic figure, with an extraordinarily vital and powerful personality, and many who heard Montessori speak became her worshipful followers. They were attracted to her in an almost fanatic, cultist way, and Montessori demanded from her followers a great deal of time, energy, and a total allegiance to her educational ideas. Montessori surrounded herself with devoted disciples, some of whom lived with her. They called her "mother", and existed "in and for her ideas as ardently and whole heartedly as nuns about an adored Mother Superior" (Fisher, 1920, p. 227). According to Hainstock (1997), the Montessori movement became characterised by this small, loyal band of followers who were personally devoted to Montessori and dedicated themselves to the spreading of her method of education. Along with Montessori they were totally committed to retaining the purity and integrity of her method, despite changes in society and an increasing professional knowledge base underpinning teaching practice.

However, Maria Montessori became a global educator. Her ideas were embedded in a world-wide system, whose philosophy and pedagogy transcends national boundaries. Despite this, it has been contended that the integration of Montessori education within any country results in a culturally specific Montessori education (Rambusch & Stoop, 1992). The major aim of this thesis is to examine how Montessori education changes and adapts in different cultures and during different time frames. The thesis concentrates on New Zealand as a culturally specific example of a global phenomenon.

In New Zealand as in the United States, Britain and Australia, the enthusiastic initial reception accorded Montessori teaching was replaced in the 1920s by what Cohen (1972, p. 358) terms "adoptive failure", where an educational innovation "is rejected by the target system due to deficiencies in resources and power or incongruence with existing target system norms and procedures".

During the first phase of Montessori in New Zealand the State infant schools adapted aspects of Montessori, which went towards supporting existing aims of education. The intention was not to challenge the State Education system. A brief history of the Montessori movement in England, from 1911 up until the mid-1920s, is included to illustrate this. The English experience had an impact on the implementation of Montessori education in New Zealand.

Initial interest in the Montessori system of education in New Zealand, along with the reemergence of interest after its “adopted failure”, illustrates the significance of historical timing. Montessori arrived on the international scene in the early 1900s when her ideas were embraced in relation to popular interest and societal need. In the early childhood sector, though, teachers and educators had just finished a stressful examination of their teaching practices and were less than willing to replace Froebel’s curriculum with another one they perceived to be even more rigid. Moreover, even with shared beliefs in science as a basis for early education and the importance of a child-centred approach, Montessori’s ideas were too dissonant from others emerging at that time (Hunt, 1964; May, 1997; Goffin & Wilson, 2001).

The North American revival of the Montessori movement in the late 1950s was a forerunner to its re-introduction into New Zealand in the mid-1970s. Parents wanting a different type of early childhood education for their children, other than state kindergarten or the parent cooperative playcentre, established Montessori as an alternative early childhood curriculum model. The Montessori revival in New Zealand is still in progress.

Research Questions and Method

The aim of this study is to examine the historical rise and fall, resurgence, and present nature and status of Montessori education in New Zealand. This discussion is situated within developments in mainstream education, especially

dominant ideas about pedagogy and curriculum. More specifically, the thesis considers a number of research questions.

Research Question 1

In what ways have the original ideas of Dr. Maria Montessori been reworked in New Zealand to suit a different historical and social context?

Sub-questions:

- Why was Montessori accepted as an 'alternative' method education worldwide in the early 1900s?
- What aspects of the Montessori method appealed to educationists who were adopting her philosophy?
- Why was the Montessori system being extensively tried throughout New Zealand, both in training colleges and schools, in the early 1900s, especially in the Wanganui region?
- Why did the Montessori method fail to maintain and consolidate its presence in New Zealand?
- Why was there a resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand in the late 1970s?
- How does the development of Montessori in New Zealand demonstrate the ways in which the social and historical context influences and shapes schooling?

Research Question 2

How have New Zealand Government policies influenced Montessori?

Sub-questions:

- How did Government policies influence Montessori at particular historical points?
- How did the underpinning theories and ideas of New Zealand's early childhood curriculum, *Te Whāriki*, introduced from 1996 affect the Montessori programme?

Research Question 3

What are the perceptions of present and former Montessori teachers, former parents, and former pupils in New Zealand of the nature and value of Montessori education, and their understanding of the Montessori philosophy?

Sub-questions:

- Why do people choose to become Montessori teachers?
- As perceived by current and former teachers, former parents and former pupils how well is Montessori education working in New Zealand, in terms of:
 - (a) the value of Montessori education; and
 - (b) children being prepared for the mainstream primary school system.
- What factors influence parents to send their children to Montessori schools?
- How did parents find the information on which they based their choice?

In addressing these research questions, a variety of methods were used: qualitative, historical, case study, interviews, survey and observations. The following section elaborates each of these approaches to the research.

Research Design

To address the research questions the research design for the study incorporated the following features:

- Historical research about Montessori's early life and work, and the development her method of education.
- Historical research about the two distinct phases of Montessori education in New Zealand, including a life history of a central figure.
- A case study of a Montessori early childhood centre, catering for children 2 1/2 to 5 years of age, located in a provincial city in New Zealand. The first class was established in March 1980 and it has since grown to four classrooms with 10 teachers, located on two sites. It is a non-profit, parent owned and operated centre, run by an Executive Committee, similar to a

primary school's Board of Trustees. The case study involved historical and contemporary research.

A Qualitative Approach

Qualitative research methods are used extensively in this thesis because it is primarily a case study with historical and contemporary dimensions. Denzin and Lincoln (2000, pp. 3-4) state that qualitative research:

Involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials - case study; personal experience; introspection; life story; interview; artifacts; cultural texts and productions; observation, historical, interaction, and visual texts - that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals' lives. Accordingly, qualitative researchers deploy a wide range on interconnected interpretive practices, hoping always to get a better understanding of the subject matter at hand.

According to Merriam (1998) the question of whether to use a qualitative case study for investigation, rather than other research strategies depends essentially on what the researcher wants to know. How a researcher defines the problem and the questions it raises determine a study's design. "In general, 'what' questions may either be exploratory (in which case any of the strategies could be used) or about prevalence (in which surveys or the analysis of archival records would be favored). 'How' and 'why' questions are likely to favor the use of case studies, experiments, or histories" (Yin, 1994, p. 7). 'How' and 'why' questions are the focus of this study, using both historical research and a case study approach.

There were several characteristics of qualitative research that figured prominently in this study. First, the research is mainly concerned with process rather than outcomes or products. Second, I am "interested in understanding

the meaning people have constructed", assuming meaning was embedded in people's experiences, and that this is mediated through my own perceptions (Merriam, 1998, p. 6).

A third characteristic of qualitative research is the importance of the researcher's role, as she or he is the primary instrument for the collection of information and analysis. When gathering data I was responsive to the context, sensitive to non-verbal aspects, and had the ability to consider the total context, process data immediately, clarify and summarise as the study evolved (Guba & Lincoln, 1981).

Another aspect of qualitative research is that fieldwork is usually involved. I was able to go to the people and the Montessori early childhood centre to observe behaviour in its natural environment.

Two other significant aspects of qualitative research that characterise it from quantitative work are qualitative description and induction. Using qualitative research, I am interested in process, meaning, and comprehension. Words or pictures were used rather than numbers to communicate what was learnt in a descriptive manner. Finally, qualitative research is primarily inductive. Such research "builds abstractions, concepts, hypotheses, or theories, rather than testing existing theory" (Merriam, 1998, p. 7).

Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg (1991, pp. 6-7) argue that there are several fundamental lessons that can be learnt by using case study research in education. Each of the following three points applied to this study. First, case studies allow the grounding of observations and concepts about social structures in natural settings, which are studied at close range. Second, it provides data from a variety of sources and over a period of time, which permits a more "holistic study of complex social networks and of complexes of social action and social meanings" (p. 6). Third, case studies can provide the

dimensions of time and history to the study of social life, which allows the research to examine continuity and change in lifeworld patterns. Finally, it can encourage and facilitate, in practice, theoretical innovation and generalisation.

I was aware that there are certain attributes important for carrying out successful qualitative research. Yin (1994) delineates five research skills for the conduct of case studies specifically. The first is an inquiring mind and the ability to ask good questions, as well as interpret the answers. The second is listening, and assimilating the new information without bias. Third is adaptability and flexibility to accommodate unanticipated events and to change data collection activities if preliminary analysis points to additional or alternative sources. Fourth is a firm grasp of the issues being studied, whether theoretical in nature or policy issues, as judgements have to be made during the collection of data. The researcher must be able to determine, for example, if different sources of data contradict one another and if additional sources are necessary. The fifth quality is lack of bias in interpreting the data. Yin (1994) suggests that the researcher should be sensitive and responsive to contrary findings. Throughout the research process I took cognisance of these points.

Historical Research

Historical research is in essence both descriptive and analytical, and elements of historical research and case study often merge. Yin (1994, p. 8) discusses the two approaches:

Histories are the preferred strategy when there is virtually no access or control. Thus the distinctive contribution of the historical method is in dealing the "dead" past - this is, when no relevant persons are alive to report, even retrospectively, what occurred, and when an investigator must rely on primary documents, secondary documents, and cultural and physical artifacts as the main sources of evidence. Histories can, of course, be done about contemporary events; in this situation, the strategy begins to overlap with that of the case study.

The case study is preferred in examining contemporary events, but when the relevant behaviors cannot be manipulated. The

case study relies on many of the same techniques as a history, but it adds two sources of evidence not usually included in the historian's repertoire: direct observation and systematic interviewing. Again, although case studies and histories can overlap, the case study's unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence - documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations - beyond what might be available in the conventional historical study.

As Wiersma (1995, p. 231) puts it, historical research is a "systematic process of searching for the facts and then using the information to describe, analyze, and interpret the past". The process of historical research, then, is primarily qualitative in nature. The historical discussion of this thesis utilised primary sources along with historical and philosophical literature on educational change.

Historical research deals with past events, which occur for the most part, in natural rather than contrived settings. The context of the primary sources must be emphasised in their interpretation. In historical research interpretation takes on special importance because the events that have occurred did so before the decision was made to study them. Nonetheless, as documents were produced those preparing them had a particular aim and audience in mind. McCulloch and Richardson (2000, pp. 79-80) note that it is important for the researcher "to seek to understand these in order to appreciate the perspective adopted by the author, and therefore the potential biases and interests involved". When researchers use the documents, interpretation takes place. However, it is important to note that Edson (1988, p. 51) argues, "there is no single, definable method of historical inquiry". He states that historians employ a method, or various approaches, to deal with historical information, but history has no particular method. This has occurred because historical research "tends to be a rather holistic process in which there is considerable overlap of activities" (Wiersma, 1995, p. 235). For example, interpretation is involved throughout the process not only when making value judgments concerning the genuineness of sources but also when determining the relevance of the sources (Yin, 1994).

According to Wiersma (1995) historical research involves four overlapping strategies, each of which formed part of this study. The first step was selecting a topic. This involved preliminary consideration of the significance of Montessori education in New Zealand, and insuring the adequacy of surviving related records. McCulloch and Richardson (2000, p. 80) note that this is "still the most broadly characteristic requirement of such research". Data collection involved a review of historical records on Montessori philosophy and practice and the subsequent implementation and development of this 'alternative' approach within Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The collection and evaluation of primary sources, and the synthesis of information from primary sources, were the second and third steps. This involved deciding which primary sources were first-hand accounts of the Montessori philosophy and practice, and which were secondary.

When examining primary sources, Edson (1988, p. 53) cautions that "because the standard of judgement for a historical work is extrinsic (in the sense of whether it is congruent or compatible with the surviving record), historians, unlike novelists, must possess an overriding commitment to the available evidence". Furthermore, the historical record is usually incomplete, fragmentary, ambiguous, and even faulty. Thus, researchers must not accept passively and uncritically all that has been preserved about past events. Instead, historians must confirm their "allegiance to the evidence by actively subjecting historical records to analysis, validation, comparison, and criticism" (Edson, 1988, p. 53).

Given that historians are required to interact with the information they gather, interpretation is inescapable. Edson (1988) maintains that even when historians try to suspend beliefs in familiar convictions and become more aware of their assumptions, it is impossible to escape all preconceived notions and theories.

He feels, however, that even if "historians cannot be purely objective in their treatment of sources, they can approach historical evidence with an open mind.... Historians who do not approach evidence with an open mind are often unable to recognize that sources are sometimes mute or ambiguous concerning the questions that interest them most, and thus they are liable to shape or subordinate that evidence to fit their own understanding" (Edson, 1988, p. 53). When interacting with primary sources I was committed to objectivity as a value or an ideal, not as an outcome or an attainment. For instance, the first research question posed, to what extent has Montessori been reworked in the New Zealand context, could only be fully developed after shifting through the written and oral material. Only then did I began to appreciate the very different cultural context in which Montessori was developing - middle class parents, the tendency of New Zealanders to work through committees at grassroots level, the close links between communities and schools, all of which tended to impact upon Montessori education.

After examining the primary sources, Wiersam's (1995) final step in historical research is analysis and interpretation, with the formulation of conclusions. Given that historians view the past with the "same eyes" that are used to comprehend the present, it is important that when explaining historical evidence they avoid what is known as the "perils of presentism" (Edson, 1988, p. 53); that is, superimposing their present-day comprehension and answers on the past. As historical explanation is undertaken to achieve perspective, not to provide prescription, I was careful not to elevate my beliefs about the Montessori system of education into "facts or to inflate partial insights into truths" (Edson, 1988, p. 53).

According to McCulloch and Richardson (2000, pp. 13-14), recently there has been the emergence of "a new form of historical study which is strongly reliant on a combination of the fieldwork methods of qualitative research in the social sciences". Labelled 'life history', 'biography', 'policy' and 'narrative research',

these forms are only loosely inspired by traditional historical methods, taking some of the traditional interests and skills of the historian and applying these to social theory in education. A life history approach was part of this investigation. The researcher carried out a number of in-depth interviews with Binda Goldsbrough, a central figure in the revival of the Montessori method of education in New Zealand in during the mid-1970s. A discussion of her life provided a personal perspective on Maria Montessori and her own role in the Montessori movement in England and in New Zealand. Goldsbrough's work in New Zealand exemplifies the crucial role played by key individuals in developing alternative educational philosophies.

McCulloch and Richardson (2000) state that while there is agreement that methods such as life histories are descriptive and mainly qualitative as opposed to scientific or experimental. "There is debate about the extent to which they are rooted in the traditional 'humanistic' method of history or in the techniques and interpretative frames of social science" (p. 14). Furthermore they maintain that a large percent of "contemporary educationalists are more interested in, comfortable with and competent to undertake the latter methodology; moreover, most are also content to combine at will research methods and techniques from very different traditions"(McCulloch & Richardson, 2000, p. 14). Discussions of life histories remain almost absent in general research methods texts. Instead they are represented in growing numbers in edited collection of essays concerned with qualitative research in education (Tierney, 2000). This research partially overcame the difficulties faced by contemporary educationists by using multiple research strategies.

In summary, historical research is a systematic process of reconstructing what happened in the past, and interpreting the meaning of events. Historical research was necessary to define the status of Montessori education in the past and its meaning in relation to the present day resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand.

The Case Study

A qualitative approach was used for the analysis of the contemporary Montessori situation, through a case study of a Montessori early childhood centre located in the North Island. A case study is defined as:

An in-depth, multifaceted investigation, using qualitative research methods, of a single social phenomenon. The study is conducted in great detail and often relies on the use of several data sources..In case study research the nature of the social phenomenon studies has varied. It can be an organization; it can be a role, or role-occupants; it can be a city; it can even be an entire group of people. The case study is usually seen as an instance of a broader phenomenon, as part of a larger set of parallel instances (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991, p. 2).

There are several types of qualitative research that have been termed, or connected to, case studies. Each informed my case study of a Montessori centre to varying extents. The first of these is ethnography. The term ethnography has been used interchangeably with fieldwork, case study, qualitative research, and so forth (Ely, Anzul, Friedman, Garner, & McCormack Steinmetz, 1991). For anthropologists, though, the term has two distinct meanings. Ethnography is a set of methods used to collect material, and it is the written record that is the end result of using ethnographic techniques. Ethnographic techniques refer to the strategies researchers use to collect information such as interviewing, documentary analysis, life history, investigator diaries, and participant observation. Merriam (1998), however, states that using such techniques does not necessarily produce ethnography in the second meaning of the word. She claims ethnography is a sociocultural interpretation of the information. Using analytic descriptions or reconstructions of participants' symbolic meanings and patterns of social interaction, "ethnographies recreate for the reader the shared beliefs, practices, artifacts, folk knowledge, and behaviors of some group of people" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 2). My case study draws on ethnographic methods, but does not comprise a full ethnography because of restrictions on time in the field.

As Merriam (1988, p. 23) concludes, an ethnographic case study is more than an "intensive, holistic description and analysis of a social unit or phenomenon". The emphasis is on the sociocultural analysis of the phenomenon under study. Thus, it is this concern with the cultural context that sets this kind of research apart from other qualitative inquiry.

A second type of qualitative research procedure, which can also take the form of a case study, is the historical case study. When doing this research, I employed techniques common to historiography, principally the use of primary source facts. Merriam (1988) states that the main emphasis of historical case studies, organisational or otherwise, is the notion of investigating the event over a period of time. In this research I used archival records to present a holistic description and analysis of a specific event, but from a historical perspective.

A third type is the examination of life histories, an approach that was part of this study. According to Merriam (1988) researchers employ concepts, theories, and measurement techniques from psychology in investigating educational problems. In agreement with McCulloch and Richardson (2000), she states that case studies in education also draw upon theory and technique from sociology to examine the sociobiography of a particular social type or social role.

Numerous traditions, then, from sociology, history, anthropology to psychology have all influenced the theory and methods of case studies in education. Overall, however, what situates these case studies in education is their "focus on questions, issues, and concerns broadly related to teaching and learn. The setting, delivery system, curriculum, student body, and theoretical orientation may vary widely, but the general arena of education remains central to these studies" (Merriam, 1988, p. 27).

Yin (1994) maintains that data collection for case studies relies on many sources of evidence. Nonetheless, there are six important sources: archival records, documentation, interview, direct observation, participant-observation, and physical artifact (p. 78). He argues that no single source is advantaged over all the others. The various sources are highly complementary, hence a good case study will utilise as many sources as possible. In this study archival records, documentation, interviews and direct observation were used, and the following section considers the utility of each.

Sources

Archival Records and Documentation

Archival records, as already discussed, were relevant for the historical discussion for this thesis. Documentation was utilised in this case study, both for the historical and contemporary sections. The type of information used included Department of Education archives, library archives, case study centre minutes, newsletters, books, academic journal articles, and unpublished theses. Documents were carefully used to verify and augment evidence from other sources. Documents were important as they played an explicit role in the gathering of information in doing this case study.

Interviews

I share Yin's (1994) view that the interview is one of the most important sources of case study information. Focused interviews involving former and current Montessori teachers, former parents and former pupils were used in this research. This meant that certain types of information were wanted from all interviewees but the "particular phrasing of questions and their order are redefined to fit the characteristics of each respondent" (Denzin, 1989, p. 105).

The founding parents and subsequent Committees of the case study centre kept records [enrolment forms] of children who attended from its origins (see Chapter 5). In order to interview former pupils and their parents or guardians

I first obtained permission from the Executive Committee of the Montessori case study centre to view the records, and then compiled a list of potential interviewees.

To select a sample of former pupils that would be a representative cross-section of the whole group being studied I used stratified sampling. This was to ensure that former pupils had an equal chance of being selected in relation to their proportion within the total student population. Although stratified sampling adheres to the underlying principle of randomness, boundaries are added to the process of selection and randomness is applied within these boundaries (Denscombe, 1998). Accordingly I divided the former student list into a number of groups, according to gender, age, and a two-year period, based on the average time a child attended the centre. As the case study early childhood centre expanded in 1998, building another site on the other side of the city, it was decided to use that as the cut off point. The list contained 593 names but many of the former pupils' current addresses were unavailable. This was due to families moving overseas, or addresses not listed in phone book. In addition, children's enrolment forms were not updated once they left the centre, and there was also a high incidence of separated or divorced parents. If the parents and child selected were unable to be contacted the next name on the list was approached.

Once the sample was chosen I made contact via the telephone to explain the nature of the research. When the participants expressed interest in the study they were posted out the Information Sheet and the Consent Form (See Appendix A - Information Sheet, Consent Form and Interview Schedules (Former Montessori Teachers, Parents, and Pupils). This was followed up with another phone call to make an appointment to do the interview. Eighteen former pupils and parents were interviewed. All the interviews I undertook were transcribed and I then organised excerpts from the transcripts into categories or themes, searching for connecting threads and patterns among

them. The ethical considerations involved will be discussed at the end of this section.

When preparing for interviews, Saran (1985, p. 221) stresses that for all stages it is vital to draw on one's existing knowledge of the research topic. This was useful in designing the interview schedules and creating the list of former and current key Montessori teachers at the case study centre and nationally, all personally known to me. Like the former pupils and parents, consent was sought to interview the teachers via the telephone. When they expressed interest I sent them information about the research (See Appendix A - Information Sheet, Consent Form and Interview Schedules (Former Montessori Teachers, Parents, and Pupils). A further phone call was made to make a time to carry out the interview. Six Montessori teachers were interviewed.

Messor (1985) makes the important observation that who the interviewer is can influence and even determine the kind of data that is obtained. She points out a number of factors, age, gender, and ethnicity are probably the most significant. According to Messor (1985, p. 74) there is a need to 'stay bland' during research, problems can arise over how much of one's self to reveal. "Building rapport and then relationships necessarily entails giving information about one's own life and interests". The interviews were particularly useful at producing data that was in depth and detailed. It was helpful that I knew most of the interviewees and we had enough basic viewpoints in common.

Yin (1994) recommends that interviews should always be considered verbal reports only. They are subject to the problems of bias, poor recall, and poor or inaccurate articulation. It is important, therefore, to corroborate interview material with information from other sources. Triangulation is one of the most frequently cited tactics for the validation of data (Denzin, 1989; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Stake (1994, p. 241) states that triangulation has been generally considered a "process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning, verifying the reputability of an observation or interpretation". Nonetheless, one must acknowledge that no observations or interpretations are perfectly repeatable. Consequently, triangulation serves also to clarify meaning by identifying distinct ways the phenomenon is being seen.

One of the major advantages of using a case study approach is that it allows for the use of a variety of research methods. Along with interviews, observations, direct and non-participant, a survey, oral history, archival records and documents were used in this investigation. Using multiple sources of evidence in this case study allowed me to see things from a different perspective and provided the opportunity to corroborate findings to enhance the validity of the data.

Observation

A non-participant observation approach was utilised to examine the current administration of the Montessori early childhood centre used for the case study. This involved attendance at monthly meetings over an eighteen month period and analysing the minutes. Non-participant observation is an important means of collecting information in case study research. It provides a firsthand account of the programme under study and, when combined with interviewing, observation, and document analysis, it allows for a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon under investigation.

Direct observations of the teachers and children in the Montessori early childhood centre was also part of this study, whereby I investigated the extent to which the Montessori programme was being implemented. In particular, I was interested in whether teachers' stated goals corresponded to the implementation of the programme goals.

I used a holistic approach with narrative recording to provide detailed descriptions of what had been observed in the overall programme. According to Pellegrini (1996, pp. 149-150) "narratives are descriptions of behaviors that include some reference to the ways in which the behaviors unfold across time". The type of narrative system used to observe the teachers and children was specimen records, which are "continuous, sequential recordings that occur in specific situations" (Pellegrini, 1996, p. 155). These indicated not only the extent that teachers' activity goals matched the actual occurrence of children's activity experiences, but also described and offered an analysis of the nature of such activities, highlighting points of strength and of weakness (Blenkin & Kelly, 1992; Cole, Clark, Hirschheimer, Martyn & Morrall, 2001; Helm, Beneke & Steinheimer, 1998). The observations were carried out during the morning session in two-week blocks, over four different periods in the 1999 school year. Each observation was three hours long, giving a total of 120 hours observation. Merriam (1988, p. 91) states that there is no 'ideal' amount of time when doing an observation study nor is there a preferred pattern of observation. Depending on the situation, observation over an extended period of time is more appropriate.

As Adler and Adler (1994, p. 378) note, "one of the hallmarks of observation has traditionally been its noninterventionism. Observers neither manipulate nor stimulate their subjects. They do not ask the subjects research questions, pose tasks for them, or deliberately create new provocations". Furthermore, most of the major research treatments of qualitative methods "focus on participant observation to the virtual exclusion of observation as a method in its own right" (Adler & Adler, 1994, p. 378).

Accordingly, I did not want to influence the children during the observation. Nonetheless their natural curiosity with another adult in the classroom inevitably affected their normal pattern of behaviour. When children approached me to find out what I was doing, I explained that I was doing 'my

work', writing about what they were doing and asked if that was acceptable with them.

There are many reasons why a researcher gathers information through observation. By observing, the researcher may notice things that have become routine to the early childhood educators themselves, which may lead to a better understanding of the context. This research confirmed these advantages. I was able to see things firsthand, using my own knowledge and expertise in interpreting what was being observed. Finally, by observing, I was able to record behaviour as it occurs naturally in the early childhood setting.

What is to be observed depends on the research question, but where I focused my attention could not be determined ahead of time. Merriam (1998) recommends that the focus be allowed to emerge, and she suggests that this may change over the course of the investigation.

As I was unable to observe everything, there had to be starting point. I followed a checklist provided by various qualitative researchers (Merriam, 1998; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Patton, 1980). First, I described the setting. For example, what was the physical environment of the centre like? Second, I described the participants. How many children attended? How many teachers were there? Third, the activities and interactions that occur in the setting were noted. For example, how did the children interact with each other? Fourth, I stated the frequency and duration of particular situations while observing. Fifthly, information about the planned programme was gained through discussions with the teachers before the children arrived. A written plan of the week's activities was also obtained. Finally, I was aware of subtle factors such as informal and unplanned activities in the early childhood environment.

Survey

A survey of all Montessori teachers currently teaching in New Zealand was carried out. A postal survey was sent to members of the Teachers Division of the Montessori Association of New Zealand (See Appendix B - Survey of Current Montessori Teachers). This was undertaken to gauge Montessori teachers' perceptions of the nature and value of Montessori education, including how well Montessori education is working in New Zealand and how successful it has been in preparing children for the mainstream primary school system. The questionnaire also provided information on why people choose to become Montessori teachers. This method produced large amounts of data, and allowed respondents anonymity, thereby encouraging frankness.

The Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC) requested that I personally did not distribute the postal survey as I was an active member of the Association. The survey was sent to the president of the Teachers Division of the Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc. who distributed 160 questionnaires and collected them on my behalf. Due to the strict requirements, established by MUHEC, I was unable to follow up on respondents who had yet to fill in their questionnaires. Reflecting this the response rate was disappointing low at 23 percent. Consequently it was necessary to strengthen the results by undertaking further data collection to strengthen the data base. One way to accomplish this was to invite experienced Montessori teachers currently teaching in New Zealand to comment on the findings thus far.

I contacted the Teachers Division of the Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc. for a list of teachers currently teaching in New Zealand and selected twelve experienced Montessori teachers from the list. All had taught for some years and I presumed they would have a strong and well-developed sense of their philosophy along with a long-term perspective of development of Montessori in New Zealand. The participants were accessed from two groups:

- Those teachers who volunteered to provide further information when they submitted their questionnaire (6); and
- An expert group consisting of leaders in Montessori education who were currently teaching (6).

(See Appendix C - Information Letter for Experienced Montessori Teachers and Consent Form for Expert Group.)

Summaries of the main findings of the postal survey were sent out in October 2002 to the selected teachers inviting them to comment on the findings thus far. Five teachers returned their postal questionnaires, a response rate of 42 percent.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for this study was sought from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC) in March 1998. Approval was given on 28 July 1998 when the following ethical considerations outlined to the MUHEC were met:

Informed Consent

I informed all participants of the objectives of the investigation. The research involved persons under sixteen years of age and consent was obtained from parents or guardians.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

The data collected was treated as confidential and the names of the participants remain anonymous. When writing up the case study, pseudonyms were used for all participants and the name of the Montessori early childhood centre was not given, as stipulated by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC). Due to the specific group, total anonymity may not be guaranteed and participants were advised of this. I requested permission to use the names of key Montessorians, if participants agreed to be identified. Those who were asked gave written permission.

Participant's Right to Decline to Take Part

Participation in the research was voluntary and those persons who agreed to participate had the right to withdraw if they wished. If participants did withdraw they had the right to require that their own data, including recordings, be destroyed. The participant's right to decline was clearly indicated in the Information Sheet. No one declined or withdrew from this study.

Interviews

The focused interviews were taped with the participants' written permission, and they were assured that they would remain anonymous. The transcripts of the taped interviews were shown to the participants to verify that it was a correct record, which gave them the opportunity to change it. The original interviews were retained by me for archival purposes or returned to participants after a certain time period if so requested.

Non-Participant Observation of the Administration

I obtained authorisation from the Executive committee of the Montessori early childhood centre to examine the current administration. The Executive Committee needed to accept an invitation to participate in the process before consent was gained from individual participants. Each member of the Executive Committee was given an Information Sheet and a Consent Form to fill out (See Appendix D - Permission forms for school administrators). All members signed their form, which was a requirement from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, before I could proceed with the case study.

Direct Observation in the Classroom

Negotiating permission to observe in the centre was carried out with an initial approach to the Executive committee of the Montessori early childhood centre. Obtaining permission from the teachers and then the parents or guardians of

the children attending the centre followed this. (See Appendix E – Permission forms to observe children; Appendix F – Permission forms to observe teachers). Written permission was given for the observation of the teachers and from parents or guardians for their children. The teachers were assured that they would remain anonymous as well as the names of the children in the classroom.

Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Roles

According to Robson (1993) good case study researchers should be unbiased by preconceived notions, along with those derived from theory. Researchers, therefore, should be sensitive and responsive to contrary findings. This was an important consideration here, in that I was a qualified Montessori teacher and a supporter of the organisation being studied. Furthermore, at the time the research was conducted I was a lecturer in early childhood teacher education, training kindergarten and childcare educators. I was conscious that my subjective position impacted on how I analysed and interpreted the data.

Organisation of Thesis

The remainder of the thesis is organised in three parts. Part I, consisting of Chapter 2, focuses on Dr. Maria Montessori's life and the initial Montessori movement, and her method. It places Dr. Montessori's early life and the development of her early childhood curriculum model in a historical context. The circumstances that supported the rapid interest in and transmission of her ideas, particularly in Britain and the United States are examined. Also identified are the reasons for the rapid decline of the Montessori movement, using the history of the English Montessori situation to illustrate this. In this chapter Montessori's theory and philosophy is examined, providing the rationale for her model of education.

Part II, which includes Chapters 3 and 4, examines the Montessori movement in New Zealand, the first phase and the revival. During the first phase Montessori's ideas had an impact on New Zealand infant schools, in particular during the second decade and up until the 1930s. This was largely due to the work and influence of Martha Simpson in Sydney. Montessori's influence in New Zealand and Australia did not occur after adaptation in England, like so many other new ideas. Instead Montessori's ideas came through the study of her books and direct contact with her in Rome.

The re-emergence of Montessori education in New Zealand is the focus of Chapter 4. As necessary background to this, however, I examine the North American revival of the Montessori movement, which preceded its re-introduction into New Zealand in the mid-1970s. Binda Goldsbrough worked with Maria Montessori in 1939 and 1946, before moving to New Zealand in 1951. Along with providing a personal perspective on Montessori and her own role in the Montessori movement both in England and New Zealand, she is the key figure in the second phase of Montessori education. As such she is an integral part of the focus of Chapter 4.

Part 3 of the thesis comprises the case study, Chapters 5 through 7. Chapter 5 examines the establishment of a Montessori early childhood centre during the second phase of the Montessori movement, which began in the mid-1970s. The main aim was to investigate how the policies and practices of the administration (effectively those running the centre) supported the delivery of the educational programme in accordance with the Montessori philosophy. The current administration of the centre was also examined.

In Chapter 6 Montessori teachers', parents' and former pupils' perceptions of the nature and value of Montessori education and their understanding of the Montessori philosophy is explored. In particular this chapter looks at how well Montessori education is working in New Zealand and the relative effectiveness

of the Montessori curriculum model in preparing children for mainstream primary education.

The ways in which the original ideas of Dr. Maria Montessori have been reworked to suit a different historical and social context with particular attention to *Te Whāriki* were examined through direct observation of the teachers and children in the classroom. This is the focus of Chapter 7.

In conclusion, Chapter 8 discusses the main findings and limitations of the study.

**Part One:
The Historical
Background**

Chapter 2

Maria Montessori and the Internationalisation of Her Method

Introduction

In this chapter Dr. Maria Montessori's early life and work in relation to her personality, work and teaching is examined to outline how her ideas about how children learn and develop were proposed and received. Montessori achieved enormous impact worldwide but she soon became marginalised by the educational establishment. To explore these issues in depth, Montessori's personality and career is examined along with the significance of her claim to scientific authority (she was a medical doctor, one of the first women to qualify as such). Of significance, too, was Montessori's natural charisma and gender.

The influence of Montessori and the development of her early years curriculum model must be examined against the interplay of economic, social and cultural conditions that underlie developments in educational practice. As Cunningham (2000, p. 203) puts it: "individual theorists and practitioners make their impact....by means that are themselves culturally specific, working within or outside an established system of schooling, conveying ideas and exerting influence in a whole variety of ways".

Montessori's method gave considerable impetus to progressive ideas in the early decades of the twentieth century, particularly as they applied to the education of young children. Montessori devised the methods, apparatus and practical activities designed to foster the self-development of children and promote freedom for this development to occur. The Montessori method is the only curriculum model where a single individual was responsible for developing the conceptual framework as well as the template for its implementation (Goffin & Wilson, 2001; Turner, 1992).

When Montessori's method was first implemented it was a comprehensive programme for poor children. As the method gained popularity and became an international phenomenon, it attracted more affluent families. The comprehensive child care services, including children's nutritional and health care needs were excluded (Montessori, 1912/1964). The shift to a narrower curriculum was reinforced by the emphasis placed on Montessori's method and her didactic materials by her followers, rather than on Montessori's insights about children and their families. The patenting of the didactic materials further promoted that they, rather than Montessori's pedagogical premises, were the central focus of her method. In addition, this shift was facilitated by the complexities involved with replicating Montessori's method in different community contexts.

When she was forty years old, Montessori made a full-time commitment to disseminating her ideas and to train teachers in her method. As Goffin and Wilson (2001, p. 38) point out, Montessori's method "appears to be the first curriculum model carefully and intentionally mass-marketed for dissemination and replication". This ownership along with the method's implementation may help explain Montessori's ongoing attempts to retain total control over how her method would be disseminated and the use of the Montessori didactic materials. She dedicated herself to this work from 1916 until 1952, the year of her death. (See Appendix G - Some highlights in the life of Maria Montessori).

In order to devote her energies full-time to the Montessori movement, Montessori made the decision in 1916 to give up all her other roles as physician, university professor, and classroom teacher. Her official biographer, E.M. Standing, wrote about this in the following passage, approved by Montessori herself. "Her mission in life was now no longer a vague sense of something to come: it had crystallized out.... she felt the duty of going forth as an apostle on behalf of all the children in the world, born and as yet unborn,* to preach for their rights and their liberation" (Standing, 1962, p. 61). This decision, however,

had certain consequences. In order to support herself financially, Montessori became dependent on the money received from her training courses, royalties from her books and the sale of her didactic materials, which meant that her activities were linked with commercial as well as academic and professional interests from early on.

According to Goffin and Wilson (2001), this quote begins to reveal the task of explaining and comprehending the Montessori method. Maria Montessori was a physician, anthropologist, educator and mystic. Montessori stated that she was both a scientific educator and a missionary. When examining these last two roles in this chapter one is aware that they have contradictory characteristics. Such contradictions are also present in Montessori's writings. Nonetheless the endurance of Montessori's method might be explained by apparent contradictions. First, Montessori stated that her method was a scientific approach, which gave it both prestige and presumed validity to early years education. Second, the method was associated with an emotional fervor that accompanies what both Kramer (1988) and Cohen (1974) labeled cultist.

Montessori – The Early Years

Maria Montessori was born in the town of Chiaravalle in the province of Ancona, Italy on August 31, 1870. She was the only child of well-educated and liberal-minded, middle-class parents.

In 1877, seven years after Montessori's birth, a new law was passed to establish compulsory primary education for males and females in free nondenominational schools. Traditionally, female education had been private, the business of the family and the Church. Now public girls' schools were founded, as were normal schools, to train secular teachers for the new system of public instruction. The early hopes of these reforms, and their lack of impact, had an effect on Montessori's education as a female and her subsequent

career as a social reformer, particularly her support of gender equality (Kramer, 1988).

When Montessori was five the family moved to Rome which provided more possibilities for her future education. She eventually chose to gain a qualification in medicine, as she had become increasingly interested in the biological sciences. There was general disapproval, particularly from her father, but her mother supported her in this ambition, as she did in many others throughout Montessori's life (Kramer, 1988).

Montessori enrolled in the University of Rome in the fall of 1890 as a student of physics, mathematics, and natural sciences. When she passed her examinations in the Spring of 1892, she was eligible, except for the fact that she was a woman, to begin the actual study of medicine. She persisted until she was accepted. There is no record of how she managed this. One account states that Pope Leo XIII interceded on her behalf. Another story is that they misread her name as Mario (Cunningham, 2000; Kramer, 1988; Newby, 1991).

In the 1890s when Montessori studied at the University of Rome it was regarded as "a seedbed of Marxist thought" (Kramer, 1988, p. 36). Studying in such an atmosphere influenced Montessori "to think in terms of social reform, not just of how to use her newly acquired status and skills to organize her own life but to make a contribution to society" (Kramer, 1988, p.36). This was evident in *The Montessori Method* (1912/1964) where she outlined her socialist views on how "the transformation of the house must compensate for the loss in the family of the presence of the woman who has become a social wage-earner" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 67).

Montessori impressed the faculty with her seriousness and ability, and in June 1894, her second year in medicine and surgery, she won the coveted Rolli Prize and the scholarship that went with it. Adding to the scholarships she

continued to win each year by doing private tutoring, she was able to pay most of her own way through medical school (Kramer, 1988; Standing, 1962).

Her fellow students resented her at first and initially did what they could to make her life miserable. They shunned her, made contemptuous noises when they passed her in the corridors, and talked about her with open hostility. They were soon to discover, though, that she was not to be frightened away. She confronted her tormentors with such courage that in time persecution was changed to a sort of grudging admiration.

“In those days” (I once heard Montessori remark) “I felt as if I could have done anything”; and certainly it seemed that – for her – difficulties existed simply to be overcome (Standing, 1962, p. 22).

Medical Career

In July 1896 Montessori was awarded her Diploma in Medicine and Surgery. A month after her graduation Montessori was chosen to be part of a delegation to represent Italy at an International Women’s Conference in Berlin. Montessori played a major role at the conference. Of the five hundred women attending the Congress, to draw attention to the condition of women and to fight for reforms, it was Montessori who captured the interest of the press when she spoke to the Congress voicing her concerns about the injustices against women. Montessori’s speeches were enthusiastically received and the press singled her out (Kramer, 1988). It helped that Montessori was young, attractive, intelligent and an eloquent speaker.

Press articles about her published in Germany, France, and Italy. Many of them commented on:

Her elegant and genial appearance, her lady-like bearing, her charm and beauty...This physician-surgeon graces the speaker’s podium as if it were a box at the theatre, and all the large questions she talks about – the emancipation of the peasant and factory women, the economic and legal rights of married women are discussed in a Rome accent that sounds like music (Kramer, 1988, p. 55).

Montessori was a charismatic figure who spoke without notes yet managed to captivate her audiences. "She had a presence, a combination of charm and conviction, that attracted those who heard her speak in a way that her writings alone could never had done" (Kramer, 1988, p. 264). Renilde Montessori, the grand-daughter of Montessori, recalls that "she was very short and everyone remembered her as being very tall...She had an extraordinarily vital and powerful personality. A most striking characteristic was her almost visible intelligence and interest in everything around her" (Montessori, R., 1988).

Montessori returned from the Congress determined to stay out of the news and concentrate her efforts on serious work. In November 1896 she was appointed surgical assistant at Santo Spirito. Along with her new appointment, Montessori was still spending time working at the women's and children's hospitals, continuing with her private practice, and undertaking research work at the psychiatric clinic of the University of Rome. The last brought her into contact with 'feeble minded' children in Rome asylums (Montessori, 1912/1964). Montessori started to read everything she could find on education and mentally defective children, exploring the links between delinquency and the lack of adequate care for these children. Before long her studies led to the works of Jean-Marc-Gaspard Itard and Edouard Seguin. Itard was known for his attempts to educate the 'wild boy of Aveyron' while Seguin had developed a specialised method along with didactic materials for work with 'deficient' children. What she found in the writings of these two men was a revelation. "...I felt that mental deficiency presented chiefly a pedagogical, rather than mainly a mental, problem" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 31). This gave a new direction to her thinking and set the future course of her entire life's work in education rather than medicine.

An Eclectic Borrower

In 1897 and 1898 Montessori attended courses in pedagogy during the university term and "read all the major works on educational theory of the past

two hundred years”(Kramer, 1988, p.61). She drew upon the ideas found in these works to form her own theories of education. Philosophically Montessori was in agreement with theorists, who were committed to a “belief that the power of children’s learning exists within the child and proceeds from the child” (Rambusch & Stoops, 1992, p. 2). In common with these theorists Montessori felt that children’s learning was an integral part of their being. Learning was not something that had an independent and disincarnated existence external to the child. Drawing on their ideas, Montessori regarded children as capable of constructing their own intelligences and their own morality.

Montessori drew on the ideas of earlier European educational philosophers, working these into her own approach. One influence was John Amos Comenius (1592-1670), who believed that education should follow the order of nature, implying that there was a timetable for growth and learning, and forcing children to learn before they are ready was to be avoided. Montessori’s concept of sensitive periods is reflected in this belief (Comenius, 1896; Montessori, 1912/1964; Standing, 1962). Another of Comenius’s (1896) beliefs was that learning is best achieved when the senses are involved, and that sensory education shaped the basis for all learning. Montessori extended and refined this principle through the manipulation of didactic materials in the prepared learning environment (Montessori, 1912/1964; Morrison, 1991).

Montessori’s philosophy also has several features that appear to be derived from John Locke (1632-1704), in particular her emphasis on the education of the senses. Locke believed that children were born into the world as ‘blank tablets’ and it was through sensorial experiences that their minds were filled up. These experiences would determine what they learnt and what they would eventually grow up to be (Chattin-McNicholas, 1992a; Montessori, 1912/1964; Morrison, 1991).

In common with Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), Montessori believed that learning occurs best when it happens at just the right moment in children's development. Rousseau felt that sense experience was the basis of the child's knowledge. He emphasised the process of learning rather than what is learnt. For Rousseau the educator's role was to assist in a process, which is latent within the child's mind. Rousseau's emphasis on the child learning from their own experiences from the beginning was adapted by Montessori, where she felt children needed concrete experiences first before being introduced to abstract concepts (Hainstock, 1997; Kramer, 1988).

Already briefly mentioned were Itard and Sequin, who had a profound influence on Montessori's ideas. Itard (1775-1838) was a French physician, who through his experiments with the 'mentally defective', believed that the mind developed through the actions of the senses. Seguin (1812-1880) who studied medicine under Itard, developed a series of graduated exercises to assist mentally deficient children's motor education. Guided by these two men, Montessori "manufactured a great variety of didactic materials" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 36).

The Swiss writer, Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827), also influenced Montessori's thinking. Pestalozzi believed that social progress could be attained through a new method of teaching. He was influenced by Rousseau and through experimentation of his ideas in practice built upon these. Pestalozzi described the process in his book where his fictional mother, *Gertrude*, became both mother and teacher of her young children by including them in her everyday task with love and understanding (Rusk, 1979). Within this environment "self-activity, discovery, individual development, and concrete experiences" of the children were encouraged. These later "became the key principles of child-centred education" (May, 1997, p. 13).

One of the main educational principles for Pestalozzi's teaching method was the training of the senses. This was based on his idea that all thinking starts with accurate observation of concrete objects. The home and then the school were based around the child's direct experience of objects and discussion, allowing for natural learning to occur. As children developed and their level of comprehension increased formal exercises were provided, which moved from concrete ideas to the more abstract ones in language and mathematics. According to Kramer (1988), Montessori saw the implications of Pestalozzi's idea and refined its uses.

Another person who influenced the forming of Montessori's philosophy was the German educationalist, Friedrich Froebel (1782-1852). They both agree that learning is essentially what children do, not what is done to children. Froebel believed that there was a place for the education of children from the ages of three to six (later seven) outside of the home and school. In 1837 Froebel established a school for very young children, a very radical innovation at this time. Building upon the ideas of Rousseau and Pestalozzi, Froebel developed a curriculum which combined indoor and outdoor play space, providing opportunities for gardening, nature study, outings, songs and games, educational playthings (the gifts), and handcrafts (the occupations) (May, 1997).

From 1826 onwards Froebel published books outlining his ideas on the education of young children, some of which Montessori later developed in her own way. Froebel's aim as an educator was to ascertain universal principles of life and apply them scientifically in order to fully develop man's divine spiritual nature. He focused on children's experience of the real world as well as the unfolding of their natural capacities and viewed learning as a process of self-discovery as children pass through successive stages of development. This process of self-fulfillment occurred through self-activity, which was possible only when adults did not interfere with children's spontaneous activity. Adults were to provide guidance, not coercion (Rusk, 1979; Kramer, 1988).

Going against the accepted views of his time, Froebel firmly believed that women were the most appropriate teachers for young children. The first kindergarten-training course in which Froebel pioneered the professional training of women for early childhood education, was established in 1849 (Cole, 1950; May, 1997).

In the process of developing her own ideas, Montessori did make use of many of Froebel's insights as well as being influenced by several other thinkers. Montessori was an eclectic borrower (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a). The extent that she borrowed from others is illustrated in her writings, particularly in the construction of her theories explaining how her system worked. It is from Seguin, however, that Montessori primarily borrowed her materials.

Special Education

Through her research Montessori became convinced of the need for special schools for the 'education of the feeble minded'. By the late 1890s, she was a well-known personality, and regarded as a specialist and acknowledged authority on special education for deficient children. In 1898 her article *Social Miseries and New Scientific Discoveries* was widely quoted and was reprinted in the educational press, using the title *Educational Awakening* (Cunningham, 2000). Montessori was invited to address this theme at a national Pedagogical Congress in Turin, which led to further acclaim. Although praising philanthropic effort, Montessori highlighted the necessity of employing modern scientific knowledge if the real needs of 'retarded' children were to be met. She argued that "our efforts will have to go into gaining an understanding of those children who have the most difficulty adapting to society and helping them before they get into trouble" (Kramer, 1988, p. 75).

In 1900 Montessori was appointed co-director of the State Orthophrenic School, a medical-pedagogical institute, to train teachers in the care and education of deficient children. Montessori's colleague and research associate, Dr. Giuseppe

Montesano was the other co-director. A practice demonstration school with twenty-two children was also part of the institute. For two years Montessori put into practice methods based on Seguin and Itard. Through her close study of Seguin, Montessori developed the principle that underpinned her work with normal children; she believed that the education of the senses must precede that of the intellect (Montessori, 1912/1964).

Once the education of the senses is underway, along with the arousal of interest, we can begin real instruction. We can introduce the alphabet, not in a book, but on a little table on which are raised letters, painted different colours, that can be touched and traced with the fingers. We gradually follow with manual instruction and eventually moral education, the final goal of the scientist as well as the philanthropist (Montessori cited in Kramer, 1988, pp. 76-77).

Montessori spent long hours teaching the children from 8:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m., observing, and experimenting with different methods, eventually adapting apparatus developed earlier by Itard and Seguin, based on children's reactions. It was this apparatus and the manner of its presentation that later became the Montessori materials and the Montessori method. Her experiments also led to an "original method for the teaching of reading and writing" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 38). She taught many of these children at the State Orthophrenic School to read and write so well that when presented for an examination at a public school along with 'normal' children, they passed. "These two years of practice", she later wrote, "are my first and indeed my true degree in pedagogy" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 32).

The news of her work with 'idiot children' was reported in hundreds of newspaper articles in Italy, France, Germany and England (Cunningham, 2000).

Montessori, however, stated that:

These results seemed almost miraculous to those who saw them. To me, however, the boys from the asylums had been able to compete with the normal children only because they had been taught in a different way. They had been helped in their psychic development, and the normal children had, instead, been suffocated, held back...While everyone was admiring the progress of my idiots, I was searching for the reasons which could keep the

happy healthy children of the common schools on so low a plane that they could be equalled in tests of intelligence by my unfortunate pupils! (Montessori, 1912/1964, pp. 38-39).

Scientist and Mystic

When Montessori wrote about her success with these 'defective' children, the unusual tension in Montessori between scientist and mystic was already evident.

We must know how to call to the *man* which lies dormant within the soul of the child. I felt this, intuitively, and believed that not the didactic material, but my voice which called to them, *awakened* the children, and encouraged them to use the didactic material, and through it, to educate themselves. I was guided in my work by the deep respect which I felt for their misfortune, and by the love which these unhappy children know how to awaken in those who are near them (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 37) [italics in original].

Montessori spoke of her "belief that we must act upon the spirit, served as a sort of *secret key*" that had opened the way for her to obtain such surprising results. She further stated that "while my efforts showed themselves in the intellectual progress of my pupils, a peculiar form of exhaustion prostrated me. It was as if I gave to them some vital force from within me" (Montessori, 1912/1964, pp. 37-38) [italics in original].

Change of Direction

At what would seem to have been her moment of triumph, in 1901 Montessori left the State Orthophrenic School for personal reasons. In 1897 she had volunteered to join a research programme at the psychiatric clinic of the University of Rome and it was here that she first worked alongside Dr. Montesano. This relationship developed into a love affair and in March 1898 Montessori gave birth to a boy named Mario. Why they did not marry is not clear. Montessori's grand daughter, Renilde, stated the Montesano's family was against the match. She said that the pair made a promise to each other never to marry and that it was Montesano's betrayal of that promise by marrying

someone else that was the crisis to which Montessori responded by leaving the institute where they had worked together in daily contact since early 1900 (Montessori, R., 1982). In any case, after Mario's birth, the child was sent to stay with a wet nurse that lived in the countryside near Rome. Mario Montessori understood that this plan had the backing of Montessori's mother as well as Montesano. He also revealed that "Montesano made it a condition of legally granting the child his name that the birth be kept a secret from all but the families and closest friends of the pair" (Kramer, 1988, p. 92). Montessori visited Mario often and a year after her mother's death, in 1913, she brought him to Rome to live with her. Despite this Montessori was unable to acknowledge him publicly, referring to him as her nephew throughout her life.

After giving up the directorship of the school Montessori also gave up the practice of medicine in order to study anthropology, experimental psychology, educational philosophy, basically everything she thought could help her in her search for the reasons why schools were failing the children they were supposed to be helping. She did anthropological research in the elementary schools to observe normal children and how they learnt. Montessori was appalled by the teaching methods used in the classroom and felt that the system repressed children, who, "like butterflies mounted on pins, are fastened each to his place, the desk, spreading the useless wings of barren and meaningless knowledge which they have acquired" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 14).

In 1902 Montessori attended the second national pedagogical congress in Naples where she outlined the results of her work in medicine and teaching. In her report, Montessori discussed Seguin's methods as a starting point from which she had evolved her own programme for stimulating the potential capacities of deficient children (Kramer, 1988).

Having justified her belief in Seguin's methods through actual experience and feeling a need of meditation, Montessori began a more thorough study of Seguin and Itard, translating their books into Italian, and copying them out by hand. She discovered that after his thirty years of study with deficient children, Seguin had reached the same conclusion she herself recently had (Kramer, 1988). His "physiological method, which has as its base the individual study of the pupil and which forms its educative methods upon the analysis of physiological and psychological phenomena, must come also to be applied to normal children. This step, he believed, would show the way to a complete human regeneration" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 49).

Montessori's background in medicine along with her social reformer's outlook had involved her in the problem of deficient children. In solving that problem using the tools of physical anthropology and psychological pedagogy, she was led to another problem, namely how to educate normal children in order to create a better society. "From the very beginning of my work with deficient children (1898 to 1900) I felt that the methods which I used had in them nothing peculiarly limited to the instruction of idiots" (Montessori, 1912/1964, pp. 32-33). Montessori believed that her methods "contained educational principles *more rational*" than those that were currently in use. She became convinced that if her methods could enable "an inferior mentality" to grow and develop, then its use with "normal children would develop or set free their personalities" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 33) [italics in original].

In 1904 she was appointed Professor of Pedagogical Anthropology at the University of Rome, a position she held until 1908. From all accounts Montessori lectured with liveliness, immediacy, and relevance (Kramer, 1988; Standing, 1962). Her lectures were later published as *L'Antropologia Pedagogica* (in English the volume appeared as *Pedagogical Anthropology*).

Establishment of the 'Children's Houses'

In 1906 the opportunity arose for Montessori to apply her methods to 'normal' children. Edoardo Talamo, the Director General of the Roman Association for Good Building, invited Montessori to set up a centre for children aged 3 to 7 years in the notorious Rome slum tenement of the Quarter of San Lorenzo (Montessori, 1912/1964). Montessori was approached because of her successful 2-year tenure at the State Orthophrenic School.

Montessori realised that the job offered tremendous possibilities. The Roman Association for Good Building owned more than 400 tenements in the city, with plans for each tenement house to have its own school. Montessori envisioned that the 'Children's House' would have both social and pedagogical significance.

From the very first I perceived, in all its immensity, the social and pedagogical importance of such institutions, and while at that time my visions of a triumphant future seemed exaggerated, today many are beginning to understand that what I saw before was indeed the truth (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 43).

In the early 1900s the concept of the 'Children's House' was an astonishing progressive idea, serving not only the needs of children and their parents but also the community and its business interests. The 'Children's House', as first envisioned by Montessori, is similar to what is known today as a family resource centre (Goffin & Wilson, 2001). As part of the educational programme the children received comprehensive child care services, which included their nutritional and health care needs as well as public baths and a "house-infirmary" for children who were unwell (Montessori, 1912/1964, pp. 63-65).

Montessori saw the 'Children's Houses' representing the "the union of the family and the school in the matter of educational aims" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 63). In her inaugural address, at the opening of the second Casa

dei Bambini on April 7, 1907, in another of the San Lorenzo tenements, Montessori described this new kind of educational institution.

This is not simply a place where the children are kept, not just an *asylum*, but a true school for their education, and its methods are inspired by the rational principles of scientific pedagogy...We see here for the first time the possibility of realising the long-talked-of pedagogical ideal. We have put *the school within the house*; and this is not all. We have placed it within the house as the *property of the collectivity*, leaving under the eyes of the parents the whole life of the teacher in the accomplishment of her high mission (Montessori, 1912/1964, pp. 62-63) [italics in original].

Maternal Function

Montessori's ideas demonstrated sensitivity to the problems of others taking over the "maternal function" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 66). The 'Children's Houses' would solve "many of woman's problems...the home will be transformed and will assume the functions of the woman" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 66). That the children would be well looked after during the absence of the mother was a reflection of her concern. Montessori was a mother too but she was unmarried. Others were bringing up her son, Mario, and she was unable to acknowledge the relationship publicly. Some have seen her sense of loss in regards to her own situation as the key to her work in the 'Children's Houses' (see Martin, 1992).

The notion of women as mothers to society, as both carers and social workers, is noted in Montessori's discussion of the role of the directress in the 'Children's Houses'. She emphasised the need for families and educators to work together in close contact so those children could truly benefit. Montessori noted the advantages of having the 'Children's Houses' located within the tenement. Parents could observe at any time and their financial support of the programme, "maintained by a portion of the rent they pay", provided a sense of parent ownership (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 63). The teacher, furthermore,

lived in the same tenement building as the children and their families, making her accessible to parents.

This is a fact of immense importance. Among these almost savage people, into these houses where at night no one dared go about unarmed, there has come not only to teach, *but to live the very life they live*, a gentlewoman of culture, an educator by profession, who dedicates her time and her life to helping those about her! A true missionary, a moral queen among the people, she may, if she be possessed of sufficient tact and heart, reap an unheard-of harvest of good from her social work (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 62) [italics in original].

Montessori's discussion outlining the kind of person who would make a good directress highlighted the fact that it was mainly women who were interpolated by her discourse (Brehony, 1994).

Parents' Obligations

Parents whose children attended the 'Children's House' had certain responsibilities, set out in the regulations (See Appendix H). Although directed at parents, Montessori specifically stated that "mothers were obliged to send their children to the 'Children's House' clean, and to co-operate with the Directress in the educational work" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 61). If children arrived unclean or unruly, they were sent home. Mothers, too, were required to meet with the teacher at least once a week to discuss their child's progress and accept any helpful advice (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 71).

Trialling New Ideas

The first Children's House opened on 6 January 1907, under Montessori's guidance and direction. She was able to trial her ideas with around fifty normal children aged between two and a half and six. Montessori combined the liberal ideals of Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Froebel's child-centered principles of education with the "games of practical life, and of the education of the senses" that she had experimented with the children at the Orthophrenic Institute (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 267).

As already discussed, Montessori was familiar with each of these pedagogues but she extended their ideas. Focussing on the physical and mental needs of the children through a sensory-motor approach she also appeared to meet their social and emotional needs. Montessori introduced various activities, which allowed for a much greater degree of independence and individual activity. By constantly watching the children and learning from them she experimented with many materials and activities, keeping only those that the children were spontaneously and repeatedly drawn to (Kramer, 1988; Montessori, 1937/1966).

Montessori gradually developed her own concrete materials and approach to teaching reading and writing, with particular emphasis on a sensory based alphabet. The relative ease in which the children came to write, and then to read, created huge interest in her work.

By 1908 there were three Children's Houses in Rome and one in Milan, catering for children of all social classes (Montessori, 1948/1988). In the summer of 1909 Montessori gave the first training course outlining her approach to early education to about one hundred students. Encouraged by a patroness, Baronessa Franchetti, the former Alice Hallgarten, Montessori published a detailed exposition of her work at the Children's House during this period. She wrote in under a month *Il Metodo della Pedagogica Scientifica applicato all'educazione infantile nelle Casa dei Bambin* (*The Method of Scientific Pedagogy Applied to the Education of Young Children in the Case dei Bambini*), which was later translated as *The Montessori Method*. The method emphasised free choice for the child as a self-activated learner within a prepared environment with specialist materials. An essential part of the work of the 'Children's House' was social education whereby the children helped prepare and serve meals, and to maintain a tidy learning environment. The role of the teacher, referred to as a Directress by Montessori, was to observe the children and only when necessary intervene.

Conceptual Framework of Montessori's Ideas

The Montessori method is the only curriculum model where a single individual was responsible for developing the conceptual framework as well as the template for its implementation (Goffin & Wilson, 2001; Turner, 1992). The following section examines more fully the fundamental pedagogical premises of Montessori's method, and provides an overview of her programme and its practices. Also examined are interpretations of Montessori's method.

When Montessori's method was first implemented it was a comprehensive programme for poor children. As the method gained popularity and became an international phenomenon, it attracted more affluent families. The comprehensive child care services, including children's nutritional and health care needs were excluded (Montessori, 1912/1964). The shift to a narrower curriculum was reinforced by the emphasis placed on Montessori's method and her didactic materials by her followers, rather than on Montessori's insights about children and their families. The patenting of the didactic materials, discussed later in this chapter, further promoted that they, rather than Montessori's pedagogical premises, were the central focus of her method. In addition, this shift was facilitated by the complexities involved with replicating Montessori's method in different community contexts.

Montessori's Writings

Montessori offered us no composite piece of literature. There is an assortment of books, written lectures transcribed by students, articles written by Montessori, newspaper articles from interviews with her or from observations of a Montessori classroom, educational societies' annual reports, speeches and so forth. It is necessary, therefore, to read the many sources available to begin to get a complete picture of what Montessori proposed should happen in practice in a Montessori centre. Montessori recognised this problem. She urged E. M. Standing, a student of philosophy, who she met in 1921 to

“delineate the various psychological and pedagogical principles which underlie Montessori’s whole approach to the child” (Standing, 1957, p. xix). His book, *Maria Montessori: Her Life and Work*, was a result of thirty years of close collaboration with Montessori “through articles, lectures, teaching in Montessori schools, or as her assistant and representative in training courses for teachers” (Standing, 1957, p. xix). Along with Faust (1984) and Hainstock (1997), I believe that it served Montessori’s request well, despite Standing’s attitude of worshipful adulation, which does make it difficult to get an objective view. Anna Maccheroni, another of Montessori’s lifelong disciples, wrote *A True Romance: Doctor Maria Montessori As I Knew Her* in 1946, but like Standing she portrays Montessori in a saint like manner, closely linking Montessori with her method. More recently Lillard (1973; 1996), Hainstock (1968; 1997a; 1997b), Chattin-McNichols (1992a) and Lawrence (1998) give us a more balanced perspective of Montessori and her method of education.

Although Montessori did not provide a complete description, each of her writings address specific areas. Montessori tended to focus on a particular frame of reference, offering an appropriate perspective for specific audiences when she wrote her books, spoke to groups, when interviewed for newspaper articles or when contributing to educational journals. Individuals, therefore, can get a terribly distorted view of Montessori’s ideas by expecting one book or one particular article to be an adequate foundation for comprehending her ideas. For instance, throughout Montessori’s writing the remark ‘our aim of education is’ is frequently found. Having an in-depth knowledge of the particular area that Montessori is referring to is necessary in order to comprehend where she intended that particular ‘aim of education’ to fit in her overall philosophy. Sometimes when Montessori was writing she referred to ‘the aim of education’ in relation to a specific piece of equipment whereas at other times she was referring to much broader educational goals.

Another problem is terminology. Montessori used her terms loosely, thereby changing the meanings of the same words in different contexts and giving us different words for the same contexts within the same set of writings. Montessori's critics also assumed that the definitions Montessori used were based on their own definitions, thereby making inaccurate assumptions about her meanings and purposes (Faust, 1984). Some of the difficulty associated with terminology was related to problems with translating Montessori's work into English. The resources used in this research and those read by Montessori's critics were English translations from original texts in Italian or French. Kramer (1988), in her biography of Montessori, highlighted the problem of distorted meaning when she found that the word "intuitively" was translated into English as "instinctively" (p. 357). As Faust (1984) puts it, such mistakes in translation only served to aggravate critics already turned off by Montessori's popularised announcements that she had solved many of the problems of the education system.

A further significant example of mistranslation was the English title of her first book. *Il Metodo della Pedagogica Scientifica applicato all'educazione infantile nelle Casa dei Bambini* was the original title of the Italian version of *The Montessori Method* [translated - *The Method of Scientific Pedagogy Applied to the Education of Young Children in the Casa dei Bambini*]. *The Montessori Method* was an unfortunate translated title choice, implying both a patenting and a commodification of Montessori's pedagogical system. Bentley, in his foreword to a 1964 English edition of *The Montessori Method*, commented:

Unfortunately, a quality of near illiteracy - *some take this to be the deepening mysticism of Montessori's later period* - obscures the meaning of almost everything published on education over Montessori's name after 1920. Here we confront not just the sloppy and irresponsible work of translators but the uncritical acceptance of the translators' unpublished works by Montessori's English-speaking follower (Bentley, 1964, pp. xix-xx) [italics added].

The need to rely upon English interpretations and translations constrains our ability to get complete and accurate perspectives exclusively from written material.

It needs to be pointed out that Montessori wrote only five of the many books that bear her name as author. Four of these books were written and translated into English prior to 1920: *The Montessori Method*, was published in English in 1912; *Pedagogical Anthropology*, was published in English in 1913; and *The Advanced Montessori Method: Spontaneous Activity in Education*, Volume 1, and *The Advanced Montessori Method: The Montessori Elementary Material*, were both published in English in 1917. Montessori was directly responsible both for writing the books and arranging their translation from Italian into English. The fifth book, *Dr. Montessori's Own Handbook*, was published first in English in 1914 after her return from the United States. According to Kramer (1988), these five publications, which describe in detail her method and didactic materials, contain practically all that is essential and original in Montessori's method, a fact also noted by reviewers of her later writings.

Other works by Montessori, such as *The Absorbent Mind* (1949/1980), *The Discovery of the Child* (1948/1988), and *The Secret of Childhood* (1937/1966) were originally lectures given during her teacher-training courses or speeches given to general audiences. They did not directly involve Montessori but she did rewrite *The Absorbent Mind* (1949/1980) into Italian after it was first published, and then it was retranslated it into English. These publications are problematic, as the translations were reliant on individuals to transcribe what she was saying. Montessori "always lectured in Italian", pausing "after each sentence for [for] her interpreter to repeat what she had said" (Goldsbrough, 1998). Listeners recorded her talks, which were then retranslated into the language of publication. According to Faust (1984), individual biases and levels of comprehension severely limited the accuracy of these translations. A further problem is that Montessori never wrote out her oral presentations. She always

spoke without notes so it is not possible to check the various translations against an original (Bentley, 1964). We are heavily reliant, therefore, upon those who were close to her, her dedicated followers, for their interpretation of her ideas.

An additional point to note is that the main purpose of Montessori's writing was to offer the wider community her new insights into education, drawing on the results of her new method of scientific inquiry those concepts which had not been identified or appreciated before. Montessori did not include those aspects of the curriculum that she felt were obvious or already available in a classroom setting. As Faust (1984) put it, this created problems when critics, along with Montessori's advocates, interpreted what they thought Montessori felt should be included in the classroom. For instance Montessori did not write about the extent to which art, music, and other cultural activities were appropriate, as she did not feel that she had anything new to offer on the topic. Some readers assume that each of Montessori's books stand alone, a composite of what Montessori considered to be essential to be on offer for the child in the classroom.

The negative consequences were two-fold: 1) critics were appalled at what Montessori left out of her curriculum and; 2) some Montessori educators, with an inadequate perception of Montessori's intention, did leave out essential aspects in the classrooms (Faust, 1984, p. 8).

The era in which Montessori wrote also needs to be taken into consideration. Her own writings were quite technical and frequently written in awkward pedagogical jargon. Many of her critics simply did not have the patience to wade through the "rhapsodic passages to find the valuable insights about fostering the development of children" (Faust, 1984, p. 8). Furthermore, as Hainstock (1997, p. 3) points out:

...some people involved with the method were unwilling to share ideas and fostered an aura of secrecy, implying that only a special few could understand and impart the knowledge of this

educational approach. This attitude tainted the method and made people arch their backs whenever it was discussed.

Finally, for a description of Montessori's method we still rely on Montessori's own writings. According to Chattin-McNichols (1992a, p. 21) certain aspects of the method have changed in response to new ideas on child development and early childhood education. Nonetheless, he does admit that these are "small changes and adjustments", which are mostly related to the sequence or further development of the materials, not a reexamination of her fundamental pedagogical premises. Consequently, in the next section, I draw heavily on quotes from Montessori to express the philosophical as well as the practical aspects of her method.

Fundamental Pedagogical Premises

Throughout Montessori's writings are five interlocking beliefs that she emphasised repeatedly. One, that her method was a scientific approach to education. Second, Montessori stated she had discovered the secret of childhood; every child has a spontaneous urge to learn. A third belief was that a child's mental development was similar to his or her physical development, due to a natural, internally regulated force. Another belief was Montessori's notion of liberty. Her idea was to free the child within an environment filled with appropriate material so that the teacher could observe the child's true needs for growth and development, and then assist the child to develop to her or her full potential. A fifth essential belief is order. Montessori believed that children need order within themselves and within their environment to enable them to become independent, autonomous and rational human beings (see Montessori, 1912/1964, 1914/1965b, 1917/1971b, 1936/1970, 1937/1966, 1949/1980). These beliefs underpinned Montessori's conviction that her method promised a reform of schools, and through educating a new kind of child, of society itself.

The Montessori Method is a Scientific Approach to Education

Montessori constantly asserted that her pedagogy was valid as it was based upon a system of logical, rational and scientific inquiry. “My method is scientific, both in its substance and in its aim. It makes for the attainment of a more advanced stage of progress, in directions no longer only material and physiological” (Montessori, 1914, p. 8/1965b, p. 36).

Experimental psychology, pedagogical anthropology and the medical ideas of Montessori’s time influenced her ideas. She argued that:

Practical progress of the school demands a genuine *fusion* of these modern tendencies, in practice and thought ; such a fusion as shall bring scientists directly into the important field of the school and at the same time raise teachers from the inferior intellectual level to which they are limited today (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 4) [italics in original].

According to Montessori the potential of a scientific approach to pedagogy was possible due to the vast improvements made in medicine through scientific progress, substantially improving the physical well-being of individuals. Likewise, scientific pedagogy would ensure the spiritual and intellectual well-being of individuals, which, in turn would transform the future of civilisation. “The science of forming man” was possible through scientific pedagogy (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 2).

Montessori stated that it was the distinguished anthropologist, Guiseppe Sergi, one of her teachers from medical school, who had proposed the idea that the scientific principles of anthropology could be applied to the “instruction and education of man” (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 3). During the early 1900s, which also saw the beginnings of the scientific movement in psychology and education, the application of anthropology involved taking measurements of “human features to determine ideal racial characteristics and physical anomalies”(Goffin & Wilson, 2001, pp. 49-50). Montessori did take regular

anthropometrical measurements of the children but the real significance of pedagogical anthropology only came to her when she began directly observing and learning from children in the prepared learning environment. It was children and their actions that became the basis of pedagogy, not the general principles or abstract philosophical ideas (Montessori, 1912/1964).

According to Montessori, her method was scientific due to the naturalistic observation of children in a prepared learning environment and the teacher's new role as an objective observer. "Here lies the essential point; from her scientific preparation, the teacher must bring not only the capacity, but the desire, to observe natural phenomena" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 87). To learn to become an objective observer teachers needed specialised training. For Montessori the scientific preparation of teachers was connected with the preparation of the spirit. "But let us seek to implant in the soul the self-sacrificing spirit of the scientist with the reverent love of the disciple of Christ, and we shall have prepared the spirit of the teacher. From the child itself he will learn how to perfect himself as an educator" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 13).

Montessori felt that the type of teacher in her learning environment was so different from the traditional concept of a teacher that a new term was required and so she used 'directress'.

Indeed, with my methods, the teacher teaches little and observes much, and, above all, it is her function to direct the psychic activity of the children and their physiological development. For this reason I have changed the name of teacher into that of directress (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 173).

Difficulties have arisen with the use of this term with its business connotations, providing inappropriate images of someone in authority directing children. Recently the terms 'guides', 'educators' or 'teachers' is used instead (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a). Regardless of which term is used it represented a new role and new goal for the adult in the Montessori learning environment. The

emphasis was on the guidance, the stimulation that children require rather than directive teaching or instruction of information. Her ideas represented a new relationship with both the child and the environment (Faust, 1984).

Montessori stated that scientific pedagogy emerged through her experimentation. This required the transformation of the school that was "contemporaneous with the preparation of the teacher" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 28). Being able to carefully observe children within a prepared environment made it possible to determine experimentally "a precision not hitherto attained, what is the mental attitude of the child at various ages, and hence, if the fitting material for development be offered, what will be the average level of intellectual development according to age" (Montessori, 1917/1965a, pp. 80-81). When Montessori had concluded her 2-year experiment at the State Orthopedic School, her findings within the prepared learning environment became the scientific context of how children's development is nurtured. In particular, Montessori believed the fundamental principle of scientific pedagogy was the liberty of the child. "Such liberty as shall permit a development of individual, spontaneous manifestations of the child's nature" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 28). By liberty Montessori meant that the children were free to work in the prepared environment where only destructive acts of children were to be limited. "But all the rest, - every manifestation having a useful scope, - whatever it be, and under whatever form it expresses itself, must not only be permitted, but must be observed by the teacher" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 87).

Many of Montessori's critics, however, argued that her 'scientific pedagogy' was not good science, as she did not:

Provide adequate evidence or proof of her findings, had no control groups, did not provide detailed accounts of her experiments in such a way that they could be replicated by other investigators.... Although she insisted on the scientific basis for her statements, they were largely the result of remarkably intuitive observations integrated with creative genius into a body

of thinking about education which came down from Itard and Seguin. Which is not at all the same thing as laboratory science subject to statistical analysis (Kramer, 1988, p. 376).

According to Faust (1984), there is no evidence that any of Montessori's critics tried to examine exactly how Montessori's questions originated or how her thinking evolved. As to the appropriateness of Montessori's research there are many suggestions, but no research was carried out to prove that she was wrong.

Montessori was very careful to define her method of scientific inquiry, distinguishing it from laboratory analysis.

It is not my intention to present a treatise on Scientific Pedagogy. The modest design of these incomplete notes is to give the results of an experiment that apparently opens the way for putting into practice those new principles of science which in these last years are tending to revolutionize the work of education (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 1).

Faust (1984) points out that Montessori was no doubt guilty of using the term 'scientific' loosely, in the broader European manner that was still fashionable (see also Bruce, 1984). Montessori, however, maintained that her method of inquiry was one that was not spoiled by preconceptions as it was based on "empirical data, testing and reworking them on the basis of further observations" (Kramer, 1988, p. 376). Even William Kilpatrick, one of her main critics, appreciated Montessori's scientific attitude, stating that the scientific basis for her experimentation had led to her to develop her method of education (Faust, 1984).

Spontaneous Activity

Through her careful observations of children at the 'Children's Houses', Montessori discovered the 'secret' of childhood. Montessori believed that children spontaneously seek their own growth and development. Montessori observed that adults habitually serve children. "This is not only an act of

servility toward them, but it is dangerous since it tends to suffocate their useful, spontaneous activity” (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 97). In the Montessori learning environment children need to progressively increase their independence so that they can free themselves so that teachers can see the free child, observe the child’s needs and allow the child’s spontaneous activity to guide the teacher to determine the child’s ideal environment.

The Four Planes of Development

Montessori regarded education as a “help to life”, from a developmental perspective which started from birth and continued throughout a person’s life span (Montessori, 1949/1980, p. 17). Additionally Montessori believed that developmental stages succeeded one another, with each one building on what occurred before and anticipating what will happen next. For children to have an optimal experience it is important for them to be exposed to Montessori’s pedagogical strategies at an early age. When a child begins at a Montessori early childhood programme the amount of time spent in that setting will determine the overall impact and effectiveness of the child’s Montessori experience. Understandably, the earlier the start and the longer the exposure, the more effective the outcome will be for the child.

Montessori maintained that educators needed to understand child development in order to aid it. Based on her years of observation and drawing upon the ideas of psychologists Montessori developed a theory of ‘four planes (or stages) of development’. Montessori felt that the minds of children were different from that of adults. She also believed that a child’s mind differed from time to time in the child’s life and that the educational system must cater for these differences (Montessori, 1949/1980, pp. 18-28). In other words, the “structure and content of education should be determined by the child’s needs, not by what society thinks is appropriate for children to know, and that this will change through the course of childhood. That suggestion remains controversial to the present day” (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a, p. 37).

Montessori proposed different learning environments for children at different planes of their development. Interestingly, Montessori's critics seemed to be completely unaware of her concept of the four planes of development. They failed to be aware of Montessori's flexible approach to children's learning based upon their changing needs during development. Frequently criticisms were directed towards a different level of development than was actually being examined by Montessori. There was a complaint from Dewey, for example, about an over-valuing of sensorial materials related to his perception of the needs of the five to six year-olds. Montessori was in fact referring to the need of two to three-year-olds (Faust, 1984).

For each stage of development there was a culmination of important biological, physiological, social, emotional, personality, spiritual and language changes. Montessori divided the stages of life from birth through to age twenty-four into four six-year periods. She noted that the two of the periods, early childhood (0-6) and adolescence (12-18), were active stages of tremendous growth while the others, middle childhood (6-12) and early adulthood (18-24), experienced relatively calm periods of consolidation (Ball, 1983; Standing, 1962). Similar to other stage theorists, Montessori emphasised that the ages outlined were approximate but that the sequence of the stages remained unchanged.

First Plane of Development - Birth to Six Years of Age

The most important period of life is not the age of university studies, but the first one, the period from birth to the age of six. For that is the time when man's intelligence itself, his greatest implement, is being formed. But not only his intelligence; the full totality of his psychic powers (Montessori, 1949/1980, p. 22).

Montessori described this period as the time of the 'absorbent mind'. "It is a form of mind that is quite different from that of the adult" (Standing, 1962, p. 108). Montessori used the term to highlight that a child has a heightened sensitivity to learning. "By merely 'living' and without any conscious effort the

individual absorbs from the environment even a complex cultural achievement like language" (Montessori, 1949/1974, p. 89).

Some of Montessori's critics were confused about this term when it was first introduced and felt that she was implying passivity on the part of the child. Montessori, however, never believed children were passive. In her writings Montessori frequently compared the young mind to a sponge, which literally absorbs information from the environment (Montessori, 1949/1974; 1949/1980). This absorption always involves interest and activity. It was through observing this exceptional receptivity of the young child that Montessori coined the term 'the absorbent mind'. Montessori believed that this receptivity was exhibited not only by the ease in which a young child learnt vast amounts of information but also by the eagerness and enthusiasm when doing so.

The baby starts from nothing; it is an active being going forward by its own powers. Let us go straight to the point. The axis around which in the internal working revolves is *reason*. Such reason must be looked upon as a natural creative function that little by little buds and develops and assumes concrete form from the images it absorbs from the environment. Here is the irresistible force, the primordial energy. Images fall at once into pattern at the service of reason. It is in the service of reason that the child first absorbs such images... (Montessori cited in Standing, 1962, p. 206) [italics in original].

Another observation noted by Montessori was that there were specific 'sensitive periods' to aid children in their task of development as individuals in the first plane. Children appear to go "through periods of concentrating on specific capacities" (Lillard, 1996, p. 25). These are periods of intense fascination for learning a particular subject or skill such as going up and down stairs, putting things in order, counting or reading. It is easier for children to learn a particular skill during the corresponding sensitive period than at any other time in their life.

Montessori divided the stages of the child's mental absorption of the environment into two levels. She called the first, from birth to age three, the

'unconscious Absorbent Mind'. According to Montessori young children are driven by impulses coming directly from their unconscious mind. Sensorial impressions that are merely registered within the child's mind are:

- unconscious growth and transition
- enthusiastic and effortless discoveries of the environment
- cannot be directly taught but can learn through self-activity
- period of creation from nothing
- ego develops as the young child becomes conscious
- learns in accordance with natural drives and responses, intelligence is formed via movement

(Ball, 1983; Chattin-McNichols, 1992a; Lillard, 1996; Montessori, 1949/1980; Standing, 1962.)

In relation to the last point Montessori firmly believed that children construct themselves through movement.

It is in fact the basis for the development of personality. The child, who is constructing himself, must always be moving. Not only in those large movements which have an external aim, such as sweeping a room or laying a table or any other of the Exercises of Practical Life, but also when the child merely sees, or thinks, or reasons; or when he understands something in relation to these thoughts and sensations – always he must be moving (Montessori cited in Standing, 1962, p. 230).

During the next stage, from three to six years, Montessori believed that children use these impressions again but in a conscious manner. She wrote:

...these multitudinous impressions, thus unconsciously absorbed, are used again by being known again in a different way as the basis on which conscious life is built up. These primordial unconscious impressions are then the stuff out of which is woven consciousness itself, with all that it implies of reason, memory, will and self-knowledge (Montessori cited in Standing, 1962, p. 208).

In this period:

- the child makes use of faculties to create a consciousness

- it is a more conscious stage of child's development
 - the child needs active exploration and discovery
 - the child is anxious to learn
 - rapid language development occurs
 - from the environment the child is discovering via hands and other movements; learning qualities of things; moving to abstract conceptualisations to where touch is not needed to know the quality of things
 - obedience is still out of reach...children have no comprehension of right and wrong; children obeys to please or out of fear of punishment but they are not in complete control of their own will
- (Ball, 1983; Faust, 1984; Standing, 1962; Montessori, 1949/1980)

In Montessori's later years, after she had spent much more time observing children from birth through infancy, she sub-divided this first plane of development into three different levels; birth to two years, three to five years and six to seven years (Faust, 1984). Furthermore, in regards to the movement from the unconscious development to conscious development Montessori stated that educators could not reach children to teach them directly during this stage. Standing interpreted Montessori as stating:

We cannot intervene in this mysterious process of passing from the unconscious to the conscious, i.e., of constructing the human faculties. It is a process which goes on independently of us, and we can only help by providing the best conditions (Standing, 1962, p. 111).

In this first stage Montessori believed that children absorb the world through their unconscious intelligence, through movement. During the second stage children take in consciously through using their hands. The hand has now become the conscious instrument of the brain and cognitive growth. "It is through the activity of his hand that he enriches his experience, and develops himself at the same time" (Standing, 1962, p. 112).

The second plane of development, from ages seven through to twelve years, emphasis the child's need:

☞ To highlight his field of action [whereas] the closed environment is suited to the small child. [During the first plane] social relations are established with others. [Throughout the second plane] the child needs wider boundaries for his social experiences. Development cannot result by leaving him in his former environment (Montessori, 1973, p. 9). ||

According to Montessori children are ready to move out from a limiting environment that was both psychically and physically limiting into the wider community.

The Montessori Programme

Through her work in the Children's Houses, Montessori believed that she had created a "scientific and rational" method for facilitating children's "inner work of psychical adaptation" (Montessori, 1914, p. 8/1965b, p. 36). Teachers and children were not to modify any aspects of her method, as any modification would render its scientific results void. The method and its specialised materials were to be used in the precise manner outlined by Montessori.

☞ In order for children to realise their fullest potential in a socialised context, Montessori stated that they needed a suitable learning environment, a teacher, who is a link between the children and the environment, and material objects adapted to their needs (Montessori, 1937/1966).¹¹ "Montessori stated that there were three parts to her method for children aged 3 to 7-year-olds: motor education, sensory education, and language education. Montessori teacher education programmes now divide the curriculum into five basic areas, including math and cultural subjects (Ball, 1983; Turner, 1992).¹¹

For Montessori (1914/1965b) children's care and management of the prepared learning environment provides the primary means of motor education, while the didactic materials provide for children's sensory and language education.

The Prepared Environment

With Montessori's realisation that children absorb unconsciously from their environment, she designed an educational learning environment to meet their needs, interests, abilities, and development. The first Montessori school was a tenement room in the Quarter of San Lorenzo, but she soon expanded this to a "set of rooms with a garden of which the children are the masters" (Montessori, 1914, p. 9/1965b, p. 37-38). The main room of the building provided space for the "intellectual work", with the didactic materials. This area needed to be larger than customary classrooms for the child-sized tables and chairs, the small rugs children spread on the floor to work on, and freedom of movement around the furniture (Montessori, 1914/1965b; 1917/1965a). Other proposed rooms in the learning environment included a sitting room, bathroom, a gymnasium, and a dining room. Outside, Montessori's suggestion of an ample playground with room for a garden was not a novel idea but her use of this space was. She thought that it should adjoin the "schoolroom, so that the children may be free to go and come as they like, throughout the entire day" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 81).

Inside the furniture consisted of child-sized table, chairs, and sofas, which were light in weight so the children could move them, and light in colour so they could easily be washed. For Montessori there were two pieces of furniture that were indispensable. One was a long, low cupboard with large doors to store the didactic materials, which could be reached by a small child, thereby fostering independence. The other piece of furniture was a chest of drawers containing several columns of little drawers, with a bright handle for each one, and a small card with a child's name. All the children each had their own drawer for personal belongings. The walls were hung with low blackboards and above them were pictures of "simple scenes in which children would naturally be interested" (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 82). Montessori felt that "beauty both promotes concentration of thought and offers refreshment to the tired spirit" (Montessori, 1917/1965a, p. 146). Such concepts are familiar to us

today but a specialist learning environment for children was a revolutionary perspective in the early 1900s.

Motor Education

Care and management of oneself and the environment were the principle means of muscular education, better known today as the practical life area, which also included rhythmic movements with locomotor patterns, gymnastics on innovative outdoor equipment, gardening, and working with clay. These activities not only aided in the development of what we would call self-help skills today, but also care for the Children's House.

Montessori created a collection of wooden frames to teach children self-help skills. "She carefully described how to present the materials to the children, to encourage the orderly development of children's movement. The assortment of activities in this area depends upon the physical and cultural environment of the centre, and the special needs of the children who attend."

Sensory Education

Montessori's method emphasises the methodical education of the child's senses based on her belief that education of the senses is the basis of intellectual development. According to Montessori (1912/1964, p. 173) "the education of the senses has, as its aim, the refinement of the differential perception of stimuli by means of repeated exercises". The Montessori didactic materials were developed in order that children could exercise their senses (see Appendix J for a list of didactic materials). Today the best known characteristic of the Montessori method would probably be the didactic materials. I conclude with Turner (1992) that "perhaps more than any other component, the materials make Montessori's system *replicable*" (p. 37) [italics in original].

The use of the didactic materials in the Children's House only made up one hour of Montessori's proposed daily schedule (see Appendix K-Winter

Schedule). Turner (1992) questions whether Montessori early childhood programmes today over emphasise intellectual activities. For example the case study centre had the children working with the didactic materials for an average of two hours per day, within a three-hour programme. Montessori (1912/1964, p. 121) herself emphasised that the “Children’s House” is a garden of child culture, and we most certainly do not keep the children for so many hours in school with the ideas of making students of them!”

The didactic materials were designed to demonstrate a separate quality and so to build clear concepts of size, shape, colour, form, sound, temperature, surface weight, texture and so forth. All the materials are graded in difficulty so that as a child works from one material to another, the distinctions in size, texture and so on become fine and finer. Montessori explained that:

The didactic material, in fact, does not offer to the child the “content” of the mind, but the *order* for that “content”. It causes him to distinguish identities from differences, extreme differences from fine gradations, and to classify, under conceptions of quality and of quantity, the most varying sensations appertaining to surfaces, colours, dimensions, forms and sounds. The mind has formed itself by a special exercise of attention, observing, comparing, and classifying (1914, p. 93) [italics in original].

Montessori believed that children are capable of educating themselves and she referred to this as auto-education. The didactic materials are structured to allow for only one correct response. This makes them self-correcting, thus allowing a child to proceed at his or her own pace, independent of the teacher once the material has been presented.

Language Education

Montessori’s (1914, p. 95/1965b, p. 139) original intend for language went no further than “preparing the hand for writing”. This component was divided into two parts, the association of language with sensory perceptions, and reading and writing. For Montessori, language happened at the same time as sensory education.

Montessori presented the process of learning to write and read as an extension of sensory education. She used sandpaper letters, which the children traced with their fingers, while giving them the sound of the letter. Once the children were shown how to trace the sandpaper letters they took:

Great pleasure in repeating it *with closed eyes*, letting the sandpaper lead them in following the form they do not see. Thus the perception will be established by the direct muscular-tactile sensation of the letter. In other words, it is no longer the visual image of the letter, but the *tactile sensation*, which guides the hand of the child in these movements, which thus become fixed in the muscular memory (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 276) [italics in original].

The children were also given the sounds of each letter. When they could recognise some of the letters Montessori provided them with the opportunity to write, making words using cardboard letters. By the age of five, Montessori found that most children learned to write and read.

Interpretation of Montessori's Method: What is Montessori?

Montessori's ideas about education have been interpreted in many different ways. Montessori's method is regarded by some as too structured and rigid while others have argued that the curriculum is loosely organised and undisciplined. Why have there been such diverse opinions and attitudes concerning the Montessori method in practice? First, the name 'Montessori' is not a reliable guide for parents seeking a Montessori education for their child. Legally there is no way to prevent an early childhood programme being labeled as 'Montessori'. One way to address this problem is promote Montessori in the wider community, providing prospective parents with information in order to make an informed choice for their child.

Second, Montessori early childhood centres may have all the available Montessori materials but on their own they do not provide a learning

environment that is responsive to the individual needs of the young child.

Lillard (1996, p. 22) states:

Because they are beautifully executed and highly visible many people make the mistake of equating the whole of Montessori education with these specially designed materials. In fact, the materials are secondary. It is the totality of the prepared environment to be explored and acted upon by the children that is primary: the other children, the teacher, the nonmanufactured Montessori materials, and the careful arrangement of the classroom. It is possible to have an environment that meets the essentials of Montessori education when no manufactured Montessori materials are available. Conversely, not every classroom with a full complement of manufactured materials meets all the criteria of a quality Montessori programme.

How children learn is another important part Montessori's theory and philosophy. Her writings included the importance of manipulative materials, the isolation of difficulties for each activity, the importance of concentration, her ideas on reinforcement, and so forth. "In the area of reinforcement, for example, her ideas anticipated the concept of "competence motivation," the notion that children can be motivated to work through a desire to become better at a skill, without external rewards such as praise from adults" (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a, p. 4).

As Faust (1984, p. 10) puts it, the key to the differences and the key to the interpretation of Montessori is dependent upon the "individual teacher and the individual classroom as well as the significantly different needs of populations of children in different cultures throughout the world". An individual teacher's interpretation of Montessori is dependent upon one's personal needs and capacities, which can enhance and limit a teacher's abilities. People are drawn to Montessori for different reasons. For instance, teachers and parents who seek order and structure within the learning environment can be quite different from those who pursue a controlled environment. Furthermore, Faust (1984) points out that order and structure as opposed to control represent two very different qualities, reflecting different needs. The result is two very

different interpretations of Montessori's ideas within the learning environment. Interestingly the two opposing learning environments may appear to be similar to someone observing who has limited knowledge of Montessori. Both may seem ordered and quiet, with the children engaged in constructive, productive learning.

But the differences may be as significant as contrasting an internal skeleton, which provides internal support and much room for free movement, with an exo-skeleton, one which creates external control and is in fact, quite limiting, though very neat and orderly (Faust, 1984, p. 10).

Another factor contributing to variations in interpretations is due to the fact that Montessori's writings do not always agree with the now expected traditions found within the learning environment. For example most teacher training programmes now divide the curriculum into five basic areas, including separate math and cultural subjects, such as fine arts, science, and social studies. Materials that were not discussed in Montessori's books are now part of a Montessori learning environment. Teacher training courses have expanded the curriculum through additions and extensions (Turner, 1992; Ball, 1983).

The Rapid Spread of Montessori's Educational Ideas

Italian press reports of the "new children" in the slums of Rome began to spread to the rest of Italy and were picked up by the press in Europe, Great Britain and the United States (Cohen, 1972). The rise of the printed media of communications during the early 1900s was responsible for the rapid spread of Montessori's educational ideas on a global scale (Cunningham, 2000).

The English speaking world was initially quick to embrace Montessori's method of education. Her ideas came at the same time as others in the progressive movement were seeking change in the education system (Cohen, 1972, 1974; May, 1997). In September 1909 *The London Journal of Education*

published a favourable account of Montessori's work, written by Maude J. May. Her article, '*A New Method of Infant Education*', predates the first mention of Montessori in print in the United States by a few months (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a).

Americans were among the first to become interested in Montessori's ideas, comparing her method with the practices within kindergartens, with particular attention to Montessori's approach to the teaching reading and writing (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a). During the next four years reports of visits to Montessori schools, discussions of her method, the philosophical underpinnings, and its relevance to the American kindergarten scene by educators and journalists were published. In 1911 six reports of Montessori's work appeared by educators and journalists, with the number climbing to 54 in 1912.

Whether you were a reader of such special periodicals as *American Education*, the *Journal of Educational Psychology*, the *Kindergarten Review*, *Pedagogical Seminary*, the *American Primary Teacher*, or such popular ones as *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Woman's Home Companion*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Dial*, *Scientific American*, the *Delineator*, *Contemporary Review*, you could not have avoided reading about Montessori schools and Montessori methods by 1912 (Kramer, 1988, p. 159).

The Promise of the Children's Houses

According to Kramer (1988), the appeal of Montessori's system was that it offered a programme of reform during a reform-minded age. Montessori's approach to education seemed to have proved, in a very short period of time, that it could lead to an improvement in society. It appeared to be possible to mold a new generation of children who would be independent, productive members of society and at the same time solve the many problems that existed including social inequities of the social classes and gender.

Educators and journalists were fascinated by the promise of the Children's Houses. They came to Italy to visit this new kind of educational institution and

to talk with Montessori. Their conflicting reactions were spread throughout the world, including New Zealand. In the United States the number of publications on Montessori increased to a high of 76 in 1913, “then the explosion appears to have rapidly subsided” (Hunt, 1964, p. xii). According to White and Buka (1987), this was due to Montessori’s ideas arriving at a time when the American public was eager to distance themselves from European ideas and influence. Furthermore, Professor William Heard Kilpatrick, a disciple of John Dewey, and one of the country’s best known progressive educator, wrote *The Montessori System Examined* in 1914, stating that Montessori’s ideas were based on an outmoded theory and her method was mechanical, formal and restricting (Hunt, 1964; Lillard, 1973; Weber, 1969).

The most influential publication regarding Montessori’s method in the United States was a series of articles in *McClure’s Magazine*. The history of the Montessori movement in America began with the publication of Josephine Tozier’s article, *An Educational Wonder-Worker: The Methods of Maria Montessori*, in the May 1911 issue of *McClure’s Magazine* (Cohen, 1972). In the illustrated article, Montessori’s principles, her methods, and her apparatus were described in detail. It was Montessori’s success in teaching the three R’s, however, that was highlighted, with pictures of three-and-four-year-old children reading and writing. The lead paragraph portrayed the Montessori method as an experiment “that bids fair to revolutionize primary education, by practically abolishing the difficulty of learning to read and write” (cited in Cohen, 1972, p. 359). This point was stressed three more times in the article. McClure gambled that the significance of Montessori’s method for his readers was that it promised to teach young children to read and write quickly, easily, and skillfully. Public response proved him correct (Cohen, 1972; Kornegay, 1981).

The Montessori Method

In the fall of 1911, McClure and William Morrow, Secretary of Frederick A. Stokes Company, the New York publishing house, persuaded Montessori to

bring out an English translation of her book. Renamed *The Montessori Method*, translated by Anne George, a young American teacher who had just returned from a year's study with Montessori in Rome, the volume had an introduction by Professor Henry W. Holmes of the Harvard School of Education. Published by Stokes in early April 1912, it proved to be very successful. A first edition of 5,000 copies sold out in less than a month, by the end of September, a sixth printing was in circulation, and *The Montessori Method* became the number-two nonfiction best seller of 1912 (Cohen, 1972).

The Montessori Method was an unfortunate translated title choice, implying both a patenting and a commodification of Montessori's pedagogical system. Binda Goldsbrough recalled that Montessori did not want her approach to be "called a method" and that it was "against her will that her book was called *The Montessori Method*". Furthermore Montessori did not want "her name to be stuck onto it" (Goldsbrough, 1998). Montessori's "mission was to reveal the life the child" to explain how "children developed, how humans developed, not to set down [a] prescription. But the same time she did set down a prescription" with many people taking the prescription but forgetting to "take the holistic view" of things (Goldsbrough, 1998).

In his introduction to *The Montessori Method*, Henry W. Holmes wrote:

The astonishing welcome accorded to the first popular expositions of the Montessori system may mean much or little for its future in England and America; it is rather the earlier approval of a few trained teachers and professional students that commends it to the educational workers who must ultimately decide upon its value, interpret its technicalities to the country at large, and adapt it to English and American conditions (Holmes, 1912, p. xvii).

Several commentators highlighted the fact that Montessori was female and her work was:

Remarkable, if for no other reason, because it represents the constructive effort of a woman. We have no other example of an educational system - original at least in its systematic wholeness

and in its practical application - worked out and inaugurated by the feminine mind and hand (Holmes, 1912, pp. xvii-xviii).

Impact of the Movement

Holmes's introduction to *The Montessori Method* raised several points that he believed would affect the future of the Montessori method, and, indeed, they eventually did so. First, he felt that the growth of Montessori's method would depend on the professional teaching community not popular interest. Second, he realized that "if we are to make practical application of the Montessori scheme we must not neglect to consider the modification of it which differing social conditions may render necessary" (Holmes, 1912, pp. xxvii-xxviii). Furthermore, he argued that the method would eventually have to be combined with other systems rather than remain in its current form.

It is highly probable that the system ultimately adopted in our schools will combine elements of the Montessori programme with elements of the kindergarten programme, both "liberal" and "conservative." In its actual procedure school work must always be thus eclectic. An all-or-nothing policy for a single system inevitably courts defeat; for the public is not interested in systems as systems, and refuses in the end to believe that any one system contains every good thing (Holmes, 1912, pp. xix-xx).

A third point noted by Holmes was the apostolic character of the Montessori phenomenon, commenting that she "presents her convictions with an apostolic ardour which commands attention" (Holmes, 1912, p. xviii). Finally, he stated that the "material is by no means the most important feature of the Montessori programme" (Holmes, 1912, p. xxxvii). Holmes recognized that it was the principles, how Montessori believed that children learnt and what was needed for them to reach their fullest potential, which would prove to be her long-term contribution and that these could be achieved without Montessori personally or those directly trained under her.

Endorsement of the Montessori System

Three years after the first article of her work was published in England, Montessori received a fervent endorsement in an official publication, *The Montessori System of Education* (1912), written by Edmond G. A. Holmes, a former Chief Inspector of Elementary Schools. No ordinary inspector, Holmes described himself as a “neo-Froebelian” and had a “profound distaste for the regimentation and routinisation that he saw in the public elementary schools” (Brehony, 1994, p. 6). He was sent by the Board of Education to investigate the Rome experiment shortly before his retirement in 1911.

The Board of Education published Holmes’s pamphlet in 1912, at the same time the English translation of *The Montessori Method* (1912) came out, and it “sold out in a few days” (*Times Educational Supplement*, 3 December, 1912, J. Allen papers, 5, M2/93; Cunningham, 2000). In his report Holmes outlined Montessori’s principles and practices, praising her method highly, especially Montessori’s success in teaching young children to read and write quickly and with ease.

The truth is that the Montessori system enables young children to learn reading and writing without mental strain.... Whatever else Dottressa Montessori has done, she has fully proved that reading and writing can be taught to quite young children – to ‘babies’ in fact – without overtaxing their brains, and without their realising that they are doing anything but playing at interesting games (Holmes, 1912, p. 17).

Holmes believed that Montessori’s system could be applied to children over the age of six or seven. “In my opinion, its principle is applicable to children of all ages, and will bear its best fruit in the higher classes of the schools for older children” (Holmes, 1912, p. 7). He did, however, identify some defects in Montessori’s system. First he thought that her curriculum was too narrow for the English education system, as it did not include free drawing, clay modelling, fairy tales and had limited games. Second, he felt that the method would have to be modified if introduced in English infant schools and, in

particular, he was concerned Montessori's dogmatism would make this difficult.

Another concern was the manufacturing and sale of the Montessori didactic apparatus. Holmes pointed out the cost of producing and distributing the apparatus from Milan and hoped that they could soon be manufactured in the UK, which would substantially reduce the cost (Holmes, 1912; Cohen, 1974; Cunningham, 2000).

The Hand of Commerce

The Montessori phenomenon was linked with commercial as well as academic and professional interests early on (Cunningham, 2000; 2001). Montessori's decision in 1916 to give up all her other roles as physician, university professor, and classroom teacher made her dependent on the proceeds of the her training courses, lecture tours, royalties from her books and the sale of her didactic apparatus. At the end of 1911, McClure had arranged with Montessori for the manufacture and sale of her didactic apparatus through a company, the House of Childhood, Inc., in New York, under the management of Carl Byoir. A set of materials cost fifty dollars (Kornegay, 1981). The patent rights, for the United States and Canada, were announced in the Acknowledgements when *The Montessori Method* was published in 1912. Anyone who purchased the apparatus was provided with a booklet, giving detailed instructions on their correct use. Montessori had designed the materials to be used in a particular way and "care should be taken to observe the Montessori rule that apparatus is to be used for its proper purpose only, in order to avoid confusion in the child's mind" (Fisher, 1920, p. 101). The didactic materials were not a set of toys or games. Instead they were to be used to teach children how to learn according to the principles of the Montessori method (Kramer, 1988; Fisher, 1920).

As had happened in North America, the commercial aspects of the Montessori movement soon appeared in Britain. In his report, for example, Holmes (1912)

commented on twenty-six different items of apparatus that were for sale. He provided the name of the manufacturer and the cost. In the spring of 1913 the educational suppliers, Philip and Tracy, set up a model Montessori classroom in their showrooms in London. They had acquired the exclusive rights to manufacture and distribution of the Montessori materials in Britain, and they cautioned that the Montessori apparatus must be kept together as a complete system and used in an intelligent, careful manner, applying the principles of the Montessori method.

This tenor of commercialism to publicise Montessori's method of education also reached New Zealand. In March 1914 the Minister of Education received a memo from A. T. Macalpin and Co. stating that they were agents for the supply of the Montessori System. "We shall be glad to indent to the order of the Department, sets of this system as required. The Montessori System is in use throughout Europe and America and is rapidly ousting the old-style kindergarten methods" (Education Department file re Montessori Education, E-W, W10112, 29/21).

William Boyd, a professor of education at the University of Glasgow, was highly critical of what he considered the rather sordid commercialism associated with the marketing of Montessori's apparatus. He felt that it was a slight on teacher's intelligence in that they were expected to use the materials but were not allowed to modify or improve upon them in any way. Many other educators shared this view, outlined in Boyd's book, *From Locke to Montessori*, which was published in London in 1914 (Cunningham, 2000; Kramer, 1988).

World-wide Interest

The rapid spread of the Montessori movement was recorded in June 1912 in the *Time Educational Supplement*. A year earlier the system had been established by law in the public schools of Switzerland (Education Department File re

Montessori Education, E-W, W1012, 29/21, 7 November 1912). Following the publication of *The Montessori Method* (1912) the *Times Educational Supplement* reported that "interest in the Montessori system increases every day" (*Times Educational Supplement*, 3 December, 1912, J. Allen papers, 5, M2/93). Montessori schools were being established in Paris, New York and Boston, and others were planned to open in India, China, Mexico, Korea, Honolulu and in the Argentine Republic (Cunningham, 2000).

As interest in Montessori's ideas grew in England, conferences were held throughout 1912 where English educators examined the advantages and drawbacks of Montessori's system. On November 16, for example, the Montessori Society and the Child Study Society held a joint conference in London to discuss Montessori's ideas (*Times Educational Supplement*, 3 December, 1912, J. Allen papers, 5, M2/93). In 1913 information about Montessori started to dominate the educational press. The journal *Child Study*, begun by the Child Study Society in 1908 and had until now mainly published articles on a variety of educational innovations, in 1913 publish several articles as well as reporting on meetings held. The discussion and debate that followed these meetings were not totally uncritical of some aspects of Montessori's work and philosophy, with some prominent progressive educators highly critical. Nonetheless Brehony (1994) states this and other indicators demonstrate that by 1913 Montessori and her system of education had become, what some contemporaries referred to, a fad in educational circles.

Wanting to know more about Montessori and her ideas, many educationists from Britain traveled to Rome to visit Montessori and observe the children in the Children's Houses. One English lady who went to Rome was Lily Hutchinson, an infant-school teacher. She successfully applied to the education committee of the London Country Council at the end of 1912 for travel expenses so that she could attend Montessori's international course beginning in January 1913. On her return Hutchinson set up a Montessori class in the

London County Council Schools. She had gone to Rome “with a more or less open mind, more or less prepared to condemn, and came away unable to do anything but bless” (Radice, 1920, p. 4).

In 1914 Hutchinson reported to the educational committee of the London Country Council that much of what she observed in the Children’s House could be applied with advantage to the English school system. The committee agreed to trial a “small experiment in the Montessori system” in one of their one thousand schools (Kramer, 1988, p. 242). Later Montessori described Hutchinson as “the pioneer of my English students” and she was responsible for translating *The Advanced Montessori Method* published in 1917 (Radice, 1920, p. 4).

Early Childhood Sector

As is the case with all new methods, Montessori’s pedagogical approach received a wide range of reactions. Within the early childhood sector Montessori’s ideas were not embraced with enthusiasm. Early childhood educators criticised the variety and scope for the use of the didactic materials, her apparent lack of interest in children’s creative self-expression, and the curriculum’s narrow focus (Weber, 1969). These criticisms are still directed at Montessori today. In addition Montessori’s approach was mainly compared with the British and U.S. Froebelian kindergarten, not other progressive programmes, which was significant. Montessori arrived on the international scene just as they were “reformulating their earlier Froebellian doctrines” (May, 1997, p. 123). Montessori’s combination of the new child-centred principles of education mixed with traditional subjects used in infant schools was perceived to be more rigid than Froebel’s curriculum. Kindergarten teachers who were just beginning to distance themselves from the “curricular domination of one set of materials” were not eager to embrace another one (Weber, 1969, p. 79).

Montessori brought back formal apparatus when the kindergarten was succeeding in emancipating itself from the formalism of Froebelian gifts and occupations. Montessori brought back sense

training when the kindergarten was fighting the battle to discard the sensory material of Froebel in favour of Deweyan projects and social play (Cohen, 1974, p. 58).

Amongst educators there was an intriguing division between those who became Montessori's published critics and those who became published advocates. Her main critics were professors of education, who appeared to be removed from direct contact with students while strong support came from those who actually taught within the classroom (see Faust, 1984; and Appendix I- Montessori's Critics and Advocates).

Montessori's Response to Criticism

Montessori chose not to address her critics directly. In responding to criticism, Montessori would simply restate her ideas and encourage the educational community to go and observe her principles in action. Montessori spoke about this matter in her talks with Sheila Radice.

"I have never yet succeeded," Dr. Montessori says, "in convincing any one by word of mouth. I think some new form of language will have to be developed to express this new phenomenon. Fortunately the children are there, behaving as I say they behave, and people who do not believe me can go down into the schools and see! (Radice, 1920, pp. 104-105).

I share Cohen's (1974, pp. 59) argument that:

Montessori could have debated with her critics. But instead she chose to disregard them; she refused to debate with the unconverted. Her disciples followed the lead of the master. No dialogue ensued. The insurmountable obstacle was Montessori's dogmatism, and the emergence of a Montessori cult.

However, in spreading her method of education Montessori made the decision to directly address the public instead of the more traditional and acceptable way through the usual professional settings. Some critics made reference to Montessori's personality as responsible for the rapid spread of her pedagogy internationally. They claimed that without her presence nothing of value was offered to the field of education (Faust, 1984).

Overseeing the Montessori Movement

Organisations who used Montessori's name had restrictions placed on them by Montessori. She kept a tight reign on the use of her name and all aspects of how her method was used. The Montessori Society of the United Kingdom, which was formed in March 1912, illustrated the difficulties associated with this. The Society was "inaugurated by a small band of enthusiasts, most of whom had some personal experience of the classes in Rome" (The Montessori System IV Recent Developments in England reported in *Times Educational Supplement*, 1912, J. Allen, 5, M2/93).

Montessori approved all of the members as her representatives in England, with the expectation that they would "preserve the purity of her teaching", and "restrain the over-zealous" (The Montessori System IV Recent Developments in England reported in *Times Educational Supplement*, 1912, J. Allen, 5, M2/93). In June 1912 Montessori entered into an agreement with them that guaranteed her 500 pounds a year, over a three-year period. A member explained, early in 1913, that without paid employment Montessori was reliant upon the "support of those who believed in her, and upon fees for courses of lectures" (Kramer, 1988, pp. 240-241). In return Montessori would "train a limited number of students sent out to Rome by the Society from time to time, who might extend the knowledge of her methods in England" (Radice, 1920, p. 162). The Society understood, though, that these teachers would be able to train other teachers. According to Kramer (1988) it is unclear whether Montessori had actually agreed to this but the teacher-training issue caused controversy and eventual splits. Montessori stated at a later date that she only intended to train the teachers so that they could teach children. Those teachers trained by her were able to use her name but she was the only one allowed to train Montessori teachers.

Training Montessori Teachers

One of the attractions of Montessori's method of education, deriving from its scientific basis, was her requirement that the teachers were properly trained. Montessori used the term 'directress' instead of teachers, which indicated a different relationship between the adult and child thus reinforcing the scientific basis of the system. According to Cunningham (2000) there were concerns in Britain about the quality of elementary trained teachers and an emphasis on teachers being trained appropriately was welcomed.

In the summer of 1914 the Montessori Society held a conference at East Runton, attended with about two hundred and fifty educationists from all over the United Kingdom, in the hope of uniting the growing number of "educational progressives under the Montessori banner" (Cohen, 1974, p. 60). However not all the delegates were sympathetic to Montessori. The attempt to use this conference to "bring together not only representatives of the Montessori Movement, but all kindred movements", while receiving majority support ultimately foundered because of Montessori's commitment to retaining the purity and integrity of her method (*Times Educational Supplement*, 4 August 1914 cited in Brehony, 1994, pp. 5 - 6).

Any institution to which Dr. Montessori lends her name must plainly be one that embodies the whole of her teaching, and her teaching only. Dr. Montessori has consistently on this account declined to approve any schemes for training "Montessori" teachers not under her own control (Radice, 1920, p. 163).

If the organisation wanted to continue using the name Montessori they had to restrict themselves to propaganda on behalf of Montessori only and so the Montessori Society Committee disbanded. The 'kindred movement' led to the organisation of the Conference of New Ideals in Education and later merged to become the New Education Fellowship (Cohen, 1974).

By the end of the year a newly organised Montessori Society had been formed, with Montessori as President, to carry on Montessori's work in England. A

major problem facing the Society was the lack of teachers, as Montessori's capacity to train teachers could never meet the ongoing demand. Plans had been announced in the fall of 1914 for Montessori to come to London to present a training course but the war interceded and Montessori did not make it to London until five years later (Kramer, 1988).

With Montessori training unavailable in London plans were made to establish an early childhood training college at Gipsy Hill in 1917, offering Montessori training along with other methods. Lillian de Lissa, the Director of the Adelaide Kindergarten College, was hired to head the college. In 1913, she travelled to Rome and trained under Montessori at her second international course held in 1914 (Petersen, 1983).

De Lissa and another Montessori trained teacher, Belle Rennie, planned to give students mainly a Montessori education along with an understanding of other methods at the training college (Cohen, 1974). The prospectus of the College confirmed this.

The aim of the College course is to give students a wide a survey of modern methods as possible. But as Dr. Montessori is the latest of our great educational pioneers, and is also the most systematic of all the apostles of self - development, special attention is given to her work, a thorough study is made of the principles underlying her method, and training is given in the use of the use of her apparatus, and in its physiological and psychological implications (Petersen, 1983, p. 260)

However, when Montessori heard she reacted strongly, "taking pains publicly to repudiate the plan and the two heretics" (Cohen, 1974, p. 60). Only she was allowed to train Montessori teachers. The Montessori element of the programme was quickly dropped (Petersen, 1983).

The First World War only produced a transitory lull in the increasing interest and debate concerning Montessori's system of education. In 1917 the English translations of *The Advanced Montessori Method - Spontaneous Activity in*

Education and *The Montessori Elementary Material* were published. The two volumes extending Montessori's method into elementary school were widely read and discussed (Kramer, 1988).

When the war ended Montessori made plans to visit England to give a training course under her direction in London, starting in September 1919. Two thousand applications were received and from these two hundred and fifty students were accepted (Brehony, 1994). Montessori's visit generated widespread publicity and, as a result, the Montessori Society in London increased to over a thousand members (Radice, 1920). An office was established in Tavistock Square, a "popular location for radical causes" (Cunningham, 2001, p. 441), and in other English cities branches were formed. During her time in England Montessori had a hectic schedule of lectures, meetings and receptions, with the most celebrated one being a formal dinner at the Savoy Hotel chaired by the President of the Board of Education. Her extensive tour ended in January 1920 but she planned to return to England in 1921 to give another training course (Brehony, 1994; Kramer, 1988).

While Montessori was in England, in the winter of 1919, a public appeal was launched by a group of Montessori enthusiasts to collect funds in order to establish a Montessori training institute. The amount raised was insufficient so the project had to be post-phoned (Kramer, 1988).

At the end of 1920 when the news was announced that Montessori would be giving her training course in London from April to July 1921, the fact that the teachers would only be able to teach in Montessori schools but not train others was highlighted. Lady Betty Balfour, in a public statement, commented on the lack of trained Montessori teachers and asked when Dr. Montessori "will delegate the office of training teachers to those she has already trained" (*Times Educational Supplement*, January 13, 1921 cited in Kramer, 1988, p. 271). Many Montessori supporters agreed with Balfour's comments.

C. A. Bang, the official organiser of the Montessori society, speaking on behalf of Montessori, stated that she did not consider any British Montessori teacher sufficiently perfected in her system to train others. Instead he proposed that the best way to provide more trained teachers was to establish a Montessori teacher-training institute. Contributions were collected but again they were insufficient for what Montessori had in mind. However, by the summer of 1921, a Montessori department was established at St. George's School in Harpenden, under the guidance of Claude Claremont, who was a devoted follower of Montessori and sought to protect the purity of her teaching (Cohen, 1974). Montessori's ideas for the education of older children were put into practice (Kramer, 1988).

Brehony (1994) considered Montessori's visit to be the zenith of the movement in England. The Montessori Society suffered a damaging split after a meeting in September 1921. Tension had become evident between members of the Montessori Society in London concerning their role in furthering the Montessori movement. Some members felt that they should be carrying out Montessori's personal directives while the majority of the membership was more pragmatic in their adoption of Montessori's methods. At the September meeting of the Society Dr. Kimmins, Chief Inspector of the Education Department with the London County Council, spoke on the 'Future of the Montessori Movement'. In his widely reported talk he stated:

It is always a grave misfortune for a name to be associated with a movement, because there is no finality in education and the individual teacher must vary her method as time goes on. There must be scope for the personality of the teacher in any scheme of reform, otherwise it is doomed to failure. If, however, the divergence resulting from the original scheme becomes great, the name of the founder of the original scheme should be omitted in the description (Kimmins cited in *Times Educational Supplement*, Oct 1, 1921 in Kramer, 1988, p. 272).

Essentially this was a plea towards a wider movement than just Montessori's system of education. Kimmins, along with others, believed that the society

could include methods of teaching which did not use the Montessori didactic materials but which were inspired by Montessori's ideals. According to Kramer (1988, p. 272) it was this distinction "between the method and the movement, between Montessori's system of education and a larger trend toward reform of education beginning with that system, which became the heart of the issue from now on" and split her English supporters. The same thing had occurred amongst her supporters in the movement in the United States.

Montessori responded to Kimmins' talk by withdrawing her name from the Society and resigned as President. The members split into two groups, with the largest becoming The Auto-Education Allies and then eventually the Dalton Association (Brehony, 1994). Dr. Kimmins was prominent in this association, which promoted the Dalton plan developed by Helen Parkhurst. A Montessori trained teacher, Parkhurst had worked closely with Montessori in the United States before breaking away and developing her own system, known as the Dalton Laboratory Plan. From 1925 onwards the movement associated with the Dalton Plan began to replace the Montessori system as the focus of interest in British education (Kramer, 1988).

A smaller group of Montessori loyalist supporters headed by C. A. Band and Lily Hutchinson set up a provisional committee, with the intention of restoring Montessori as President. By 1922 they had exclusive ownership of Montessori's name.

Other committee members announced their withdrawal in order to "leave the field quite open for those who feel they can work under Dr. Montessori's Rules of Authorization," which they made no secret of finding "unworkable, because they are autocratic in conception," adding that "the rules of any Montessori Society should permit the same freedom to its members as the method permits to the child" (*Times Educational Supplement*, January 21, 1922 cited in Kramer, 1988, p. 276).

Kramer (1988) exposed the central paradox that in a movement committed to liberty members' freedom of action and expression was stifled. Montessori

advocated freedom, although with clear limitations, for the individual child in her system but this was in direct contrast to her style of dissemination (Cunningham, 2000).

In January 1930 an English branch of the Association Montessori Internationale (AMI) was set up. In August 1929 Montessori and her son Mario founded the AMI to protect and promote the name of Montessori (See Appendix E). All the members of the existing London Montessori society transferred, becoming a branch of an organisation headed by Montessori herself (Kramer, 1988, p. 323-333).

Mention has already been made of some schools that adopted the Montessori system. Cohen (1974, p. 57) further states that “the list of schools using the Montessori Method in the ‘twenties reads like a *Who’s Who* of English progressive education” [italics in original]. Progressive education thrived during this period due to the belief that “through educational reconstruction, war could be eliminated, a ‘new man’ created, and a brave new world ushered in” (Cohen, 1974, p. 57). In particular, progressives found the Montessori system entirely suited to do this. In fact William Boyd, one of her critics conceded in 1924 that she “will live in educational history as the leader and exemplar in the movement for individualised learning (Boyd cited in Cohen, 1974, p. 57).

Although Montessori had been reluctant to delegate the training of teachers in England in 1923 she finally agreed to the establishment of two Montessori training colleges, St. Christopher’s in Letchworth and St. George’s located in Harpenden. The courses were two years in length and were preparatory to Montessori’s own course of four months. Students only received a Montessori diploma when they had completed Montessori’s course. Claude Claremont directed St. Christopher’s School in Letchworth from 1923 until 1925, when he

became principal of the Montessori training colleges at London and Cranleigh (Cohen, 1974; Kramer, 1988).

Montessori was responsible for drawing up the syllabus. During the course the students “studied nothing but Montessori, by Montessori, with Montessorians. “We Montessori the students”, boasted Claremont” (Cohen, 1974, p. 61).

When Montessori’s ideas arrived in Britain other progressive thinkers including Margaret McMillan, Homer Lane, Susan Isaacs, Bertrand and Dora Russell, A. S. Neill, the Theosophists, and numerous other academics and public schools were developing their projects (DuCharme, 1992; May, 1997). They all arose in reaction to their dissatisfaction with the current methods of education, which involved large passive classes, severe discipline, rote learning and rigid teaching methods (Lucas, 1994). According to Selleck (1974, p. 81), the progressive vision, in direct contrast, had common themes that included “growth, nature, instinct, freedom, play, activity, self-activity, innate goodness, development, individuality, spontaneity, interest”, with the notion of freedom leading to individuality and inner growth, development or self-realisation. Montessori’s method appeared to offer an answer, especially in the infant schools, where much of the criticism had been directed.

The “Failure” of the Montessori Method

One of the main reasons for the failure of the Montessori method was Montessori’s insistence that her method be delivered in its entirety. The process of adaptation to society was something that she recognised happening in young children but not in her own work. Many reasons have been put forward including her position as a woman asserting her views in the face of dissent as well as her profession as a doctor and an academic, which encouraged a confidence that brooked no challenge. Montessori was a charismatic personality who attracted supporters from around the world but she was also a solo mother who gave up a promising academic career to pursue

her dream and was subsequently required to defend her intellectual property in order to maintain her independence (Chisnall, 2002; Kramer, 1988).

I share Cohen's (1974, p. 51) view that the reason for the failure of the Montessori movement in England was "an illuminating case study in adoptive failure". He maintained that it was not the method that failed to deliver but "deficiencies in the management of the reform" (Cohen, 1974, p. 51). The main reason amongst the deficiencies was Montessori's refusal to delegate responsibility for teacher training. When women such as Lillian de Lissa and Belle Rennie, who were both Montessori trained, planned to give students an understanding of Montessori and other methods of education at Gipsy Hill College, she reacted strongly. The Association Montessori Internationale was established in 1929 to safeguard the orthodoxy of the movement but Cohen states that by that time it was far too late. "In the 1930s progressive education everywhere in Europe was in retreat; Montessori was hit especially hard" (Cohen, 1974, p. 62).

Cohen (1974) argues that a similar problem occurred in the United States. In the first introduction of the Montessori method in America, Montessori moved to halt development at the translation or interpretation phase (Rambusch, 1992c). When the well-known and influential Alexander Graham Bells (Dr. Bell was the inventor of the telephone), became interested in her method, for example, they established a school in their Washington, DC home, early in 1912, and set up a Montessori Educational Association to stimulate wider public interest in her work. Others soon became interested in starting up societies. In 1913 the New England Montessori Association was established while in New York City the head of the Scudder School for Girls, Myron T. Scudder, gave a series of lectures for teachers on Montessori's method. When Montessori heard she reacted by sending a letter to *The New York Times* stating that only she could give a Montessori training course.

In view of this widespread interest I feel that the public should be able to obtain accurate information about those teachers who have

been specially trained by me. Owing to the short period of the training course it has been possible to give, and also to the fact that the method has not yet attained to its full development, I feel it would be premature to establish training schools which were not under my direct supervision, so that for the present no training course for the preparation of teachers except those held here in Rome, will be authorized by me (*The New York Times*, August 10, 1913 cited in Kramer, 1988, p. 181).

According to Kramer (1988) many Americans did not think it appropriate that an educational method should be fabricated into a closed system with the leader of the hierarchy having the sole power to determine who could disseminate it. To American educators this was unseemly and it was felt that the Montessori movement was more suggestive of a church than of what a Montessori school should be.

According to Goffin and Wilson (2001) another reason for Montessori's rapid descent was her unwillingness to permit anyone other than herself to train Montessori teachers and her insistence that her method be embraced as a complete system. This was the situation in Europe, and was what Montessori herself expected, and demanded. This effectively blocked the Montessori movement from gaining entry within the early childhood profession.

Cohen (1974, p. 372) further argues that the failure of the Montessori movement was equally due to the mismanagement of Montessori's cause by her supporters in America as well as Montessori's own personality and squabbles within the Montessori movement. He states that the movement had the "ill luck to be led by a woman who was temperamentally unsuited for the effective use of friends or colleagues or coalitions".

William Heard Kilpatrick, of Columbia University contributed further to the decline of Montessori in America. After visiting Italy in 1914 he published a devastating critique, *The Montessori System Examined*. Montessori's doctrine he stated "belongs essentially to the mid-nineteenth century some fifty years

behind the present development of educational theory". He outlined in his book an extensive and unfavourable comparison of Montessori's work with John Dewey. He noted, for example, that Dewey's emphasis in the earliest schooling for children, while not retracting the need for reading and writing, is placed on activities "more vital to child-life which should at the same time lead toward the mastery of our complex social environment". On the other hand Montessori's "much narrower conception of education" had led to her constant use of "logically simple units as if they were also the units of psychological experience" (Kilpatrick, 1914, pp. 63-64 cited in Faust, 1984).

Even with the failure of the movement in the United States, and to a lesser extent in the United Kingdom, there were still many people and institutions interested in Montessori. Montessori continued disseminating her method of education throughout Europe, India and other parts of the world until her death in 1952.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter Montessori's early life and the development of her early childhood curriculum model was presented. In particular this was examined in relation to Montessori's particular character and her personality. Montessori was a charismatic figure, with an extraordinarily vital and powerful personality and many who came in contact with her became her worshipful followers. Montessori's messianic zeal and fervor along with her conviction that her curriculum was complete as it was based on scientific results helps explain the endurance of her method. Furthermore, in spreading her method of education Montessori directly addressed the public rather than the more traditional and acceptable way through the usual professional settings. Her personality assisted in the rapid spread of her pedagogy internationally.

The rise of the printed media of communications during the early 1900s was mainly responsible for the rapid spread of Montessori's educational ideas on a

global scale. The English speaking world was initially quick to embrace Montessori's method of education. Her ideas came at the same time as others in the progressive movement were seeking change in the education system.

The circumstances that supported the rapid interest in and transmission of her ideas, particularly in Britain and the United States were examined in this chapter. The appeal of Montessori's system was that it offered a programme of reform during a reform-minded age. Montessori's approach to education seemed to have proved, in a very short time, that it could lead to an improvement in society. It appeared to be possible to mold a new generation of children who would be independent, productive members of society and at the same time solve the many problems that existed including social inequities of the social classes and gender.

A further appeal of Montessori's method was the success it achieved in teaching reading and writing with relevant ease to young children. This contributed to an overemphasis of the academic focus of the Montessori system (in comparison with Montessori's original ideas).

Montessori's unwillingness to allow anyone other than herself to train Montessori teachers as well as her insistence that her system of education be embraced as a whole package, or not implemented at all, was responsible for her rapid descent during the first phase. Another consequence of this was that she effectively blocked its sustenance from within the field of early childhood education. This separation of Montessori from the mainstream of education established it as an alternative education worldwide in the 1900s.

Montessori was responsible for developing the conceptual framework as well as the template for the implementation of her method. She believed that her method was complete because it led to the discovery of absolute truth (Montessori, 1912/1964). In spite of the results being based on only 2 years of

experiments working with children, she did not view her techniques as arbitrary nor did she feel they were open for further experimentation (Kramer, 1988; Montessori, 1917/1965a). Teachers and children were not to modify any aspects of her method, as any modification would render its scientific results void. The method and its specialised materials were to be used in the precise manner outlined by Montessori.

During her life Montessori attempted to retain total control over how her method would be disseminated and the use of the Montessori didactic materials. However, when Montessori's method was taken out of its original setting and transported to Australia and New Zealand it was modified and adapted in accordance with educational and cultural expectations very different from those which she would have envisaged (Miltich-Conway & Openshaw, 1988). This is the focus of the next chapter.

**Part Two:
The Growth of
Montessori in New
Zealand – Past and
Present**

Chapter 3

The Montessori Movement in New Zealand - The First Phase

Introduction

In New Zealand, like most other English speaking countries, Montessori's ideas were embraced with initial enthusiasm, followed by a gradual decline in interest over some decades. From 1912 into the mid-twenties, the Montessori method was introduced into a selected group of New Zealand State Primary Schools, convents and kindergartens. Those who were enthusiastic about Montessori's ideas, however, did not try and introduce the method in its complete and original form, instead they were interested in adapting aspects that would support the existing aims of the state education system. As Miltich-Conway and Openshaw (1988, p. 189) point out, Montessori's "philosophies and techniques were modified and adapted in accordance with educational and cultural expectations very different from those which she envisaged".

The implementation of Montessori's ideas in New Zealand and Australia did not occur after adaptation in England, like so many new ideas. Instead, the spread of the movement happened when key individuals, such as Martha Margaret Simpson, read Montessori's early books and became enthused about Montessori's method. A lecturer in kindergarten at the Sydney Teacher's College, and Mistress of the kindergarten practicing school at Blackfriars, Simpson began an experimentation of Montessori's ideas soon after reading her book, in August 1912. Enthusiastic about Montessori's method Simpson travelled to Rome to meet with Montessori and see her work in the Children's Houses. On route to Italy Simpson met Sir James Allen, the New Zealand Minister of Education. Breaking his journey they traveled together to Rome to visit Montessori. On her return to Australia she published an influential and positive report documenting her Montessori work at Blackfriars, how this

compared to what she observed overseas and the suitability of the method for schools. The experimental work at Blackfriars continued to be refined and a Primary school was established. Teachers and educators came to visit throughout Australia and New Zealand. Margaret Newman, a lecturer on Junior Class Teaching at Auckland Training College was one who did. In 1910 Newman had travelled to England and spent time in Rome where she studied the Montessori system (Manuka Jubilee Edition, 1906-56). Other visitors included George Braik, the Chief Inspector of the Wanganui district, and a delegate of three teachers from that district. As a consequence aspects of Montessori's method were adapted into infant schools, the most notable experiment being the infant schools of the Wanganui district (Petersen, 1983; Mitch-Conway & Openshaw, 1988). Simpson's work in Australia and its impact on New Zealand exemplifies the crucial role played by key individuals in establishing alternative educational philosophies.

Montessori's Ideas Reach New Zealand

Information explaining Montessori's method of infant education was available to some Australian and New Zealand educators as early as 1910. Maude May's reviews of Montessori's *Pedagogia Scientifica* printed in the *Journal of Education*, in September 1909, was reprinted in 1910 in a couple of Australian journals. Further interest was generated in both New Zealand and Australia with the arrival of the popular American *McClure's Magazine* during 1911-12, containing illustrated articles. One of the articles was a reprint of Tozier's favourable review of Montessori's method written in 1911, *An Educational Wonder-Worker: The Methods of Maria Montessori*, which Martha Simpson read (Petersen, 1983, p. 233).

Simpson had a good understanding of the debates amongst the kindergartens in the United States and she was sympathetic to the progressive early childhood educators, such as Patty Smith Hill, efforts for reform. One of the reasons for not aligning herself with Froebellian practice was that she felt that

Froebel's gifts and occupations were "in grave danger of becoming torture instruments" (cited in Petersen, 1983, p. 232). In 1909 Simpson experimented with the training of her female students by eliminating the gifts and occupations to demonstrate that the "Kindergarten does not, and should not, depend on these things for its life" (Petersen, 1983, p. 235). Petersen (1983, p. 235) notes that when Simpson read Tozier's article in *McClure's Magazine* that she "found a remedy for her restlessness".

Simpson approached the Minister of Public Instruction in New South Wales, Ambrose Campbell Carmichael, drawing his attention to a magazine article on Montessori. He "was greatly taken with the application of the laws of psychology, and the training of the senses to the education of children" and discussed the matter with Simpson (Carmichael, 1912, quoted in *Herald*, NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21). They agreed this new method was worth investigating. Carmichael asked Simpson to write up a report and cabled to Italy for a copy of Montessori's *Pedagogia Scientifica*. When the book arrived in Australia arrangements were made to have it translated into English (Carmichael, 1912 cited in *Herald*, NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21). In the meantime a copy of *The Montessori Method* arrived and was reviewed in the *Daily Telegraph*; Simpson also read the book. In July 1912 she reported to the Minister that the merits of Montessori's method warranted sending one or more teachers to Italy to train under Montessori herself. Simpson supplied a description of the teachers who would be ideal candidates to send, describing herself in the process. Simpson began preparations to leave for Italy, with her departure date set for the 21 December 1912 (May, 1997; Petersen, 1983).

Trialling Montessori's Ideas in Australia

Simpson began experimenting with Montessori's method of education before traveling to Europe and seeing it applied there. Carmichael reported that "the training started" as soon as Montessori's books had been translated, with the teachers entering into the spirit of the training and making materials

(Carmichael, 1912 cited in *Herald*, NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21). It helped that the first copies of *The Montessori Method* contained directions for the making the apparatus and were illustrated by pictures in the appendix (Smith, 1912). By August 1912 Simpson had set up a Montessori class for five and six-year-olds at the Blackfriars Practice School in Sydney, using as guidance Tozier's article and *The Montessori Method*. When the class had been up and running for only two weeks Simpson wrote a descriptive account of the experiment. This occurred even before the larger didactic materials including the long stair, the cylinders, and so forth had been made locally, with Simpson and her superiors completely ignoring copyright on the Montessori apparatus (Education Department File re Montessori, NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21; Petersen, 1983; May, 1997).

The *New Zealand Herald* published Simpson's favourable report of the experiment at Blackfriars on 4 September 1912. The report outlined Carmichael's opinion that Montessori would "revolutionise the early period of education of the children and very materially affect the late training as well. It will be one of the big things of the future, and if as successful as anticipated, will be looked on as one of the landmarks of our educational system" (Carmichael, 1912 cited in *Herald*, NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21). Early on Simpson was aware that it was highly unlikely that the Montessori system could be introduced in Australia in its complete and original form (Petersen, 1983). Nonetheless she argued in her report for aspects of the method to be implemented, particularly reading and writing:

Notwithstanding the difficulties of our language, the Montessori method of teaching reading and writing will, I am convinced, prove highly successful [and] warrant the introduction of the Montessori method of reading and writing into all schools (Simpson, 1912 cited in *Herald*, NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21).

In the report Simpson contrasted Montessori's individual approach with Froebel's emphasis on group work (Simpson, 1912 cited in *Harold*, NZ Archives

E-W, W1012, 29/21; Miltich-Conway & Openshaw, 1988; May, 1997). Simpson also noted this in her 1914 report:

The idea of a class of thirty or forty children, all at different stages of development, and each one educating himself with only occasional help from the teacher when help is actually needed, seems the dream of a visionary. Yet this is what one sees in Rome and in other places where the Montessori system has had a fair trial. *Class teaching must go and individual teaching be substituted if we are to progress with the times*" (Simpson, 1914, p.29) [italics in original].

This comparison between Montessori and Froebel was important. As Miltich-Conway and Openshaw (1988) argue, the Montessori challenge came at a vital time in New Zealand education, as it went against the newly dominant Froebellian paradigm, stressing play and myth.

Travels to Europe and England

While travelling by ship to Italy, as already mentioned, Simpson met Sir James Allen, the newly appointed Minister of Education from New Zealand. Simpson interested Allen further in Montessori's work. Miltich-Conway and Openshaw (1988) suggest that his initial interest and information was gained from the pamphlet *The Montessori System of Education* (1912) by E. G. A. Holmes. Allen was on route to the Imperial Defence Conference in London but he broke his journey at Naples on 23 January 1913 to travel together with Simpson to Rome to meet and view Montessori's work in person (Petersen, 1983).

When they arrived in Rome Simpson contacted Montessori to inquire about enrolling in the International Training Course that had begun on 16 January. Petersen (1983) notes that despite the credentials of Simpson and Allen, as well as a letter introduction from Peter Board, the Director of Education in New South Wales, Montessori's manner was cool until Simpson mentioned her work at Blackfriars. An invitation to attend any of the lectures of the training course was then given, with the fees waived. Simpson had no intention of undertaking the full training, staying in Rome for over three weeks where she had "almost daily opportunity of talking to Dr. Montessori" (Simpson to Allen,

3 March 1912, J. Allen, p. 1, M2/93). For the first few days Simpson and Allen went about together, until he left to attend his conference in London. His initial interest in Montessori and her method of education had turned into enthusiasm, and the two agreed to stay in touch (Petersen, 1983; Miltich-Conway & Openshaw, 1988; May, 1997).

As well as attending lectures, Simpson visited a lot of schools “in company with an Australian teacher who is taking the course, and who speaks Italian like a native. This lady was glad of the opportunity to visit, since permission to do so is not it seems, easy for a private individual to secure” (Simpson to Allen, 3 March 1912, J. Allen, p. 1, M2/93). Dorothy Canfield Fisher described how visitors less fortunate than Simpson had to make a “violent effort to investigate” as it was necessary to put a limit on the number of visitors otherwise “there would be more visitors than children on many a day” (Fisher, 1920, pp. 229, 231).

The schools Simpson visited all over Rome were “not only those directly under Dr. Montessori, but the other original Casa dei Bambini, and the schools under the direction of the Minister” (Simpson to Allen, 3 March 1912, J. Allen, p. 1, M2/93). Having viewed the method in practice and taken the opportunity to talk almost daily with Montessori, Simpson expressed her opinion that “the Montessori method is the greatest thing in Infant Education up to the present time” (Simpson to Allen, 3 March 1912, J. Allen, p. 2, M2/93). She maintained, however, that the Italian schools did not know how to interpret Montessori’s message. Simpson had observed that Montessori’s:

Own practice Schools go a certain length and then stop – they are unable to apply the principle further on and are waiting for the Doctor’s own experiments in this directions to guide them. You feel this even in the Via Giusti which is the best Montessori school in Italy (Simpson to Allen, 3 March 1912, J. Allen, p. 2, M2/93).

Fisher (1920, p. 230) likewise noted a lack of experimentation occurring in the Via Giusti school due to the apostolic character of the movement. From early on Montessori's 'disciples' followed her lead.

In her letter to Allen just after her visit to Rome Simpson concluded that "our own interpretation of the Montessori method" at Blackfriars "is the best and sanest I have yet seen" (Simpson to Allen, 3 March 1912, J. Allen, p. 3, M2/93). Furthermore she claimed that "Dr. Montessori, like Froebel, will have to look to English speaking people rather than those of her own land for a right interpretation of her method" (Simpson to Allen, 3 March 1912, J. Allen, p. 3, M2/93).

Another issue Simpson raised with Allen was the training of Montessori teachers. She stated that:

The Montessori principle is good all through, but in order to apply it teachers trained along scientific lines are necessary. Of these Dr. Montessori has only one - Signorina Macchioni - that that one is being so fearfully overtaxed with the working of two schools that she must sooner or later break down...I think the training is making experiments on their own account that my teachers have had accounts for this (Simpson to Allen, 3 March 1912, J. Allen, p. 3, M2/93).

In order to preserve the purity of her method, Montessori felt that she had to retain personal control and oversee the training of Montessori teachers. Those who wanted to become Montessori teachers had to travel to Rome to receive instruction from her, which led to a shortage of trained teachers.

Before leaving Rome at the end of February Montessori asked Simpson to talk to her teacher training students about the Montessori experiment she had set up at Blackfriars. For over two hours she spoke and answered questions. "After it was over several of the American women expressed the opinion that we are ahead of America in a good many things" (Simpson to Allen, 3 March

1912, J. Allen, p. 5, M2/93). Americans had been amongst the first to become interested in Montessori (see Chapter 2).

During the rest of her stay in Europe and England Simpson visited other Montessori schools but was not overly impressed with what she saw. Schools were either inferior to the Montessori class at Blackfriars Practice School or some, like East Runton, confirmed what they were doing at Blackfriars was the correct interpretation of Montessori's system (Simpson, 1914; Petersen, 1983). The school at East Runton established by Bertram Hawker was the first and best-known Montessori school in England. For instance, the illustrations in *Dr. Montessori's Own Handbook* (1914) were taken there.

Hawker was a wealthy expatriate who had connections with the kindergarten movement in South Australia. He and his wife had founded the Kindergarten Union of South Australia in 1908 and continued to contribute generously over the years. In Adelaide Hawker had helped Lillian de Lissa set up the first Kindergarten in 1905 (See Chapter 2; Brehony, 1994; Petersen, 1983). Hawker was one of the early visitors to the Children's House. Impressed with what he observed he became active in promoting Montessori's ideas, including the formation of the Montessori Society of the United Kingdom along with his friend, E. G. A. Holmes (Radice, 1920; Cunningham, 2000).

In March 1912 Hawker visited de Lissa in Adelaide, and he interested her in Montessori's method. When Hawker returned to England he established the first Montessori school in the country, in August 1912, with a trained Montessori teacher (Petersen, 1983; Kramer, 1988).

The *Times Educational Supplement* reported that in the seven months the school had been running the Montessori system had "no rigid set of formulae, which needed to be imported and copied minutely in English schools" (The Montessori System IV Recent Developments in England reported in *Times*

Educational Supplement, 1912, J. Allen, 5, M2/93). More importantly, the Secretary of the Montessori Society stressed that the Montessori system could be adapted in a different culture.

Difficulties were overcome and problems solved, with the result that the little Norfolk class is to-day a striking example of what the Montessori system can do for English children and a practical refutation of the objection that a system invented by an Italian woman for Italian children is unsuited for those of another race (The Montessori System IV Recent Developments in England reported in *Times Educational Supplement*, 1912, J. Allen, 5, M2/93)

Simpson maintained that the work being done at East Runton was similar to what was being carried out in Sydney, with the exception that the children at Blackfriars were older and more advanced (Petersen, 1983). Furthermore she reported to the Sydney Morning Herald that “nowhere except in Rome itself has the method been tried so long, so fully, or so successfully as in Sydney” (*Sydney Morning Herald*, ‘English Educational Notes’ by M. S., 30 July 1913, cited in Petersen, 1983, p. 238).

At this time enormous interest was shown in Montessori’s work and its application in the United States and England. It is highly unlikely that Simpson would be unaware of Anne E. George or Mary Jackson Kennedy’s work in America, which had been established for a much longer period (Petersen, 1983; Smith, 1912). George, the first American to train as a Montessori teacher, opened a school in Tarrytown, New York in October 1911, which was reported in the December 1911 issue of *McClure’s Magazine*. She also published *The First Montessori School in American*, an account her success in transplanting Montessori’s ideas to a new culture, in the June 1912 issue of *McClure’s Magazine* (Kramer, 1988). George was well known, too, as the translator of Montessori’s book, *The Montessori Method*, which Simpson read.

According to Petersen (1983), one reason for Simpson stressing the success of her experiment at Blackfriars was to gain acceptance for Montessori from the Australian kindergarten movement. George D. Braik, the Chief Inspector of the

Wanganui district, visiting Australia in early 1913 found that Australian "official opinion regarding Montessori is reserved, if not sceptical" (Braik, 1913, p. 4).

Simpson's Montessori Experiment at Blackfriars and its Impact on New Zealand

While Simpson was still in Europe, Sir James Allen arranged for Braik to travel to Sydney, where he visited Blackfriars. When he returned to New Zealand he wrote his report commenting on what he had observed at Blackfriars, and made some recommendations for the adaptation of Montessori's method for the infant schools in Wanganui. Having investigated other kindergartens besides Blackfriars, Braik "did not see anything better than I have seen at the Central Infants' and St. John's schools" in the Wanganui district (Braik, 1913, p. 4). Nonetheless he believed "school work would be improved if our kindergarten and first preparatory classes were to receive some teaching in accordance with Montessori principles" (Braik, 1913, p. 4).

Braik's report identified three directions infant schools would gain through an adaptation of the Montessori system. First, "by developing in the children the power of judgement by a direct appeal to the senses, especially to the senses of sight and touch as applied to such matters as texture, colour, shape, weight, size" (Braik, 1913, p. 6). Second, Montessori's method could aid in children's constructive work, helping them to fit things together using their refined judgement due to the sense training. Third, the Montessori materials would assist in the beginning stages of "writing, phonics, form and numbers" (Braik, 1913, p. 6). Braik recommended therefore:

...that a set of apparatus be procured for the Central Infants' School, Wanganui; that modified sets be supplied to the largest infant departments; and that in all schools the teachers be encouraged to adopt the methods of the system so far as they aid the teaching of the primary subjects (Braik, 1913, p. 6).

Braik made it very clear however, that, like Simpson, he was only interested in adapting aspects of Montessori's method that would support the existing aims of education. While he approved of some things he observed, such as 'spontaneity' and 'self-discipline', Braik was careful to point out:

...the only justification for the vast changes that are taking place in education, and the vast expenditure of public money upon it, it, that the present generation of school children will bear the burden better than their fathers did, when they come to take it up [citizenship], and, on the other, that apart from his ultimate efficiency as a citizen, the child, as a child, is the most precious thing that the State has, and should accordingly be made the object of its fostering care (Braik, 1913, p. 6).

A further recommendation was that a copy of Simpson's report be acquired when it becomes available (Braik, 1913, p. 6).

Simpson's Report on the Montessori Method of Education

When Simpson returned to Australia in August 1913 she wrote *The Report on the Montessori Method of Education*, which was published early in 1914. The influential and positive report, documenting her Montessori work at Blackfriars, and how it compared to what she observed overseas and the suitability of the method, was forty-seven pages long with plenty of illustrations. It was widely read in New Zealand.

Simpson claimed that her experiment at Blackfriars was "carried out strictly along the lines laid down by Dr. Montessori in her book" (Simpson, 1914, p. 26). She was, however, selective in what she drew from Montessori's curriculum for "in taking up Montessori we did not drop any of the work we had been doing" (Simpson, 1914, p. 26). Simpson did not slavishly imitate the Montessori system as she maintained that rigid conformity "would be death to any system". Instead, at Blackfriars she adapted the Montessori system to the New South Wales curriculum and Australian culture environment "with wonderful results" (*Report on the Investigations of the Montessori Methods*, 7 August 1915, S. A. Department of Education Archives cited in O'Donnell, 1996, p. 33).

In the report Simpson provided a full description of the didactic materials and how they were used but the other aspects of the Montessori curriculum were barely mentioned. The only motor education series of excises mentioned were eight wooden dressing frames, to teach children self-help skills, and a picture showing children busy in the garden (Simpson, 1914, pp. 14, 17; see Chapter 3). There was no mention of the serving and sharing of meals, the silence game and other activities that occurred in the long daily sessions in the schools in Rome between the repeated periods for using the didactic apparatus, as described by Montessori (see Appendix K - Winter Schedule). Instead Simpson highlighted how the didactic materials could assist children in achieving academic goals.

Children broke into writing of their own accord and without any formal teaching the phonetic elements were mastered and applied by most children in two weeks. One boy made over forty words with the cardboard letters in ten days. These words were not suggested by the teacher - they were the child's own. After words came swift sentences on strips of cardboard. These were eagerly seized and read. One little fellow of 5 years and 9 months took a bundle of these strips into a corner of the room by himself and kept at them the whole day until he could read each one. I consider this child taught himself to read in one day. Soon there was a demand for print, and at this stage the child appeared to be seized with an acute hunger for reading. In order to satisfy this hunger we had sentences and paragraphs printed in large, clear type on strips and on stunt cards. These the children eagerly seized and devoured. Everyone was busy and happy, and the joy of achievement and delight in their work shone in their eyes (Simpson, 1914, p. 26).

This focus on academic goals was in line with the age of the children, five-and-six-year-olds, in one of the two Montessori rooms operating at Blackfriars.

In Rome the Montessori programme catered for children aged between three-and-seven years all situated in one classroom. When adapting the Montessori method in Sydney, Simpson felt that it was necessary to set up a Kindergarten Room and a classroom for the older children in order to maximise the benefits. Braik (1913, p. 4) described the Kindergarten room as "spacious, well finished and well equipped. There was a "dolls corner" a "toy corner" and a "play

corner". There was no fixed furniture and the tables and chairs were movable, characteristic of a Montessori learning environment. Placed along one wall were small washstands where children learnt "correct usage of basin and jug, and soap and towel" (O'Donnell, 1996, p. 21). The room was well equipped with Montessori apparatus and the children were "just beginning to recognize sounds and to build words" (Alexander, 1914, p. 12).

In the second room for older children a continuous blackboard (a hyloplate) was hung at the children's level for their use or the teacher. Pictures of famous artists' works adorned the walls. Placed around the walls were cabinets for storing both the Montessori equipment and Kindergarten material. There were desks but the centre of the room was kept clear. "On this floor space, strips of Japanese matting were laid down by the children themselves, and there they sat in concentric semi-circles at the feet of the teacher, awaiting instructions" (O'Donnell, 1996, p. 20). During the Montessori "free work" period the children would "quietly rise from their seats and take from the cupboard the material they wished particularly to use" (Alexander, 1914, p. 9). Montessori's guidelines for setting up the prepared learning environment were followed here (see Chapter 2).

In her report Simpson claimed that even with a "partial introduction" of the Montessori method children learnt to read and write with ease.

The methods of teaching writing and reading would, of themselves, stamp the Montessori system as far in advance of anything of a similar kind yet introduced in our schools. Notwithstanding the difficulties of our language, I am sure the Montessori method in these two subjects alone will bring about a wonderful change in our schools. The results obtained by the partial introduction of the method into Blackfriars Practice School in August of last year amply proves this. Children learnt to write with amazing rapidity and eagerness, and manifested a hunger for reading that was truly surprising. Everyone knows the drudgery of teaching children to read and write by the older systems. Owing to the difficulties of our language we may not accomplish such miracles as those I saw in the schools in Rome, where 5-year old children learnt to write and to read in the space of four or five

weeks; but the experiment at Blackfriars shows that the results, if not quite so magical as those of Rome, *are nevertheless sufficiently marvellous to warrant the introduction of the Montessori method in all schools* (Simpson, 1914, pp. 34-35) [italics added].

Interest in the Montessori system in New Zealand was growing but the greatest interest came from teachers who taught in the early years of formal schooling. As May (1997) puts it, this was most likely due to Montessori's claims of successfully teaching children to read and write quickly and easily. Simpson's experiment at Blackfriars was further proof that Montessori's system could be adopted and successfully applied to English-speaking children.

Montessori's Method Suitable for Older Children

Like Edmond G.A Holmes (1912), Simpson stated that the Montessori system could be successfully applied to older children. On a return visit to Rome in 1913 Simpson had observed at the Via Principessa Clotilde, where Montessori's elementary materials were being experimented with (Petersen, 1983). She was asked by Montessori not to speak about what she observed until Montessori's book was published. Nonetheless, Simpson was able to write in her report "that it fully bears out the wisdom of her method, and shows, with children from 7 to 10 or 11, the marvellous results that follow the application of the master principle-self education through liberty"(Simpson, 1914, p. 8). Furthermore Simpson felt that the method would find "ready acceptance" in the "small one-teacher schools of the state" (Simpson, 1914, p. 33).

Teacher Training

Simpson stressed many times throughout the report the importance of teachers being trained in the use of the didactic materials.

The mere introduction of the Montessori material will not, however make a Montessori school. Unless the teacher has grasped the principle underlying the system, the introduction of the material is not likely to be of much use. Steps should therefore be taken to make teachers acquainted with the Montessori principles and with

the correct method of using the material. This might be done by means of -

- (a) Summer schools such as are now held in music and art
 - (b) The establishment of a Montessori Observation School or Schools where country teachers and others might be permitted to attend for a period of continuous observation.
 - (c) Lectures and demonstrations in various centres in each inspector's district".
- (Simpson, 1914, p. 41).

Prior to undertaking any training with the didactic materials or having them supplied to a classroom, Simpson strongly recommended that all schools be given *The Montessori Method* so that teachers could read the book in preparation to the above. According to Peterson (1983, p. 245) Simpson was very aware of the "dangers of reform by regulations".

The Notion of Freedom for Children and for Teachers

Along with practical recommendations Simpson's report contained a lengthy discussion on freedom for children and for teachers. Petersen (1983) noted, however, that Simpson made an error in regard to freedom for teachers. After spending some time with Montessori in Rome, Simpson made an incorrect assumption about her personality.

Dr. Montessori is the least dogmatic of persons, she would be the first to deplore any blind or mechanical adoption of her methods; all she wants is a thorough mastery of the principle of liberty and intelligent application of that principle to all school subjects (Alexander, 1914, p. 5).

Montessori was indeed dogmatic and throughout her life fought to keep her method pure, without adaptation. As Petersen (1983, p. 245) puts it, Simpson attributed to Montessori her own "habit of dissociating theory and practice, of thinking that if intentions were pure then any means would serve to realize them in practice". Simpson's in depth discussion on freedom in her report was used to "justify the truncated and adulterated version of Montessori" that she felt was suitable for Australia (Petersen, 1983, p. 245).

Based as it is on liberty, the Montessori system is particularly well suited to the educational needs of a free, democratic country like Australia, where self-reliance, individuality, resource, originality, and freshness of thought are qualities much to be desired in the future citizens (Simpson, 1914, p. 45).

Such sentiments greatly appealed to New Zealanders and her report was widely read here (Miltich-Conway & Openshaw, 1988).

Distribution of Simpson's Report

Simpson gave Sir James Allen a perusal proof copy of her report. After reading it he wrote to the Under Secretary, P. Board, in the Department of Public Instruction, in Sydney requesting a "supply for circulation amongst the School Teachers in New Zealand" as soon as it was printed (Allen, 10 March 1914, *James Allen Papers*, NZ National Archives, M2/93). George Hogben, the Inspector General of Education also read Allen's copy of Simpson's report and was enthusiastic. In May 1914 Hogben negotiated with the Under Secretary and Director of Education in Sydney to purchase 5000 copies of her report, which were distributed by July 1915 to the education boards (NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21). Twenty copies were also sent to each of the teacher training colleges, Christchurch, Wellington, Auckland and Dunedin, in August (Wanganui Education Board. Vol. 1-4, July 1914, NZ Archives E-W, W1012 Box 39, 29/21).

Implementing Montessori's Method in New Zealand

The earliest mention of a school using Montessori methods was in 1912 (May, 1997). In 1909 Mother Aubert had opened a kindergarten at her Wellington Foundling Home and Hospital and in 1912 she established a primary school. The Head Teacher Sister Isidore was "assisted by her own sister, Miss Mary Shorthall, a primary school teacher, who left a position at Feilding to teach at the Home of Compassion. Miss Shorthall was responsible for the introduction of the Montessori phonetic teaching system there" (Rafter, 1972, p. 97).

Kelburn Normal School

Another Wellington school that implemented Montessori's ideas was Kelburn Normal School. During the period from 1915 to 1925 the Infant Department at Kelburn Normal School ran their programme along Montessori lines. The school was located across road from the Wellington teachers' training college, and took part in the college training programme. When the school was built Miss Fitch, an experienced teacher with special interest in young children had insisted that a kindergarten be part of the school so that teacher trainees would be to study children's educational development from an early age (McCallum & Sullivan, 1990; May, 1997).

George Hogben, the Inspector General of Schools, took a keen interest in the new Kelburn School. He wanted the "work of schools tied closer to everyday life, wanted the highly formal bookish nature of class work reduced and wanted more opportunity given to children to do things for themselves and so learn" (McCallum & Sullivan, 1990, p. 24). Hogben was responsible for organising a grant for the building of the infant school, which was completed first. When Miss Fitch retired early in 1915 Miss W. G. Maitland was hired from England to take over as headteacher along with a dual post of lecturer at the teacher training college (McCallum & Sullivan, 1990).

Miss Maitland's appointment was in itself a revolution. She was young' - just over 30 - and a woman. Normally these would have been two crushing disabilities. New Zealand had very few woman headteachers and in 1915 she was a phenomenon. Tall, dignified and assured, she had been chosen for the position not only because of organising ability, but also because she was familiar with current trends in England and with the teachings of the Italian educationalist, Maria Montessori (McCallum & Sullivan, 1990, pp. 28-29).

The Kindergarten Department of the training college had a modified set of Montessori apparatus, obtained in mid-July 1915. In 1917 when Mrs. Jessie A. R. Boyd, of Patea, wrote to the Education Department to find out more about Montessori for use in her home it was suggested that she visit Kelburn School

to see how the materials could be used (Education Department File re Montessori Education, E-W, W1012, 29/21, June 1917).

Maitland's approach to education was that she wanted to capture the interests of children and use this to motivate their learning. She maintained that "the concentration and hard work that lead to self-discipline will inevitably follow" (McCallum & Sullivan, 1990, p. 29). Consequently she encouraged teachers and training college students to trap this interest and give children freedom when possible within the school. Pupils were allowed to move about in their classrooms, talk and assist each other as long as the common rules of courtesy were adhered to. A photograph of the kindergarten taken in 1923 shows the children working with Montessori materials while sitting on mats on the floor (McCallum & Sullivan, 1990). The children, some working in groups, appear to be concentrated on their work, as no one is looking at the camera.

Wellesley Street Normal School, Auckland

Miss Margaret Newman was the Infant Mistress at Wellesley Street Normal School, and when the Auckland Training College opened in 1906, she lectured the students on Junior Class Teaching. In 1910 Newman travelled to Europe and the United States for a 12-month tour of kindergartens and infant schools. She spent time in Rome where she studied the Montessori system. Returning to New Zealand via the United States she went to Columbia College where she attended lectures given by John Dewey (Manuka Jubilee Edition, 1906-56).

When Newman returned she continued lecturing and wrote about infant work and child development. To ensure that her students understood the principles of infant teaching and child study, Newman opened a kindergarten class at the school shortly thereafter, the first in Auckland (Manuka Jubilee Edition, 1906-56). She was chairman of the first Educational Committee of Kindergarten work (Manuka, 1954).

In 1914 Newman published an article on Montessori, providing a brief description of the principles and methods. Newman outlined the importance of the learning environment such as adequate floor space, light and well ventilated rooms, small tables and chairs, Montessori's educational didactic materials and access to the garden. Newman notes that Montessori's method requires the co-operation of parents if a process of selection is adopted. She further comments on Montessori's concept of discipline, questioning:

Whether this positive encouragement of individuality and spontaneous activity will fit the child for work or the school for older scholars, or for the work of life, is a question upon which no positive opinion can be formed. In Dr. Montessori's school the child may quit the schoolroom and go to the garden without hindrance from the teacher; whether later on the child will quit the desk and go to the playground, or leave his work for a stroll in the park, in the exercise of spontaneous activity, is a question of such a serious character that it must be a source of anxiety to every teacher who may contemplate adopting Montessori principles (Manuka, 1914, p. 35).

Newman also highlights that individual teaching, an essential condition for Montessori's work, "effectually precludes all and every idea of a class even of the size we know it in the best of our infants' schools" (Manuka, 1914, p. 37). Stating that Montessori would only place twenty to twenty-five children under one teacher, she maintains "there is hardly hope for success under the Montessori system except with very small classes and very capable teachers" (Manuka, 1914, p. 38).

In her concluding remarks, Newman felt that the "Montessori method is intensely interesting" but cautioned that it was too early to make a judgement (Manuka, 1914, p. 40). She suggests that one needed to wait for seven years before commenting on the success or otherwise of the method. Newman, too, commented that while "expense should not stand in the way of the adoption of any desirable system" the adoption of Montessori's system in place of the existing infants' school would be extremely expensive (Manuka, 1914, p. 41). However, Newman points out that the extent to which Montessori's methods

could be adopted in existing schools was a “matter for local determination” (Mauka, 1914, p. 41). Nonetheless Newman suggests that some of the doctrines will have wide appeal such as the training of children’s senses and the “belief that the teacher should guide the energies of the child to find out for himself” (Manuka, 1914, p. 41).

Although the reports on her own practices do not specifically mention Montessori, it appears that Newman did adapted new educational ideas to her work with children (Manuka, 1923). In 1915 she visited Blackfriars in Sydney for several weeks. According to May (2004) this strengthened Newman’s conviction that more might be done to provide greater individuality to children.

In 1920 Newman was appointed to the Inspectorate. After 18 months she returned to the Auckland Training College as a lecturer and Women’s Warden, retiring in 1923 only to return in 1929-30 for a year (Manuka, 1954).

Attaining the Montessori Didactic Materials

As noted, the Wellington training college had a modified set of Montessori apparatus. When the Director of the School for the Deaf at Sumner, Christchurch requested a set of Montessori apparatus in July 1915, it was the Prime Minister of New Zealand, W. F. Massey, who wrote to the High Commissioner for New Zealand in England to order a complete set of Montessori apparatus. The materials were purchased for 8 pounds 8 shillings and shipped on the S. S. Rangatira, which was shipwrecked on route to New Zealand. Part of her cargo was saved but unfortunately not the Montessori apparatus. The apparatus was re-ordered in October 1916 but as it was during the war it did not arrive until December 1917 (Education Department File re Montessori Education, E-W, W1012, 29/21).

Despite such complications caused by the War, by late 1916 the Assistant-Director of Education, J. Caughley reported:

.... that there is a considerable number of schools where the Montessori system is being carried out. A few that may be instanced are the Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin Training Colleges, *the central infant school, Wanganui*, as well as several other infant departments in that district. In addition to these quite a number of teachers in infant schools in Invercargill and other centres have adopted the Montessori method in the infant classes. It will therefore be seen that the system is being very extensively tried in New Zealand, as students in the Training Colleges are also being trained in the system there will be considerable experience on which to base judgement as to the value of the system in relation to New Zealand education (Assistant Director of Education to J. H. E. Schrader, Canterbury University College, 16 October 1916, New Zealand National Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21) [italics added].

The Wanganui Education Board

The reference to the Central Infant school in Wanganui was germane as this proved to be the most significant experiment with Montessori teaching that occurred in New Zealand. Prior to Simpson's (1914) report being published, the Wanganui Education Board made plans to send a teacher representative to Australia in February 1914 for the "purpose of gaining an insight into the working of the Montessori system" (Minutes of the 439 meeting of the Wanganui Board, p. 159, ABCV W3571, Education Board Minute Books 1912-19, Box 100). In December 1913 the Board agreed to ask Miss Mary D. Alexander, Head-teacher of the Central Infants' School, if she would be willing. A follow-up to Braik's visit, however, was not undertaken until 7-18 June 1914 when Alexander along with two other teachers, Miss Emily Blennerhassett, Assistant-teacher at St. John's Wanganui, and Miss Harriet Hall-Jones travelled to Sydney to visit Blackfriars. After their visit Alexander and Blennerhassett published their reports in the *Leaflet* (Minutes of the 445th meeting of the Wanganui Board, p. 228, Wanganui Education Board ABCV W3571, Education Board Minute Books 1912-19, Box 100). The *Leaflet* was a periodical publication

edited by the Senior Inspector, for Wanganui teachers (Miltch-Conway & Openshaw, 1988).

Before travelling to Sydney, Alexander stated in her report that she was “doubtful if the amount of freedom suggested in the book could be a good thing for large classes and in the hands of weak and incompetent teachers” (Alexander, 1914, p. 9). During her visit, however, she changed her mind and was anxious to begin using the Montessori method at once in the Central Infants’ School. In her report Alexander provided details of Simpson’s visit to Rome to demonstrate that Simpson had a thorough knowledge of Montessori’s method and had tested it “so that we could not have gone to anyone better equipped to demonstrate it to us” (Alexander, 1914, p. 7). She relayed that “Simpson thought it wise to go slowly with the method and at Blackfriars has only certain periods during the day when the method is used” (Wanganui Education Board, Vol. 1-4, July 1914, p. 8).

In her report Alexander pointed out that, as teachers of Infant Schools, they were more interested in the older children, from five years of age so most of their time was spent observing in that classroom. In identifying the limitations of Montessori’s method, she stated that it did not “provide for storytelling, nursery rhymes and poetry in her curriculum”, but she believed teachers could adopt Montessori’s principles of liberty in teaching these subjects (Alexander, 1914, p. 13). She cautioned, though, that “if we are to make the Montessori method a success in our schools in New Zealand more liberty must be given to the teacher in arranging the curriculum”(Alexander, 1914, p. 13). Alexander concluded at the end of her visit that she was “quite satisfied that the Montessori method would help us considerably in our Infant Schools if it is systematically introduced and undertaken by teachers who thoroughly understand the method” (Alexander, 1914, p. 13).

Blennerhassett's report stated that Simpson gave them an insight into the method, which they would not have been able to gain by reading Montessori's book. She outlined two essential components of Montessori. First was the "principle of liberty", which Blennerhassett understood to be self-discipline with the teacher becoming an observer, a director. "She guides the child without letting him feel her presence too much, is always ready to help but never an obstacle between the child and her experience" (Blennerhassett, 1914, p. 15). The second was the sense training material and the way it could be applied to teaching children phonics, reading and numbers. Blennerhassett was convinced that the "method is superior to our own - it would tend to develop more self-reliance, individuality, originality, freshness of thought" (Blennerhassett, 1914, p. 17). Nonetheless, like Alexander, Blennerhassett was of the opinion that "sweeping changes would not be desirable or in any way necessary - this method can be worked gradually into our schools as at Blackfriars" (Blennerhassett, 1914, p. 17).

In early 1915 Braik died but the Wanganui Education Board continued to be enthusiastic about the educational possibilities of Montessori. The Wanganui inspectors, who were now headed by T. B. Strong, worked on introducing Montessori methods into the districts schools, most of which were in the country areas. Strong, who had taken over from Braik as editor of *Leaflet*, published an article on Montessori but warned that "...as a body without a soul is but useless clay, so apparatus used without regard to the underlying principle is but useless lumber" (Editorial, *The Montessori System, Leaflet*, May 1915, quoted in Miltich-Conway & Openshaw, 1988, p. 192).

During this time teachers at Wanganui Central Infants School worked towards introducing Montessori methods into their programme. In 1914 Hall-Jones, one of the three teachers who had traveled to Blackfriars, joined Alexander on the teaching staff. Early in 1915 Blennerhassett transferred from St. John's to join both Alexander and Hall-Jones. Mary D. Hawk, another enthusiastic supporter

of Montessori's ideas, headed the teaching team (Miltch-Conway & Openshaw, 1988, p. 192). Although some of the Montessori materials had been purchased the teachers themselves made a lot of them. The Montessori materials were expensive and had to be imported from England hence the necessity for teachers to make their own. They developed the Montessori programme along the lines that they had observed at Blackfairs, where certain periods during the day were focused on Montessori activities or the materials and ideas were used in selected reading and math activities. By August 1915 Strong could report that one of the more noteworthy accomplishments of the Education Board was the introduction of the "full Montessori system" at the Wanganui Central Infants School (18 August 1915 meeting, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, November 1912 to June 1916, p. 390). The minutes also recorded that the "teacher of the Western Rangitikei School be commended for being the first to attempt Montessori in a small school" (p. 395).

Montessori Model Schools

Once established the Wanganui Central Infants' School became a model for Montessori training.

The head teacher and her staff have an honourable but none the less difficult duty to perform, namely that of explaining and illustrating to their many visitors the special methods employed in the school. In this respect the school serves a most useful function (Report on Central Infants' Public School, 1917).

Some of these visitors were mentioned by the chairmanship of the Wanganui Education Board, Fred Pirani. In October 1916 he reported that three teacher from the Auckland District had spent a week observing the Montessori methods at the school and were delighted with what they saw. Pirani also reported on some other visitors to Wanganui who had spent a morning observing at the school. He stated that their impressions written up in the press made interesting reading (18 October 1916, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 71). Other visitors noted were the Chief Justice, Sir Robert Stout, and Mr. McKay from the Hawkes Bay Education

Board in 1918. Sir Robert was impressed by what he observed, as was Mr. McKay. "His Board is sending one of its Infant teachers to Sydney to study the Montessori system" (5 June 1918, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 367).

When Hawk resigned from her job as Head Teacher Wanganui Central Infants' School in June 1916 the Wanganui Education Board formally acknowledged her contributions, which was highly unusual. They noted Hawk's:

Capable, enthusiastic, and conscientious manner in which she has carried out her duties, and especially so in the introduction of the Montessori methods throughout the school, which has made the instruction a credit to the teachers and an example to the Dominion (26 June 1916, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 11).

For teachers unable to visit Central Infants' School to gain Montessori instruction, the Wanganui Education Board had a lending library, which contained information on Montessori. Many teachers, however, came to rely on the *Leaflet* to implement Montessori's ideas into their classrooms. In August 1915 the *Leaflet* published an eight-page article on Montessori, illustrated with materials made by the teachers at St. John's Infant School. In November of that year another illustrated article outlined how teachers could use the long stair to assist children to learn their numbers. A further article in the May 1916 issue provided teachers with a list of Montessori materials to use during the Montessori work periods in the areas of arithmetic, reading, writing, word-building and composition that would require "very little material beyond cardboard and is easily made by the teacher" (Hawk cited in Miltch-Conway & Openshaw, 1988). The *Leaflet* did, however, stress that Montessori work was not to take up the whole school day. Teachers in charge of large classes were only expected to use the Montessori work during one lesson period. As discussed in Chapter 3, the didactic materials only comprised one hour of Montessori's proposed daily schedule. Country teachers, on the other hand, were encouraged to utilise the Montessori's ideas throughout the day, as the

utility of Montessori's method for one-room had been stressed by Simpson (1914; see also McClune & Lord, 1917).

Frequently during their school visits the Wanganui inspectors recommended and sometimes required teachers to use the information in the *Leaflet* to make and introduce the Montessori apparatus. Miss A. M. T. Williams at Waitohi School, for instance, was told "Montessori work has not been developed here withstanding the articles in the Leaflet; the neglect of this work is disappointing" (Report on Waitohi School, 1916). An assistant teacher at Makino was advised "to study the Leaflet articles bearing on her work and to embody Montessori ideas as far as is practicable" (Report on Makino School, 1916). Senior Inspector Strong told Pohangina School's lower room Assistant teacher that the lack of Montessori work was "an omission for which I think there is no excuse. The 'Leaflet' dealt fully with the method, its advantages and the manufacture of material" (Report on Pohangina School, 1916). Strong also noted the lack of progress with Montessori at Okoia School. "Montessori has not yet been developed and I am somewhat surprised the school has been slow in securing a supply of the necessary materials" (Report on Okoia School, 1916).

During 1916 there was little material support for this to occur. In September Pirani reported to the Wanganui Education Board that an application to the Ministry of Education concerning grants for Montessori apparatus would probably be considered (20 September 1916, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 51). The Board was notified in April 1917 that the Education Department was willing to make a grant, but not more than five pounds per school was available to purchase Montessori equipment (18 April 1917, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 161). The money was finally received by the Board on September 1917 (19 September 1917, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 239). In 1915 a full set of Montessori apparatus was 8 pounds, 8 shillings but with limited funds available due to the 1914-18

War many teachers had to make their own Montessori resources. Even when money was available the War made it very difficult to obtain supplies of the Montessori apparatus (J. A. Hanan, Minister of Education to Rev. J. C. Kirby, Iago Street, Semaphore, Port Adelaide, Australia, 12 June 1918, New Zealand National Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21).

Those teachers who made Montessori materials were singled out for special mention. One inspector, James Milne, stated in the Primer class at Lytton Street School that:

...there is evidence of much time and labour spent in providing Montessori material, and the results reflect credit on Miss Walton and her assistant, Miss Mountford. They are just in the beginnings of this Montessori work and I look forward to success attending their efforts (Report on Lytton Street School, 1916).

Another inspector, David Stewart, noted at Ashhurst Public School that "Miss Piercy has gone to considerable trouble to make her lessons interesting and attractive and her supply of Montessori materials for busy work is being used to good advantage" (Report on Ashhurst Public School, 1917). Stewart too, finished off his report at Ngutuwera School with the positive comment that "Miss Matthews...has made a very satisfactory collection of Montessori materials" (Report on Ngutuwera School, 1917). Strong was particularly impressed with two teachers at Hawera District High School.

Wonderful good progress is being made here. The Montessori work was especially praiseworthy. Mrs. Anderson has done yeoman's service in assisting Mrs. Lanyan in preparing material, and other teachers have given of their best. No school in the Wanganui District has, unaided done more in this direction; the apparatus and material are admirably suited to the method (Report on Hawera District High School, 1916).

Hawera District High School had embraced the Montessori method early on. In November 1915 the Wanganui Education Board recommended that the Head Teacher and Infant Mistress be "commended for good progress made in the introduction of Montessori Methods in the infant classes" (17 November 1915,

Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, November 1912 to June 1916, p. 440). In July 1916, on the recommendation of the Inspector, "it was resolved that the Infant Department of the Hawera District School be constituted an Observation Department" due to the good work done in introducing the Montessori system (19 July 1916, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 25). Teachers now had three schools where they could go and observe lessons, Central Infants, St. John's Infants and this country school.

In July 1916 the Wanganui Education Board passed the following resolution.

All headteachers be informed that, in view of the proved value of the Montessori method of instruction in infant and lower standard classes, the Board expects headteachers to give their assistants who are in charge of those classes every facility and assistance to observe the method and subsequently to introduce it to their classes (*Leaflet*, August 1916, p.8 cited in Miltich-Conway & Openshaw, 1988, p. 194).

This placed a further emphasis on what the inspectors wrote in their reports, concerning the implementation of Montessori's method. Strong, commenting on the 'Quality of Teaching' at Apiti Public School, wrote:

I was disappointed to find so poor a development of Montessori, notwithstanding all that has appeared in the 'Leaflet'. The headmaster might well emulate what others have done in this direction and aid the Assistant in bringing the Department up to date (Report on Apiti Public School, 1917).

When he visited Opaku School, Strong felt that the Primer classes needed to be using Montessori material. "The manufacture of this material as described in the 'Leaflet' should be begun immediately. Without it it is impossible to keep the pupils constantly and profitably employed" (Report on Opaku School, 1917). After completing his inspection visit with Miss E. H. Sunaway, the Sole Teacher at Umutoi, Strong wrote:

The P. class did not answer at all well in Number, and I was sorry to find that though two years have now elapsed since the Montessori method was explained in the 'Leaflet', practically nothing has yet been done in this school to introduce the method" (Report on Umutoi School, 1917).

Amongst the inspectors' reports there was some confusion about what aspects of the Montessori method were to be emphasised. According to Miltch-Conway and Openshaw (1988, p. 196) this was a direct result of selective borrowing. Some of the reports focused on the 'free-occupations' periods, "which were to lead to a self-disciplined citizenry". One of Strong's recommendations at Ohingaiti, for example, was that "the 'free ' Montessori period might be entered in the Time-Table" (Report on Ohingaiti School). Another inspector, David Stewart, thought that Miss Beamish from the Lower Department at Maxwell School had put a great deal of time into providing material and apparatus to use in Montessori methods. He suggested that "she should arrange to have say one free half hour during the morning for putting into practice and operation the spirit of the Montessori system"(Report on Maxwell School, 1916).

Other inspectors' reports highlighted the need for teachers to use the more formal apparatus for word-building, reading, writing and numbers which would provide children with greater proficiency in acquiring reading, writing and arithmetic skills. The teacher at Parewanui School was told that "the P pupils are greatly in need of desk occupations on Montessori lines" (Report on Parewanui School, 1916). Strong noted to the sole-charge teacher at Kakatahi that "the phonic method should be used in reading and simple Montessori desk occupations introduced" (Report on Kakatahi Public School, 1917). As already mentioned the teachers were to use the *Leaflet* as a guide in these matters.

These inspector reports illustrate that there was official support for adopting and modifying the Montessori method, but overall there was limited material support for this to occur successfully. Nonetheless, the chairman of the Wanganui Education Board, Fred Pirani, when summarising the past ten year of accomplishment, stated that a number of educational reforms had "resulted in placing the Wanganui District in the forefront of advanced educational activity", and amongst a select list was the "Montessori system of infant

instruction" (31 July 1916, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 37). Subsequent reports to the Wanganui Board along with comments by the inspectors regarding Montessori implementation in the infants schools seemed to confirm such an optimistic judgement. For instance, Strong felt that at Central Infants Public School:

Good oral lessons were given by all the teachers, who seem entirely en rapport with their pupils. I regard the Montessori training however, as of much greater importance, inasmuch as its effect in the development of independence and power of initiative are much more marked than in any ordinary oral lessons. The value of the method in the development of character is most noticeable in this school. If no school and under no system that I am acquainted with is the growth of inhibitory power of self-discipline so marked as here (Report on Central Infants Public School, 1917).

The Head Teacher, however, was Blennerhassett, one of the three teachers who travelled to Sydney to observe at Blackfriars, and this was the model school to demonstrate to others how to adapt Montessori techniques.

At the end of 1916, Simpson was able to report that Blackfriars is recognised as a training ground for Infant work throughout the Commonwealth and New Zealand. Simpson claimed that her work over the past "ten years changed the whole attitude towards Infant teaching in New South Wales, and has largely influenced the rest of the Commonwealth. (Over 1300 visitors during the past three years) (Simpson cited in Petersen, 1983, p. 249). In late 1917 Simpson was appointed Inspector of Infants Schools, and her replacement, Rachel Stevens, carried on the Montessori work in a similar manner to Simpson. Education boards in New Zealand continued to send their Infant teachers to Sydney to study the Montessori system (5 June 1918, Wanganui Education Board Minute Book, June 1916 to February 1919, p. 367).

In the 1918 Annual report of the Wanganui Education Board, it was reported that the Montessori method was proving to be an immense service to country schools. The report also praised those teachers who had made their own

Montessori materials. By 1921, as noted by Miltich-Conway and Openshaw (1988, p. 194), the Board claimed that “some measure of auto-education based chiefly on Montessori methods and material is in use in practically all of the schools of that district”. It appeared that elements of Montessori had been successfully incorporated into the Infants schools in the Wanganui district, but the fact was that enthusiasm for Montessori’s method was in decline. After 1921, there was no mention of Montessori in annual reports, and at the monthly meetings the members were no longer informed of the success or otherwise of Montessori. In addition, inspector reports on teachers and schools hardly mentioned Montessori work. In 1920, for example, only one inspector, Stuckey, made reference to Montessori. Miss D. Banks at Waverley School, was told that “good use is made of the Montessori and other practical appliances” (Report on Waverley School, 1920).

During this period the ‘Look and Say’ method of teaching reading was introduced in the schools, with the result being that when Montessori work was mentioned it was relegated to a supportive role. The two teachers of the primer classes at Awahuri were told, for example, that:

A beginning should be made with this method [‘Look and Say’], which should afterwards be combined with the Phonic Method Word build can be introduced as an aid to reading and spelling. Modelling, matching games and the Montessori material should all be adjuncts to the method of teaching this, the most important subject in the preparatory division (Report on Awahuri School, 1921).

The most common reference to Montessori after 1920 was in sole-charge schools, where it continued to be encouraged. The now senior inspector, Stuckey, noted at Okoia School, by way of illustration, that “Montessori material had been provided for the primer pupils”. While commending this, he thought “the material should be increased and extended in difficulty as need arises” (Report on Okoia School, 1922). The few inspector reports that did mention Montessori, though, suggested to teachers the need to also prepare

“kindred material” during the free period (Report on Manutahi School, 1922; Report on Ohingaiti School, 1922)

At the Central Infants School, where outcomes were monitored, the ‘Montessori period’ continued, with inspectors commenting that “the children worked freely, doing useful exercise in sense training” (Report on Central Infants School, 1921). However, by the end of 1922, under the direction of Miss Ridge, who has recently joined the staff at the school, criticism of Montessori’s method was evident.

There was evidence that in some cases the pupils had outgrown the apparatus which had therefore ceased to be effective. Careful attention and observation on the part of the teacher in charge of the class is required in this matter. Otherwise waste of time and formation of wrong habits will result” (Report on Central Infants School, 1922).

New educational ideas such as the Helen Parkhurst’s Dalton Plan, were starting to replace the Montessori method. She had been one of Montessori’s close associates in the American Montessori movement, who defected in 1918. Parkhurst had extended and adapted Montessori’s principles into secondary education, and teachers and educational theorists talked it about, much like the Montessori method a decade earlier. Kramer (1988, p. 273) points out that there were some who felt that Montessori’s own term:

“ Auto-education” might well be used to designate a movement which would encompass both the Montessori method and the Dalton plan, relating them to each other and to systems still to come based on the same ideals, although differing in details.

The Wanganui Education Board adopted the Dalton Plan, shortly after the War (Miltch-Conway & Openshaw, 1988). During 1922 some schools in the Wanganui district were beginning to implement this plan with the older children, with Marton District High Public School, in particular combining both methods. The teacher, Mr. Bates, was recommended for his “introduction of auto education on a modified Dalton Plan”. The report did caution, however, that “a beginning has been made on somewhat too large a school and it may be

necessary for you to revise your arrangements to some extent" (Report to Marton District High Public School, 1922). Unfortunately this new innovation shortly came under attack, and with its links to Montessori, criticism was directed at both methods (Miltch-Conway & Openshaw, 1988).

After the early 1920s Montessori was rarely mentioned in inspectors' reports on teachers and schools, as was the case in other Education Board Districts.

Other Education Board Districts

One exception was the Pine Hill Primary School in Otago which recorded using Montessori in their programme starting in 1925 when Miss Marjory M. Whitehead was hired as Infant Mistress. *Ring in the Second Century, the story of the first 100 years Pine Hill Primary School 1872-1972* written by Audrey E. Larsen (no date) tells of the developments that occurred at the school from the early 1920s. Before Miss Whitehead's appointment low wall-blackboards had been put up in the Infant class and pupils now used chalk as part of their equipment. This was something that Montessori had included in her description of what she regarded as the ideal room for young children to learn in (Montessori, 1914/1965b; see Chapter 3).

With new methods of teaching progressing considerably over the years Pine Hill received the benefits of these as each succeeding teacher brought with them the latest developments.

Miss Whitehead followed the Montessori method and Inspectors found individual work in the Lower School very pleasing, while under her command the big classroom became gay and bright with pictures and diagrams of educational purpose hung around its walls and she always had a large amount of interesting material prepared for her pupils (Larsen, no date, p. 15).

Not everyone was happy with this latest innovation in Infants' education. At first the "phrase "Montessori Method" rang a note of alarm in rural ears and was viewed with some suspicion among the committee members who

promised parents an investigation, but soon gave up and decided instead to enjoy its educational reward" (Larsen, no date, p. 15). In 1929 Miss E. M. McKinnon replaced Miss Whitehead and there was no further mention of the Montessori method.

Catholic Montessori Schools

In the late 1920s another attempt to integrate Montessori ideas into New Zealand was made by the Sister of Notre Dame des Missions [Our Lady of the Missions]. In 1925 the Sisters opened the Sacred Heart Convent in Christchurch, a separate, open-air building located near Ferry Road, which is used today as the library of the Sacred Heart Girls' College. Sister Mary St. Theodore who was in charge introduced modern apparatus and comfortable furnishings that had not been seen before in New Zealand infant schools (The Diamond Jubilee of the Sisters of Our Lady of the Missions in New Zealand, 1928).

The large sum of one hundred pounds was allocated in 1927 to purchase Montessori equipment for the Infants' Department of St. Joseph's Convent, to implement Montessori. Mother M. St. Domitelle, who had trained under Montessori in Rome, was responsible for establishing the Montessori programme (O'Donnell (1996, p. 49).

Public school inspectors, teachers, and others who have visited this school have expressed unstinted admiration of the system by which the children are enabled to make a maximum of progress in learning reading, writing, arithmetic, drawing, music, and other subjects without the drudgery too commonly associated with the ordinary methods of instruction (Butchers, 1930, p. 504).

The Catholic educational authorities impressed with the success of the school had by 1930 equipped over 30 of the Sisters' schools with full or partial sets of the Montessori apparatus. A full set of Montessori apparatus costs only seventy pounds and is sufficient to keep about fifty children busy over a five-year period, "the price comes really to only a few shilling person head for each

child's full course" (The Diamond Jubilee of the Sisters of Our Lady of the Missions in New Zealand, 1928, p. 135). The Sisters in charge of each school were responsible for raising the money. There was an appreciation that the quality of the materials would ensure that they would last years and years instead of months.

Seventy pounds was a huge sum considering that six years earlier the five pound grant for Montessori materials was still in effect for State Primary Schools. Unlike supplying a traditional classroom the start-up costs for a Montessori classroom were higher. This issue was raised at a New Zealand Women Teachers' Association meeting in Christchurch, in July 1921. They wrote to the Minister of Education asking for a meeting to be convened in order to discuss the "whole question of the Supply of Manufacture of Montessori material", which they found to be inadequate (Education Department Files re Montessori Education, E-W, W1012, 29/21, 23 July 1921).

Butchers (1930, p. 504) reported that the Sisters regarded the Montessori method "superior even to that of the Kindergarten, its basic principle being rather the soothing effect of well-ordered and pleasant work than the excitement of continual play, for which due provision is made in other ways". Even more importantly, though, the method could successfully be applied to the "teaching of Christian doctrine" (Butchers, 1930, p. 504). Montessori and her followers, in particular E. M. Standing, spoke and wrote on the religious education of children (See Montessori, 1929). Montessori was "an eminent Catholic and a daily communicant" and even though her method of education is used in non-Catholic countries around the world it is best suited in "combination with Catholicity to which indeed it is closely allied" (The Diamond Jubilee of the Sisters of Our Lady of the Missions in New Zealand, 1928, p. 135).

Teacher Training

There was a Montessori Course, to train teachers, in the Convent at Christchurch. O'Donnell (1996) stated that the Sisters of Notre Dame des Missions had another smaller Montessori school at Kipoi, a village close to Christchurch. Sister Mary Natalie taught there for three years after completing the Montessori course. She ran the school on Montessori lines before moving to Perth in 1929 to teach at a Montessori school there. There is no other mention how the issue of teacher training was resolved.

Dr. J. M. Liston, Co-adjutor Bishop of Auckland made several visits in 1928 to the Montessori Infant School in the Cathedral parish. He was impressed by the "amount of knowledge and the understanding of it shown by these children (some sixty in number) of the ages 5 to 8" (The Diamond Jubilee of the Sisters of Our Lady of the Missions in New Zealand, 1928, 137). He felt that they were at least one year ahead of their peers who attended other schools, hence the pupils had a "distinct advance on other methods I had seen in use in New Zealand" (The Diamond Jubilee of the Sisters of Our Lady of the Missions in New Zealand, 1928, p. 137). His parochial school of St. Benedict's in Auckland adopted the Montessori system, which had been up and running for three months. Although too early to discuss results, Liston reported that the children are happy while the teachers were confident the programme would be a success (The Diamond Jubilee of the Sisters of Our Lady of the Missions in New Zealand, 1928).

Other Catholic Montessori Schools during this time included Our Lady Star of the Sea located at Sumner, a suburb of Christchurch. The first open-air school in Canterbury, it opened in February 1928. Approximately forty primary children from Montessori to Standard 6 attended and were taught by Sister Mary Andrew who was assisted by Sister Mary Michael. Sister Andrew was very interested in the Montessori method for teaching the youngest pupils. The Sisters travelled daily from Christchurch on the tram and the Mission Sisters

continued their involvement for fifty years until the Sumner convent closed (Hennessy, no date). In the early 1930s, the New Zealand Director of Education, Dr. C. E. Beeby's "interest in alternatives and experiments led him to establish links" with the experimental Montessori school set up at "Sumner by Mother Domitilee of the Mission Sisters with whom he became close friends" (N. Alcorn, 1999, p. 47).

According to Beth Alcorn (1999), a Montessori teacher trainer, for the Montessori World Education Institute (MWEI), Addington, New Brighton and Greymouth all had Catholic schools that operated with the Montessori method. In 1930 Butches mentioned a new kindergarten at Hastings, established in 1929, while in Blenheim one was currently being planned. Commenting on the rapid implementation of the method, Butches (1930, p. 505) argued that it provided an "excellent example of their fixed determination to maintain in the schools of their Church at whatever cost standards of education not merely equal, but, if possible, superior, to those of the State". Further he noted as the state education system had not yet implemented the Montessori system that opportunity may have been lost.

Beth Alcorn (1999) recalled that Margaret Dumergue, Gay Ball and herself were participants at the 1977 Christchurch teacher training course run by Margaret Homfray and Phoebe Child. All continue to be involved in Montessori education. A photograph taken by *The Christchurch Star* in January 1977 shows Margaret's daughter, Elizabeth, and another child working with a knobless cylinder block watched by Margaret Homfray (O'Donnell, 1996). Elizabeth was the third generation of the Dumergue family to be Montessori trained. Her mother, Margaret, remembered attending St. Mary's Catholic School at Lyttelton from February 1938, when she was three, until December 1949. The school was run along Montessori principles and her mother who was Montessori educated wanted the same for her daughter. She traveled each day from Christchurch and Mother Mary St. Bernard taught her (B. Alcorn, 1999).

In 1943 Guy H. Goldsbrough (Binda Goldsbrough's brother, see Chapter 5), wrote to the *School Journal and Education Gazette*, in April 1943, inquiring on behalf of his older brother about interchange of teachers between Britain and New Zealand, and asked for a list of public and private schools. He also mentioned his interest in the Montessori method of education and asked if they would tell him "of any schools in New Zealand practicing this method" (NZ Archives EW, W1012, 29/21). The Department of Education addressing all his questions, responded in relation to Montessori "there is no school practising the Montessori Method exclusively" (NZ Archives EW, W1012, 29/21).

A few years later, in April 1947, when Dr. C. E. Beeby, Director of Education, was asked to comment on Montessori's contribution to the education system in New Zealand, he wrote the following favourable comments.

Although the philosophy and method of Dr. Maria Montessori were not accepted in this country without reservations, both have had an important influence on Infant Education in New Zealand, particularly in the provision made for the very young child.

As a result of Dr. Montessori's work a complete change of attitude to the child himself and to the problems of his education became evident and the importance of allowing little children to develop naturally was widely accepted. It has been realized that education must aid and supplement the mental growth of the child and the development of his natural powers instead of attempting to implant facts and habits that were desirable in an adult...While the methods of Montessori have not been adopted in this country, a great deal of the spirit of her work is to be found in our schools. The happy actively busy infant rooms of our good schools are the result of the inspiration and spirit of her work (Education Department File re Montessori Education, E-W, W1012, 29/21).

Generally the Montessori approach was short-lived during this phase although some of the Catholic convents retained the method for their infant classes up until the 1940s and 1950s (O'Donnell, 1996). In 1984 Sister Amelda Lindsay, the Principal of Sacred Heart Girls' College, stated that the Montessori system was "practiced in our College until the late 1950s at which time all students up to

Form II transferred to other schools” (Lindsay, 1984 personal correspondence with B. Goldsbrough).

Montessori’s Reception in the Early Childhood Sector

In the early childhood sector there was not a great deal of enthusiasm to adopt aspects of Montessori’s method. Like May (1997), I was unable to find any evidence of New Zealand kindergarten teachers attending Montessori’s early courses in either Italy or Britain. However, Margaret Newman did study the Montessori system in Rome in 1910. As discussed, she was an Infants teacher and lecturer at Auckland College of Education. After travelling overseas she incorporated a kindergarten into the public education system at Wellesley Street Normal School. She was a pioneer kindergarten worker in New Zealand and chairman of the first Educational Committee of Kindergarten Work (Manuka, 1954). Further, from 1915 to 1925 the Infant Department at Kelburn Normal School ran their programme influenced by Montessori’s ideas. In 1915 Miss Goldsmith was hired as deputy directress at the Training College in Dunedin. She travelled to Sydney to learn about Montessori theory (May, 1977).

In 1918 the Minister of Education, J. A. Hanan, reported that:

The Montessori system has been established in the Dominion chiefly in the four kindergarten Departments of the Normal Schools attached to the Training Colleges, also in about twenty free kindergarten Schools in the four chief centres, and in the central infant schools which forms part of the Queen’s Park public schools in Wanganui (J. A. Hanan, Minister of Education to Rev. J. C. Kirby, Iago Street, Semaphore, Port Adelaide, Australia, 12 June 1918, NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21).

According to May (1997, p. 129) there is “little evidence to suggest that there were any substantive efforts towards including Montessori in kindergarten (training) programmes aside from a cursory introduction to her ideas, but this was alongside a range of other new ideas”. She did find that a few kindergarten teachers could recall the use of some Montessori materials but

since they were placed out of context of the Montessori philosophy the method faced a similar fate to its implementation in the state school system. Ted Scott, for example, talking about her experiences teaching in a Wellington kindergarten in Taranaki Street from 1918 to the early 1920s, remembered they had some Montessori materials. In particular the children used “frames for hooking and lacing and buttoning. They were hopeless at that because the buttons were little round boot buttons” (Scott, 1975, p. 6).

One area that Montessori’s ideas did influence was the use of child-size tables, chairs and accessible shelving. Christison’s study of New Zealand kindergarten developments, for example, points out that as “more kindergartens began moving out of their dour halls and makeshift buildings around this time”, furniture that could be moved around by children was used (May, 1997, p. 129).

Overall, in the kindergartens there was a cautious adaptation of some of Montessori’s ideas and didactic materials but, like in the primary sector, their implementation did not have a lasting effect except for child-sized furniture. Dr. Beeby also commented on this, stating that by the mid-1940s “most infant rooms in New Zealand are equipped with small tables and chairs light enough for the child to handle” (Education Department File re Montessori Education, E-W, W1012, 29/21).

The ‘Failure’ of the Montessori Method in New Zealand

(The failure of the Montessori method in New Zealand and particularly in the Wanganui District happened during a similar time frame to countries overseas. In New Zealand, the United States, Britain and Australia, the enthusiastic initial reception accorded Montessori teaching was replaced in the 1920s by what Cohen (1972, p. 358) terms "adoptive failure", where an educational innovation "is rejected by the target system due to deficiencies in resources and power or incongruence with existing target system norms and procedures".

Notwithstanding, I agree with Miltch-Conway and Openshaw's (1988) argument that Montessori teaching failed no objective tests. As indicated earlier in the chapter, Central Infant School in particular was consistently praised for their implementation of Montessori's ideas.

“(One of the reasons Montessori's ideas failed to have a lasting effect in a different educational and cultural environment, was that Simpson, the main person responsible for spreading the Montessori method, adapted aspects of Montessori's teaching and didactic materials, rather than a total adoption of her method. In New Zealand Braik made it very clear, too, like Simpson he was only interested in adapting aspects of Montessori's method that would support the existing aims of education.”

According to Miltch-Conway and Openshaw (1988) there were two consequences of this selected borrowing. The first was a great deal of uncertainty among teachers and inspectors as to what aspects of Montessori's ideas were to be a priority. A further problem was that over a third of the teachers in the Wanganui district were untrained, and with the confusion over which particular features of the Montessori method they were to implement the result was “superficial adaptation” (Miltch-Conway & Openshaw, 1988, p. 196).

“(The introduction of the Montessori didactic materials without an understanding of the Montessori principles will not deliver Montessori results. Many of the teachers had to depend on the *Leaflet* to learn about Montessori's method. Even when money was available the 1914-1918 War made it very difficult to obtain Montessori apparatus from overseas so teachers had to make their own didactic materials.”

As Miltch-Conway and Openshaw (1988, pp. 196-197) conclude:

The second result of the selective borrowing of Montessori techniques and concepts was that it encouraged those responsible for its introduction to 'bill' Montessori as the new educational

'cure-all' which would solve specific educational deficiencies within the state system. When this failed to occur, Montessori became a convenient scapegoat.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have outlined how Montessori's ideas were initially embraced with enthusiasm in New Zealand as it seemed to offer a programme of reform and success to a public that was reform conscious and seeking remedies. In particular Montessori's method was adopted in the Infants schools as it promised to teach young children to read and write with ease. During this phase key individuals were responsible for spreading the Montessori method. In particular, Australian Martha Simpson played a vital role in the implementation of Montessori education in New Zealand.

During this first phase of Montessori, it was taken out of its original setting and adopted into the primary state sector. In the mid-1970s a North American updated version of Montessori's method was reintroduced to New Zealand as an alternative approach to early childhood education, which is examined in the following chapter.

Chapter 4

Montessori: The Revival

Introduction

The second phase of Montessori education is the focus of this chapter. It was driven by groups of enthusiastic parents wanting a different kind of early childhood education for their children, who embraced Montessori's ideas and pedagogical practice. Unlike the first phase where aspects were modified and adapted in the State Primary Schools, this time Montessori's method was embraced in the early childhood sector as an alternative to existing programmes. Examined first is the North American revival of the Montessori movement as this preceded its re-introduction into New Zealand in the mid-1970s. Maria Montessori is a global educator whose philosophy and pedagogy transcends national boundaries. Nonetheless, the integration of Montessori education within any country results in a cultural specific Montessori education. Rambusch and Stoop (1992) maintain that when Montessori moved into American culture the outcome was a distinctive form of American Montessori education.

In New Zealand Binda Goldsbrough is the central figure in the resurgence of Montessori education during the mid-1970s, and she continued to have an involvement in the Montessori movement up until 2003. Goldsbrough's account of her involvement, including a personal perspective on Maria Montessori, provides evidence of the distinctive ways in which Montessori's method was reintroduced into this country. Further, Goldsbrough's story epitomises the intensely personal aspects of spreading educational innovations like Montessori within a specific historical and societal context. The success of the Montessori method of education in both the United States and New Zealand appeared to depend heavily on passionate believers, like Goldsbrough, particularly in the initial stages of revival.

The North American Revival

The North American revival of the Montessori movement in the late 1950s was a forerunner to its re-introduction into New Zealand in the mid 1970s. Once the method was established in the United States, the focus on Europe as the centre of development for the movement gradually began to shift. Many of the training and research programmes utilising the Montessori approach are now based in North America (Rambusch, 1992c; Chisnall, 2002; see Appendix L - Montessori Training Institutes: Historical Perspective and Current Status).

In 1946 Montessori returned from India, and continued to work in Europe and Asia, where the movement flourished (Edwards, 2002). During this time she made developments in both the birth to three, and the six to twelve years programme, until her death in 1952. Throughout Montessori's lifetime her method remain completely her own. It was only after her death that the opportunity for the transformation of Montessori education in the United States to American Montessori education occurred (Rambusch, 1992c).

A major revival of interest in Montessori occurred in the United States in 1957, in response to the Soviet launch of the Sputnik space satellite programme. Questions were asked as to why Americans were no longer leaders in research, and education methods came under heavy scrutiny. One outcome was the Head Start initiative for low-income children under five, introduced in 1965. Some Montessori programmes began under Head Start auspices. Initially the Head Start programmes rekindled interest in Montessori, but a set of private schools serving an almost entirely middle-class population soon became established. A teacher shortage resulted in the opening of private Montessori training centres that were typically free-standing, not associated with a college or university.

In the late 1960s parents in several school districts began to agitate for public schools to offer the Montessori method for their elementary school children

who had graduated from private Montessori early childhood centres. The most common way to get a Montessori programme established was as a magnet school, a national federally funded programme. These were set up in inner city schools, thereby attracting middle-class children. Almost all of the schools were started by grass-roots pressure from parents, not by teachers or administrators (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a).

Nancy McCormick Rambusch is credited with the reintroduction of Montessori education into the United States, which began in Whitby, Connecticut in 1958. She had discovered Montessori while traveling in Europe and did her training there (Fleege, 1979). In 1960 Rambusch and a number of educators in the United States who admired Montessori's educational methods but not her restrictive personal control established the American Montessori Society. The first American Montessori Teacher Training programme was founded shortly thereafter, and Montessori education spread as an independent school movement (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a; Rambusch, 1992b).

Maria Montessori is a global educator whose philosophy and pedagogy transcends national boundaries. Nonetheless, the integration of Montessori education within any country results in a cultural specific Montessori education. According to Rambusch and Stoop (1992), when Montessori's ideas were adapted into American culture the outcome has been a distinctive form of American Montessori education.

The history of the second wave of Montessori education in the United States has revealed both institutional complexity and variety. Once established in the United States, Montessori's ideas were "subject to translation from the side of the culture and to transformation within the culture" (Rambusch & Stoop, 1992, p. 3). The early organisers of Montessori's method of education in the United States fully intended it to become an American phenomenon, and they supported a range of settings that Montessori's ideas would find an identifiable

place. Today Montessori education in the United States can be found in private and non-profit settings as well as early childhood centres and public and secondary school programmes. I agree with Rambusch and Stoop's (1992, p. 4) view, that "to have formulated for all cultures and settings the irreducible set of operational 'Montessori' propositions would have been a useful thing for Montessori to have done during her lifetime". Instead, Montessori chose to rework her original ideas as her thoughts on education developed and expanded.

Montessori in her last years of life was a very different person from when she was thirty. Over time Montessori and her educational ideas evolved together. As previously discussed, many of Montessori's ideas were communicated orally and depended on her followers to write them down (see Chapter 2). Some of them differed in their interpretation of Montessori's ideas. Furthermore, the implementation of the Montessori method was left to others. Rambusch and Stoop (1992) argue that for these reasons there are substantial doctrinal differences found among her followers.

American Montessori educational practice may be considered, much like American Judaism, on a continuum. The most orthodox practice emanates from Montessori's circle of European disciples, while the "reformed" practice, although proceeding from Europe, is indigenous in origin and assimilationist in intention. Some American Montessorians see the original San Lorenzo Children's House of 1906 as their model; others see Montessori's insights as more critical than the full panoply of her didactic materials. Montessori practice reframed by time, circumstances and culture are the *foci* of such Montessorians (Rambusch & Stoop, 1992, p. 4) [italics in original].

In 1964 a new U.S. edition of *The Montessori Method* was published, containing an influential introduction by J. McVicker Hunt. He attributed Montessori's decline to the fact that her ideas "ran into almost head-on dissonance with conceptions which, from a variety of communicative influences, were becoming dominant in the minds of those Americans who became most influential"

(Hunt, 1964, p. xiii). Hunt not only placed the dissonance in historical perspective but he advocated that the time was right for "revisiting Montessori's approach to child pedagogy" (Hunt, 1964, p. xxxi). In the mid-1960s changes in the conception of psychological development and the domination of developmental and educational psychologists in early childhood provided justification for the sudden explosion of interest in Montessori as a viable model for early childhood education. This was despite the views of early educators such as Pitcher (1968, p. 94), who was less than enthusiastic about Montessori's academic focus and the fact that "there have been no systematic studies that demonstrate the superiority of the Montessori classroom over schools not thus labeled".

Hunt (1964) identified five conceptions dissonant with Montessori's ideas when they were first introduced, particularly in the United States. First was the belief that school experience for three and four year olds could be important for later development. Prior to the 1960s it was believed that a child's development was predetermined by heredity. "For those giving credence to the new psychoanalytic theory of psychosexual development, it was the fate of the instinctual modes of pleasure-striving that was suppose to matter, not cognitive development" (Hunt, 1964, p. xiv). Furthermore, this belief was supported by the fact that the education of young children outside of the home was regarded, by some, as an infringement on the functions and rights of families.

Second was the belief that intelligence is fixed at birth. Montessori's conception of mental retardation as responsive to pedagogical treatment ran counter to this notion, which rapidly became dominant in the educational psychology in North America (Hunt, 1964).

Another belief was that development is predetermined. Montessori's focus on cognitive development, which included encouraging children to read, write, and count, differed from this.

Just as Montessori was making her first trip to America [1912], the earliest studies showing the evanescence of the effects of practice were coming out. They appeared to imply that teaching children reading, writing, and counting before they were about eight years old was, at best, a waste of time and, as Kilpatrick (1914) noted, might possibly be harmful (Hunt, 1964, p. xv).

A fourth notion was that all behaviour is motivated by instincts or by painful stimuli, sex, or the necessity to achieve homeostasis. These conceptions of motivation worked against Montessori's method of education based upon children's spontaneous motivation for learning. Furthermore, Montessori's claim that her materials were intrinsically interesting for children did not fit in with this notion (Hunt, 1964).

Fifth was the belief that the response side of the reflex arc is the essential one in education. This behavioural emphasis made Montessori's contention that the education of the senses using the graded didactic materials would have "as its aim, the refinement of differential perception of stimuli" was at odds with the current psychological thought (Montessori, 1912/1964, p. 173 cited in Hunt, 1964, p. xvii). It was Montessori's ideas on sensory training that her most famous critic, Kilpatrick, criticised, stating that her theory was more than half-a-century out of date (Hunt, 1964).

Hunt argued that the emergence of a body of evidence repudiating each of these conceptions and supporting opposite points of view made the Montessori method of education appropriate for early childhood education in the mid-1960s. Moreover his analysis not only substantiated many of Montessori's ideas but also highlighted just how revolutionary her thinking was in the early 1900s (Hunt, 1964).

Hunt supported Montessori's contention that her method of education was based on scientific pedagogy, as did McDermott when he wrote the introduction to the reissue of *The Advanced Montessori Method: Spontaneous*

Activity in Education (1965). He stated that it was “Montessori, above all others, who holds to entwining of empirical method, scientific data, and human aspiration as the irreducible elements in any theory of education” (McDermott, 1965, p. xv). Renewed interest in Montessori’s method of education occurred alongside the search in the United States for a scientific approach to early childhood education in the mid-1960s (Goffin & Wilson, 2001).

Another important reason for revisiting Montessori was due to the fact that the ‘Children’s Houses’ had been established for working class children.

Children from the homes of many parents of the lower class come to the first grade, and even to kindergarten, unprepared to profit from regular school experience. In the light of the evidence which has become available largely since World War II, we can no longer rest upon the assumption that their lack of preparation is predetermined by the genes received from their parents of lower-class status. Regular schooling, moreover, may come too late. We must try to help these children overcome their handicap by enriching their experience during their preschool years. Montessori has provided a model. According to the impressionistic reports of observers, her “Houses of Children” worked quite well (Hunt, 1964, p. xxxv).

By the early 1970s there were more than 300 centres in operation in the United States and research studies into the effects of the Montessori programme were being undertaken (see for example Edmonson, 1963; Elkind, 1967; Berger, 1969; Miller & Dyer, 1975). In 1962 Rambusch published *Learning How to Learn*, which explained Montessori’s method to American parents by an American, much as Dorothy Canfield Fisher’s (1920) earlier work, *A Montessori Mother*, had done. Rambusch outlined her arguments for Montessori’s new found relevance, setting in place the framework for an American approach to Montessori. Elizabeth Hainstock wrote two influential books on *Teaching Montessori in the Home* (1968; 1971), providing guidance to parents wishing to utilise Montessori methods with their young children.

When Rambusch wrote a chapter for the book, *Montessori in Contemporary American Culture* (1992c, p. 15), she was able to point to the realisation of the goal that American Montessori Society set itself thirty years before, namely “the ‘naturalization’ of Montessori education” in America. This included incorporating the following points. First, recognising the critical role of parents as first teachers. Second, situating American Montessori education as a plurality of possibilities, not as a single orthodox repetition of Maria Montessori’s thought. Third, a reevaluation of the process of transmitting Montessori’s message, in which insights on the Montessori method in America are seen as coming from those who receive the message, not those who send it (Rambusch, 1992b).

Today in the United States there are over 5,000 schools calling themselves ‘Montessori’ (Edwards, 2002). The name ‘Montessori’ cannot be copyrighted; neither can it be patented. Therefore any individual can open a facility and call it a Montessori school. To determine the authenticity of a Montessori early childhood centre requires study in depth. This has been the result of a growing popular perception that Montessori education is simply a type of American education that depends on easily discernible descriptors such as family grouping, mixed grading, usage of special materials, and teaching as facilitative rather than expository (Rambusch & Stoops, 1992). Rambusch and Stoops (1992, p.2) note that a “school can have all of these characteristics without taking on the distinctive characteristics of Montessori education”. A school, therefore, can offer the appearance along with the name but not the substance. In the United States there are Montessori accrediting agencies whose purpose is to identify the required substance.

In the United States about 20 percent of the Montessori schools are affiliated with the two major accrediting organisations. Association Montessori Internationale (AMI), was established by Maria Montessori in 1929, to promote the study, application and propagation of Montessori’s original ideas and

principles for education and human development (<http://www.montessori-ami.org/ami.htm>). The American Montessori Society (AMS) supports Montessori education in the context of contemporary American culture (<http://www.amshq.org>). The two organisations are not regulatory or licensing agencies so an individual is not required to contact either in order to open a Montessori school. For that reason even though a new school has opened, AMI or AMS does not necessarily have information on it unless they have applied for membership. Membership is a voluntary process and a school is not required to be a member of AMI, AMS, or any other Montessori organisation. This does not automatically mean that the school is not a quality school. There is no guarantee that a non-member school is less dedicated to practicing the Montessori method than an AMI or AMS member, and at the same time, membership does not guarantee that a particular school is more exceptional than a school that is not a member (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a).

There are many Montessori teacher-training programmes available internationally (see Appendix L - Montessori Training Institutes: Historical Perspective and Current Status). Over 50 of them are affiliated with AMS and 15 with AMI (North American Teachers' Association <http://www.montessori-namta.org>). Moreover, in the 1960s, parents began to advocate for Montessori education in American public schools, leading to hundreds of Montessori programmes, at the early childhood and primary levels, and now increasingly at the intermediate and secondary levels (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a). With interest turned towards the state primary schools the Montessori system is aligned once again with societal and educational need, in particular academic success for a wide student population. This rekindling of interest in Montessori has been in response to the model's capacity to be able to address larger societal concerns (Goffin & Wilson, 2001).

Montessori education at the infant-toddler level is also rapidly growing. The growth in Montessori early childhood education is worth noting as the method

has not been lauded by mainstream early childhood education throughout the history of the movement. Nevertheless the National Association for the Education of Young Children is responding to challenges to expand upon the conceptualisation of teaching practices that are developmentally appropriate. Using the guidelines for developmentally appropriate practice Humphryes (1998) reexamined Montessori to discuss the model's contribution and found many similarities with other high-quality early childhood programmes.

Traditional supporters of Montessori were not always comfortable with these adaptations of the method. Montessori's son, Mario, spoke at length about his dissatisfaction with the way that Americans utilised the Montessori method.

As Hainstock (1997, pp. 4-5) put it:

He felt that it had become too diluted as it was incorporated and adapted by others, and disliked the fact that it had fallen into the public domain, thus becoming something over which he no longer had total control. This, in truth, was a monetary loss, whereby he could no longer collect a per head percentage for each child in a Montessori school and a fee from each school itself for use of the name and technique. To him it was the family business, as well as his inherited claim to fame. All of us who were not A.M.I. (Association Montessori Internationale) trained and blessed were rebels in his eyes.

Up until his death in 1982 Mario continued to tightly control his mother's ideas and methods, as the President of the Association Montessori Internationale. Montessori's grandson, Dr. Mario Montessori, Jr., took over that role and her granddaughter, Renilde Montessori heads the organisation today. Efforts by the institutionalisation of Montessori's followers to sustain and control the integrity of her method have had some negative outcomes. According to Kramer (1988), the isolation of the method in order to sustain its continuation has marginalised the Montessori movement from mainstream education as well as limiting the intellectual growth of the movement. It has not helped that Montessori teacher-training programmes are heavily dependent on Montessori's writings (Ball, 1983; Simons & Simons, 1986).

Chattin-McNichols (1992a) has also commented on the fact that many Montessori trained teachers maintain that their training contains everything they need to know about children's learning and development. As a result they feel they do not need to keep up-to-date with current early childhood education theory and practice. This has led to minimal communication between mainstream educators and Montessorians.

As Kramer (1988, p. 16) concluded, Montessori's ideas "became enshrined in a movement that took on more and more of the character of a special cult rather than becoming part of the main-stream of educational theory and practice".

The New Zealand Revival

The resurgence of Montessori education in the United States spread to New Zealand in the mid-1970s. A small group of parents in New Plymouth initiated a move towards Montessori education when they invited Elizabeth Hainstock from the United States, to talk in 1974-75 (O'Donnell, 1996). Hainstock was the well-known author of *Teaching Montessori in the Home: The Pre-School Years* (1968) and *Teaching Montessori in the Home: The School Years* (1971), written in an attempt to simplify the method and share it with others. The books were based on the St. Nicholas Training Centre course that she had taken with Margaret Homfray and Phoebe Child. Hainstock first became interested in the Montessori method when she read an article about the revival of her method in the United States, and she went on to teach in Montessori programmes as part of the Head Start initiative. Enthusiastic about the method she travelled a great deal, lecturing in the United States and overseas where there were no Montessori schools but great interest in starting them (Hainstock, 1997). Following her visit a school was established in New Plymouth, opening in May 1976 with Laksmi Fernando, who had done her Montessori training in Sri Lanka (Honey, 1977).

Like in the United States, the second phase of Montessori was driven by groups of enthusiastic parents who wanted a different kind of early childhood education for their children. During the late 1970s Montessori was embraced as an alternative to kindergarten or playcentre. As the Montessori method was implemented in the private early childhood sector, early childhood professionals in mainstream programmes did not generally see it as a challenge. By 1977 it was reported that "groups and associations are being established throughout the country, and there are plans to start Montessori schools" (Lee, 1977).

Although Hainstock was the catalyst for getting a group started in New Plymouth, it is Binda Goldsbrough who is the central figure in the resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand during the mid-1970s, just as Nancy McCormick Rambusch was in the United States. Goldsbrough knew Maria Montessori and worked with her as an Assistant demonstrator to two of the Montessori International Courses in London, in 1939 and 1946. Her life provides a personal perspective on Montessori and her own role in the Montessori movement in England and in New Zealand (see Appendix M - Binda Goldsbrough: A Life in Montessori). As with Martha Simpson earlier, Goldsbrough's work in New Zealand exemplifies the crucial role played by key individuals in establishing alternative educational philosophies. Due to these factors I will now examine in detail Goldsbrough's life and experiences as a foundational Montessori teacher in New Zealand as an exemplar of what I have been discussing in this chapter thus far.

Binda Goldsbrough and Her Role in Promoting Montessori Education in New Zealand

Goldsbrough was born in Kent, England in 1912, the same year the English edition of *The Montessori Method* was published. Goldsbrough's parents were given a copy of the book, and brought up their children in a Montessori way.

When she was seventeen, Goldsbrough undertook her Montessori teacher-training at Studio House in Hampstead, run by Claude Claremont and his wife. The two-year course included one term taught by Dr. Montessori, and Goldsbrough graduated in 1931 with her Montessori Diploma. During the next ten years Goldsbrough taught in private residential Montessori schools, a Pioneer Health Centre, and a wartime nursery before retraining at St. Gabrielle's College so that she could teach in the English primary sector. Goldsbrough found this fit in with her earlier Montessori training, and she drew upon this experience when teaching in the state schools.

In 1946 when Goldsbrough was an Assistant Demonstrator at Montessori's international training course, she "lived in the same house as Dr. Montessori", her son Mario and the other staff including Margaret Homfray and Phoebe Child (Goldsbrough, 1998). Like Martha Simpson, Goldsbrough had direct contact with Montessori as well as extensive practical experience in the implementation of Montessori's method (see Chapter 4).

Goldsbrough taught in the State sector for seven years before she and her mother travelled to visit her brother in New Zealand in 1951. They decided to stay, and Goldsbrough taught for three years at Clarence Bridge, south of Marlborough and then moved several miles south to teach at Mungamaunu Bay, where she once again drew upon her background in Montessori to provide an individual learning environment for her students (Goldsbrough, 1998).

In 1958 Goldsbrough moved to Christchurch and was appointed Principal of the Cerebral Palsy School, a position she held for seventeen years. The students' wide age and ability range made it necessary to use individual methods and Goldsbrough utilised Montessori's ideas and didactic materials to great advantage (See Appendix M – Binda Goldsbrough: A Life in Montessori).

When she retired Goldsbrough made a "trip home to England" in "1975 to 1976", and while there went to the St. Nicholas Training Centre to visit her long-time friends Margaret Homfray and Phoebe Child, who were the co-principals. The centre now offered face-to-face teaching as well as training by correspondence so Goldsbrough invited them to come out to New Zealand to run a workshop (Goldsbrough, 1998).

The St. Nicholas correspondence course had started up in 1952 in response to parents who were unable to travel to London to attend the training course. They wrote to Humfray asking for information on Montessori's method to help their children (Newby, 1991). According to Humfray, training by correspondence "isn't as good as coming to lectures and working with other students, but half a loaf is better than no bread". Homfray, however, did state that "the Correspondence Course has done more than anything else to spread the Montessori ideas and to help people get schools started" (cited in Newby, 1991, p. 72).

In January 1977 Homfray and Child travelled to New Zealand and ran two workshops. "They ran one in Christchurch and followed on with one in Auckland, with about fourteen students at both courses"(Goldsbrough, 1998). These proved to be extremely successful and they returned in 1978 to run workshops once again in both Auckland and Christchurch. As well as attending the workshops, the students completed the course study of the St. Nicholas Correspondence course, and had to pass both oral and written examinations in order to graduate as Montessori teachers. "So that was the sort of beginning really of this era of Montessori" (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Goldsbrough (1998) recalled that people interested in Montessori education began to "enroll for the correspondence course and I was an agent for a while for St. Nicholas and promoted their courses over here". Homfray and Child's approach to Montessori training was rigid and they sought to safeguard the

method from incursions, as Montessori had done during her lifetime (Newby, 1991; see Chapter 2). This eventually caused a split as Goldsbrough explains:

There was a big break in St. Nicholas when some of the Trust Board and staff broke away and formed the London Montessori Centre [1979]. I didn't realise it at the time but the leading force was Leslie Briton...*She had the idea, which in some ways was a good one, that the course should be expanded...that it should put Montessori in the focus with other people like Piaget and Erickson.* So she devotes quite a lot of course to things that are not purely Montessori, and to my mind left out quite a lot of stuff which...is essential for Montessori teachers. Students [who are] discriminating...admit that. Just as we admit now that the Aperfield Course does not include a few things that NZQA would like us to include (Goldsbrough, 1998) [italics added].

The formation of another Montessori correspondence course provided New Zealanders with another training option.

Small Beginnings

Once people were trained there was enthusiasm for establishing Montessori early childhood centres. As previously mentioned, a small group in New Plymouth had started a school in 1976 but it foundered a year later (Chisnall, 2002). Meanwhile, in Auckland the Henderson Montessori Pre-School had opened on 14 March 1977 (Jensen, 1988). The centre was first licensed as a child-care centre in July 1971, but the owner, Diana Jensen, re-licensed it as a Montessori centre. She recalled:

To pay off our property mortgage, and with three pre-schoolers of our own, we opened 'minding children' in our home. When we reached the magic number of ten children, we licensed and put our first Pre-fab on our three-acre property. Within a year we had added Prefab No. 2, and in 1976 added another Prefab, and I trained as a Montessori Directress. Thereafter we have operated as a Montessori Pre-School, the first in Auckland, and the first full-day (8am-5pm) Montessori in New Zealand (cited in O'Donnell, 1996, pp. 183-184).

Writing in 1979 Ofman emphasised the importance of introducing the Montessori method into New Zealand. Ofman as cited by Chisnall (2002)

believed that it could alleviate the 'cultural deprivation' she had isolated amongst certain Maori children. Her thesis discussed the introduction of Montessori's method in an Auckland day care centre [Henderson Montessori Pre-school] in 1977 but did not allude to developments that were occurring in other parts of the country.

In September 1977 the Kapiti Montessori Society was founded. By October the Society had opened a school in a small hall, with a Montessori trained teacher from Sri Lanka, Menike Dias, who gained her Montessori teaching qualification at St. Nicholas, London (O'Donnel, 1996).

The following year three more centres were established. In February 1978 the New Plymouth Montessori Association started up again with an AMI trained teacher, Carol McKeever, from Ireland. The Dunedin Montessori Pre-School opened in June, with an AMI Montessori teacher, Muriel Stewart, an American. In the capital city the Wellington Community Montessori Preschool got up and running in April. Early in 1977 a group of local parents had formed an Association "to promote public awareness of this approach to early education" and ran a private pre-school learning group in Karori (*The Evening Post*, 1977). The Wellington Association had about 20 people and one member of the Executive was a trained Montessori teacher from Holland, Loes Walker de Groot, while another member, Gay Ball was doing the St. Nicholas Montessori Correspondence course (Chisnall, 2002; *The Evening Post*, 1977). When their numbers built up to ten they "applied to the city council for consent to use St. Michael's Church hall, Upland Road, for the new school" (*The Sentinel*, 1978, p. 1). Nearly all the Montessori equipment had been obtained, and Mrs. Sheila Goonasekera, a trained Montessori teacher from Ceylon, ran the school, with a roll of 15 children.

A further four centres began operation in 1980, with three in the North Island. In March 1980 the Palmerston North Montessori Association Montessori started

up with an AMI trained teacher, Rachel Ryan, who was from Ireland. Later that year, in September, Elizabeth Abbott started up a Montessori centre, run from her home in Ellerton, the second to be established in Auckland (MANZ Newsletter, 1988). In December the Kapiti Children's Workshop in Paraparumu was established by Lois McConnell and Kay Young, who ran a playgroup first before eventually opening a Montessori centre in 1982 at Paraparaumu (Chisnall, 2002). A month earlier in the South Island the Montessori Courtyard School opened, with Goldsbrough as principal.

Montessori Association of Christchurch (MAC)

Goldsbrough was the first Chairman and a founding member of the Montessori Association of Christchurch (MAC). She was approached by a group of people who had been at the first St. Nicholas Training Centre workshop, and following a public meeting in April 1979 it was formed. The first months were spent writing the constitution, getting it registered and holding meetings, exhibitions and other publicity work. Soon there was pressure from parents who were keen for their children to have this type of early childhood education as soon as possible. Goldsbrough realised that there would be little progress in spreading Montessori ideas until there was a school which demonstrated the implementation of the Method (Goldsbrough, 1988a).

A frustrating search began for suitable premises. Like other groups of enthusiastic parents and educators this was to be a long process, with the search taking nearly a year (see Chapter 6). They finally settled on the Teachers College old premises, which was now the Peterborough Centre. It took six months of voluntary hard labour to renovate the site to adhere to government regulations (Batty, 1997).

The school started in November 1980 with six children the first week, ten the second, and reached 19 before the end of the term. Goldsbrough taught with Dot Rinsma, a Dutch Primary teacher, who had done some Montessori in her

training course. In spite of no advertisement the school was a popular option for parents (Goldsbrough, 1988a).

At the beginning of 1981 Beverley Rose was hired to teach with Dot, and Goldsbrough became Honorary Principal, a position she held until the end of 1987. During that period the school employed 15 teachers, the majority of whom trained on the job in the Montessori method (Goldsbrough, 1988a).

In order to accommodate the huge wait list, the school implemented a programme of part-time attendance to try and provide as many children as possible some Montessori education, but they were unsuccessful in meeting the demand. Parents were so anxious to send their children to Montessori that the committee used a ballot system during the first few years (Batty, 1997). Goldsbrough (1988, p. 2) also “regretted that some children could not attend because of the fees necessitated by lack of Government funding”.

In 1983 the school obtained another part of the Peterborough Centre and opened a second classroom after spending \$10,000 on alterations and using parents’ voluntary labour. The Association ran the school, with Committee members elected annually. In order to run the school efficiently a huge amount of voluntary service went into administration, maintenance, enrolments, parent contracts, appointment and paying of staff, fund raising and so forth. In 1988 the school had grown to the extent that voluntary work alone was insufficient to deal with the amount of administration involved. When Goldsbrough retired Marsha Morgan Kleis replaced her as a full-time paid Principal (Goldsbrough, 1988).

The Montessori Association of New Zealand

Goldsbrough was also a founding member of the Montessori Association of New Zealand. Charlotte Montgomery (nee Hallifax), who taught with

Goldsbrough, first proposed the formation of a National Montessori Association in 1982.

Prior to training as a Montessori teacher, Montgomery was a Karitane Nurse and had spent three years travelling overseas, working as a nanny in Hong Kong and London, where she first came in contact with Montessori. She trained at the St. Nicholas Centre in London, graduating in May 1981 (Hallifax, 1982a).

During the May 1982 school holidays Montgomery traveled to Melbourne to attend a Montessori Music Seminar run by Dr. Jean Miller, an AMI educator from the United States.

From my visit to Australia and the people I met there, it became increasingly apparent for a National Montessori meeting to be held for all Montessori teachers and interested people as soon as possible in New Zealand. We are all striving for the same goals, and I feel a meeting to share methods and ideas and generally to unite a little, would be of benefit to us all (Hallifax, 1982a).

Montgomery was “quite prepared to take on the organising of such a meeting”, writing to all the Montessori centres suggesting that it be held in Palmerston North at the Montessori school there during a week-end in October. Palmerston North was chosen as “geographically it seems the approximate centre of Montessori Schools (with the exception of Christchurch and Dunedin!)” (Hallifax, 1982a). She found that there was “sufficient enthusiasm to warrant going ahead”, and with the information gained from the sheet filled in by the respondents Montgomery drew up an agenda in consultation with Rachel Ryan, the Directress of the Palmerston North Montessori School (see Appendix N - Agenda National Montessori Meeting 1982).

Approximately twenty people attended the two-day meeting where the important issue of whether a National Montessori body was needed was widely discussed (Goldsbrough, 1998; Russell, 1982). As already mentioned, by

this stage there were nine Montessori schools established throughout the country (see Appendix O - Montessori schools established by 1982). It was suggested that a cohesive national voice could assist and advise existing schools and organisations (Russell, 1982). Goldsbrough was appointed as President and Gay Ball was the Vice-President, and it was run out of Christchurch for a year.

The initial idea for a national body to be a support group for teachers soon shifted its focus to Government liaison. Early on Goldsbrough was aware of the necessity to take into account the concerns of the wider early childhood sector. The Montessori Association of New Zealand (MANZ) "went to Wellington because it seemed advisable....to have it near Government"(Goldsbrough, 1998). In 1984 a formal constitution was adopted, which was important at this time, as the Government preferred to work with a single national body. MANZ's work has continued to be government liaison and Montessori teacher training.

One issue that Goldsbrough has no patience with is in-fighting over the providers of teacher training. Her father was the secretary of the British Montessori Society for many years, and having taught in Britain she was very aware of the arguments over teacher training that occurred (see Chapter 2). Goldsbrough (1998) told me as she tells "everyone about any training. One course, one training is not the end, it's only the beginning". From the beginning of MANZ, Goldsbrough stressed that everyone was in it for the "same overall purpose" regardless of his or her training. By not aligning themselves with one of the major Montessori international organisations, MANZ has been able to develop strong relationships with all of them (Chisnall, 2002).

Montessori Teacher Training Options

When Goldsbrough taught at the Montessori Courtyard School she inaugurated fortnightly staff training. Over time Goldsbrough got "utterly sick of demonstrating the sandpaper letters over and over again every time a new member of staff came...or something with the Golden Beads. I thought I should write all this down" (Goldsbrough, 1998).

People wanting to train, as Montessori teachers, in New Zealand, had to study by correspondence through one of the two colleges located in London, St. Nicholas's Training College or the London Montessori Centre. With the establishment of new centres there was a growing demand for teachers. For countless reasons Goldsbrough was deeply dissatisfied with both courses. Students had to send their assignments to Britain to be marked, hence it was weeks before they received them back. Furthermore Goldsbrough (1998) stated:

Reports [kept] coming in from student after student about the problems with communication with St. Nicholas and later with London Montessori who said they were leaving St. Nicholas because they were so poor at administration. And then they found that they were equally bad.

Another major problem for New Zealand students was the practical workshops they needed to do to complete their qualification. Goldsbrough was "involved with eleven workshops. They were not easy [to organise] and they always wanted to send somebody from England, which costs thousands of dollars" (Goldsbrough, 1998). Goldsbrough felt certain aspects of the course could be improved upon.

In 1985 the Montessori Association of New Zealand first explored the idea of face-to-face teaching. There was a need for qualified Montessori teachers and it was obvious that New Zealand was not yet in a position to start its own training institution. A Montessori training panel was established, with Goldsbrough as one of the members. Discussions were held with Massey University about offering a Montessori course, which would be located in the

education department. It appeared that Massey University would offer a course in 1988, but when the two main advocates, Betsy Miltich-Conway and her partner, Pat Conway, moved back to the United States the project was deferred (Association Newsletter, July, 1986).

Meanwhile Goldsbrough (1998) had been developing a course written from a New Zealand perspective, which was eventually called the Aperfield Montessori Course. In October 1987 Goldsbrough had attended a Lopdell House Course (Department of Education) where a significant break through was made into State Teacher Training in regards to Montessori education. The Palmerston North College of Education consented to discuss the possibility of mounting a Montessori self-study course as an option within their new Early Childhood Education three year course. Meetings were held with the Principal, Athol Forrest, and early childhood education staff in October 1987, April 1988 and August 1988. I attended these meetings along with Goldsbrough and four other members of MANZ, which resulted in the course [Introduction to Montessori Early Childhood Education] going ahead in 1989 with 10 students as an option in their personal study slot of 50 college hours plus approximately 100 hours of homework.

The Course is an Introduction to Montessori Early Childhood Education. It is not long enough or extensive enough to warrant a Montessori Diploma but could be useful to students for some application in any Early Childhood Centre or as an assistant in a Montessori Pre-School (Goldsbrough, 1988b).

However, in October of that year, the new Principal, Bryan Hennessey (1989) wrote to Goldsbrough stating that in "view of the uncertainties relating to the funding of tertiary institutions and the requirements for the provision of the teaching programmes within our institution" the course would be discontinued. He felt that it would be "most inappropriate" for students to pay more money for a course which was not a requirement for gaining a Diploma of Teaching (Hennessey, 1989).

This was a terrible disappointment for Goldsbrough (1998) as she had fought hard to get some pre-service training for Montessori's method. On Goldsbrough's behalf the Montessori Association of New Zealand (MANZ) approached other training colleges but was unsuccessful in gaining access to their mainstream early childhood training programmes. Eventually the Christchurch Training College and then Dunedin Training College accepted Goldsbrough's course as an evening option, as part of their Advanced Studies for Teachers courses. Classes were held once a week by tutors appointed by the Aperfield Montessori Trust, set up by Goldsbrough to administer the course. The trust was originally established so that the course could gain recognition from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (Goldsbrough, 1998).

The Aperfield course has been running since 1990. Along with the Montessori Centre International (MCI), and Montessori World Educational Institute (MWEI), these three courses have been primarily responsible for training the majority of Montessori New Zealand teachers. In the survey carried out in 1999 as part of this research, 60% of the teachers had gained their Montessori qualification through correspondence while the other 40% did face-to-face training. The majority of teachers in the survey had gained their Montessori qualification from an overseas training institution.

In 2002 the Government released their Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Centres, establishing the Diploma of Teaching (ECE) as the benchmark qualification for licensing in ECE by 2005 (Ministry of Education, 2002). By 2005 all centres need to at least one fully trained person holding a three-year early childhood degree or diploma. The Government has extended the current requirements for all early childhood teachers so that by:

- "2007 50 percent of regulated staff in every teacher-led service are required to be registered teachers

- 2010 80 percent of regulated staff in every teacher-led service are required to be registered teachers
- 2012 all regulated staff in every teacher-led service are required to be registered teachers” (Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 14).

The registration requirement poses challenges for the recruitment and retention of Montessori teachers when teacher supply for Montessori classrooms continues to be a critical issue (Montessori Newz, 2003). The recently released report from the Education Review Office (ERO), furthermore, noted that Montessori and Rudolf Steiner centres had significantly higher risk rates in comparison to other programmes of not meeting the 2005 minimum qualification for ‘persons responsible’ (ERO, 2004).

Anticipating that there would be changes in qualifications the Montessori Association of New Zealand (MANZ) initiated a qualifications project in 1999. The President, Dave Stott, worked with a group of Montessori providers and experienced Montessori teachers, including myself, to develop a course outline to present to the current tertiary providers.

Only one provider, Auckland University of Technology (AUT) was receptive to the proposal, and an agreement was arranged between the two (Stott, 2000). In 2002 AUT began offering a Bachelor of Education (Montessori Early Childhood Teaching), with 20 students as their first intake. In 2002 the University was also granted approval to offer a Bachelor of Education (Montessori Primary Teaching) (Chisnall, 2003).

The early childhood programme consists of a generic course for the first two years, with the students having the option to do their teaching practice in Montessori centres, and focusing some of their assignments on Montessori’s ideas. In their third year the students specialise in Montessori education. This year the course is producing its first graduate, who will hold a state-recognised

qualification, enabling them to become registered to teach in Montessori, kindergarten and childcare (Chisnall, 2003).

Another way that Montessori early childhood centres ensure that they meet the teacher registration targets is to hire qualified early childhood educators who then undertake further training in Montessori education. For example:

Early childhood teacher with Dip Tch or BEd. We are seeking an experienced and self-motivated teacher to join our friendly and professional team. You will need to have an interest in Montessori, a passion for early childhood education, excellent communication skills and the ability to lead and work positively within a team. Professional development in Montessori will be provided by our senior teachers and support will be offered for further studies

(http://www.montessori.org.nz/employment_opportunities.htm).

This has raised concern in the wider Montessori community that “Montessori education will become watered down” (*Respondent #16*) as a result of Government requirements.

Montessori teachers who do not hold a Diploma of Teaching (ECE) must upgrade their qualification. Montessori qualifications gained from international Montessori training institutions are normally of one year’s duration so recognition of prior learning is limited.

When I spoke with Goldsbrough in 1998 she stated that her “great dream would be that we did have a proper Montessori College but I think that you’d still have a need for distance learning in New Zealand”. She also spoke briefly about the development of the Montessori World Education Institute (MWEI), stating that:

The course basically is also the original St. Nicholas course rehashed. It has all come from the same stable, St. Nick's and MWEI, LMC. And in a sense mine is from the same stable since Phoebe and Margaret trained under the same College as I did.

Two years before me but at the same College with the same amount of Dr. Montessori input.

Goldsbrough (1998) also commented on how all the “courses make connections through...Phoebe and Margaret”. For example her friend Beth Alcorn, the Australasian Co-ordinator of MWEI, attended the first workshop held in Christchurch in 1977, run by Homfray and Child. An Australian married to a New Zealander, Alcorn trained as a primary teacher before moving to New Zealand. After attending the Montessori workshops she enrolled in the St. Nicholas correspondence course. The family then moved back to Australia, to Wagga Wagga, New South Wales, where she ran courses “for St. Nicholas”, and renewed contact with Homfray when she visited there. From there Alcorn’s family moved to Perth, where she set up the Montessori Society of Western Australia in 1982, and her own school. In January 1983 Homfray made another visit to Australia, this time to Perth, running a workshop there. With Homfray, Alcorn formed the Australian Chapter of the Montessori World Education Institute (MWEI), with its headquarters in Perth, and began training teachers. In 1992 Alcorn and her husband moved back to New Zealand, where she runs diploma courses for early childhood (3-6) and primary teachers (6-12), in New Zealand, Australia and Asia (Alcorn, 1996; Goldsbrough, 1998; O’Donnell, 1996; see also Appendix L - Montessori Training Institutes: Historical Perspective and Current Status).

Continued growth of Montessori Schooling

By October 1985 there were 13 Montessori early childhood centres throughout the country, providing parents with an alternative approach to early childhood education (Montessori Association of New Zealand, 1986). Similar to North America, these early childhood centres served mainly the middle-class population, but unlike North America, where most of the schools were private, in New Plymouth and many other areas, the early childhood programmes became community establishments, run as incorporated societies by parent committees.

These newly established Montessori centres proved popular and had long waiting lists, but the difficulty of finding trained Montessori teachers delayed expansion. As Chisnall (2003) points out, MANZ and local Associations kept a low profile until 1988 when the MANZ Executive sought greater publicity with a 'Montessori Week'. The consequence of keeping a low profile was that the Montessori method of education was often misunderstood. Goldsbrough (1998) believed one reason for this was that it was not well taught in the Colleges of Education.

Once if you mentioned the word Montessori...you got such a blank expression. I got a cut on my leg that I have to go and have it dressed [by] the nurse [the other day]. She said, "I hope you had a good day". I said, "Yes, I opened a new Montessori school this morning". "Oh, did you?" How interesting...My sister's little boy goes to a Montessori school".... You know, years ago you would have either got, "Oh, sort of how dreadful", or a complete blank...Now it is fairly common. In fact, years and years ago I mentioned Montessori to a lecturer at the University here and this man said, "Dr. Montessori. Who was he?"...He wasn't lecturing in education...but [was] an educated person and that took me aback. "Dr. Montessori. Who was he?" Um! (Goldsbrough, 1998).

By 1989 there were a total of 18 Montessori centres, with a fifty-fifty split between privately owned and community-run centres. Within a ten-year period there were 96 centres. In the mid-1990s due to the continued high demand by parents for a Montessori education the number of private centres expanded rapidly. Policy decisions in the Early Childhood sector had a major impact on this. The Ministry of Education statistics (2001) showed that 10 Montessori centres were owned by a trust, 19 were an incorporated society while the remaining 72 were privately owned (often teachers). This was assisted substantially by changes in government funding policy in 1989, which allocated a subsidy to each child attending a Montessori centre. While bulk funding does not cover all the costs involved, it did provide a guaranteed basis to start from.

Today there are approximately 100 Montessori early childhood centres, which represents 9 percent of the current early childhood market (Stott, 2002; (<http://www.montessori.org.nz/historymontessori.shtml>)). According to Chisnall (2004, p. 15) “proportionately, there are more Montessori centres in New Zealand than in Australia, the United States, or the United Kingdom”. As in North America, this has led to a demand for Montessori primary schools. In 1988 the first Montessori primary school opened in Wellington. Wa Ora Montessori School began as a private school, and became a state-integrated school in 1993 (O’Donnell, 1996). Today it is the largest Montessori school in New Zealand, catering for both early childhood and primary pupils.

In a survey of Montessori teachers carried out in 1999, as part of this research, the majority of respondents taught in the early childhood sector, reflecting overseas trends where the most common Montessori school is still the traditional grouping of 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds that Montessori first worked with (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a). However, with training programmes becoming more available for working with other groups, such as the 6-9 and 9-12 levels of Montessori, they have quickly been established in New Zealand during the 1990s. Many of these are attached to existing state primary schools throughout New Zealand, with parents taking advantage of the “class of special character”. A Montessori class operates within the state school and the Ministry of Education pays for the qualified teachers. The parents, however, are responsible for purchasing the Montessori materials and, if required, extra staffing.

The first Montessori class of special character opened in Wellington at Otari Primary School in 1992, with Dunedin’s Arthur St Primary School opening the following year. One of the experienced teachers surveyed in 2002 pointed out that there is a “large wait list for both pre-school & primary in Wellington – people are more aware of and wanting a Montessori education for their children”. Today there are 27 Montessori primary classes existing as classes of

special character at 17 schools in New Zealand. Two new Montessori primary classes opened in 2003 in Tauranga and Howick, Auckland and in 2004 three new primary classes were opened in Napier, Tawa and Blenheim (<http://www.montessori.org.nz/teachertraining.shtml>).

There are 14 schools that operate as Montessori units in New Zealand state primary schools. Two other Montessori schools are privately owned, while Wa Ora Montessori School, the only state-integrated Montessori school in the country, operates three primary (6-12) classes.

In February 2002 the first Montessori secondary school, Athena Montessori College, was opened in downtown Wellington (New Zealand Gazette, 2002). The National Montessori Organisation reports that parent groups are planning on setting up secondary schools in Auckland and Dunedin (<http://www.montessori.org.nz/historymontessori.shtml>).

Another area of growth has been the Montessori infant and toddler programme (under 3 years). One of the experienced teachers surveyed in 2002 stated she had “started the first 0-3 centre in NZ in 1997, as a result of parents who had children enrolled in my other centre wanting the same educational philosophy and high standards for their toddlers. Many families at my school have a child in each centre (*Experienced Teacher #3*)”. Since then several other centres are offering this programme

(<http://www.montessori.org.nz/historymontessori.shtml>).

With the increase and demand for expansion of Montessori programmes, finding suitably qualified staff remains one of the main concerns. In 1999 when Montessori teachers were surveyed around New Zealand, 40 percent [N=15] of them identified the training of Montessori educators as a major concern. For example:

Respondent #6

One of the biggest problems in Montessori is training. I recently heard someone from a school say "I could have learnt it all from a book"! And my heart sank. No one who has received "authentic" training would ever say that. I believe it requires face to face training, plus many years of practice with others of greater experience.

Respondent #12

Training available in New Zealand - is a big concern - very variable approaches to Montessori, lack of deep understanding of Montessori philosophy alienates and divides the Montessori movement in New Zealand.

Respondent #35

My major concern is the issue of consistency amongst Montessori trained educators. The philosophy is interrupted in many different ways and I feel this undermines the progress of Montessori education's acceptance as an "alternative" method/practice in New Zealand. If we followed our own advice and teach by teaching not correcting and follow the belief that we should "not" judge lest we be judged" I feel we would have achieved more and be viewed more favourably by educators outside those with Montessori training. I feel that until a "universal value" to the philosophy and practice is agreed nationally and preferably internationally we will continue to be fragmented.

Another concern for 10 percent [N=4] of the respondents was parent education, particularly keeping the children in a Montessori programme until they are six, as the following response indicates:

Respondent #37

Too many parents see Montessori as a "head start" for their children, or have social reasons for joining. To others it is baby-sitting. We need to cease referring to Montessori as "Pre-School", because it is really "School that starts at 3". If parents understand the philosophy, stages of development, sensitive periods, etc., they are more likely to commit themselves and their children to completing at least the first three-year cycle, and may even form a foundation for Montessori Primary. All parents need to be convinced of the value of Montessori education, and how respect and love for the child are paramount in all areas of development. This must be done through regular parent education - before enrolment, at school, and in the community.

When Montessori first established the Children's Houses they catered for children aged three to six or seven years. With the revival of Montessori in the United States the usual pattern of a Montessori centre was having the children attend five sessions a week, morning or afternoon, with the age range from three to six years (Goldsbrough, 1988a). In America, though, children do not start primary school until they are six unlike in New Zealand where children are able to start on their fifth birthday.

Alongside these concerns was the need to raise awareness of Montessori in the wider education sector, as indicated by 50 percent [N=19] of the respondents. For instance:

Respondent #26

There is an ongoing need to educate some parents and school that Montessori is not an accelerated learning programme and that we don't push the children they are just working as they choose.

Respondent #37

Word of mouth from happy families is always a good start, but we need to seize every opportunity we can to show Montessori in a good light, and confidently promote this method of education as "the best". It is also one which can eliminate many social problems (if started early enough!) and promote peace. So we need "education" all round - for the teachers, the children, the parents, the community, the nation, and the world. We have something extremely valuable for fostering a better world, so let's go to it....!

When experienced teachers were questioned in 2002 they were asked if the above responses reflect what was currently a concern with Montessori education. Teacher training was the number one issue, for example:

Experienced Teacher #1

For me training is still the biggest issue. Montessori schools are now forced to advertise for Dip. of Tch. as the 1st requirement and this is terribly sad. I am part way through my BEd. (ECE) and although there's much thought provoking information imparted - my AMI training stands head and shoulders above any of the generic ECE stuff in its absolute respect for the child. I'm staggered at how each time a new theory is introduced in ECE - "the baby is thrown out with bath water" - 6 months later - the

old stuff is re-introduced again. Montessori 100 years old and never needed more than now!!

Experienced Teacher #2

Until you have qualified trained teachers [Montessori] you will never be strong enough as a community of educators to tackle the other problems facing Montessori in NZ.

Experienced Teacher #5

Yes - I guess my biggest concern is "quality teachers". I feel the face-to-face training is the best and it is hard to find NZ teachers with that qualification.

Situating Montessori Within a Generic Degree Programme

As already discussed the first cohort of students enrolled in the Auckland University of Technology (AUT) three year Montessori early childhood degree B. Ed (ECT Montessori) graduate in December 2004. This is the only Montessori qualification that is recognised by the New Zealand Teachers Council for NZ teacher registration purposes, and will allow graduating teachers to become registered to teach in Montessori and mainstream early childhood centres. It is anticipated that having an understanding of the wider field of early childhood education and a working knowledge of the early childhood curriculum *Te Whāriki* will impact on their delivery of the Montessori method of education. Until recently Montessori teachers have been isolated from mainstream developments in the early childhood sector.

From the mid-1970s European and North American trained teachers have influenced the Montessori movement. As already discussed, efforts to sustain and control the integrity of the Montessori method has marginalised the Montessori movement from mainstream education. This was further strengthened by the dominance of Montessori's writings in overseas Montessori teacher-training courses. For instance, the AMI training course that I took during 1982-83 in Canada consisted of lectures on Montessori principles and

anecdotes from Montessori's life, demonstrations of how to use the Montessori materials, manipulation of these materials in order to practice the sequence of presenting them to children, observation in Montessori schools, and teaching practice in Montessori schools. The lectures were primarily based on *The Absorbent Mind* (1949/1980), *The Discovery of the Child* (1948/1988), and *The Secret of Childhood* (1937/1966), which were originally lectures given during Montessori's teacher-training course or speeches given to general audiences (see Chapter 2).

Current developments in the fields of early childhood development and child development were not explored as part of the course. One of the reasons for this was that it was a post-graduate qualification for one year, although some students were accepted due to their work experience with young children in a Montessori setting. However not everyone had a relevant degree in education so what we learnt about children and teaching was totally based on Montessori's philosophy and theory.

Upgrading to a Degree or Diploma

In 1990 the Labour government introduced the points scheme, allowing those currently teaching to meet licensing requirements before the implementation of the Diploma of Teaching (Early Childhood Education), which is the benchmark. Montessori teachers needed a minimum of 100 points in order to be the person responsible for licensing in a centre. To achieve the required points teachers were able to take a variety of courses but did not have to undertake a recognised training diploma programme. In 2002 the Government's Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education Centres now requires the person responsible to have a Diploma of Teaching (ECE) as the benchmark qualification for licensing in early childhood centres by 2005 (Ministry of Education, 2002). Montessori teachers who have made the decision to continue teaching have or are currently upgrading to the Diploma or a Degree through recognised tertiary providers including AUT. Montessori teachers are now

being trained to both generic and Montessori standards. What effect this will have on their implementation of Montessori's method within its established parameters remains to be seen.

Goffin and Wilson (2001) maintain that new ideas about child development are not easily incorporated into existing curriculum models, including Montessori. Consequently such programmes often inadvertently continue to use dated understandings in their practices. This discrepancy was the basis of Simons and Simons' (1986, p. 218) conclusion regarding Montessori education in the mid-1980s. They argued that her method "as practiced today, is misguided in its attempt to keep to keep alive a system of education that may have been effective and appropriate in the past, but which, being fossilized, as inappropriate for the children of today". As Goffin and Wilson (2001, p. 197) state "the unavoidable divergence between newly created knowledge and a model's particular frame of reference highlights a tension inherent to reliance on others' research and theory as templates for practice".

Implementing Te Whāriki

Another challenge for Montessori trained teachers is implementing the early childhood curriculum document, *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996). The *whāriki* concept recognised the diversity of early childhood programmes in New Zealand, including Montessori. In 2002 the Ministry of Education signalled its intentions to make *Te Whāriki* a statutory requirement in all licensed and chartered early childhood centres (Ministry of Education, 2002). There have been no administrative sanctions for early childhood centres to implement *Te Whāriki* directly, however centres which meet the requirements of *Quality in action*, the revised statement of desirable objectives and practices in New Zealand early childhood services (DOPs) (Ministry of Education, 1998b). DOPs 4 and 5 needed to be consistent with *Te Whāriki*. In particular, the goals of *Te Whāriki*'s five strands (Well-being, Belonging, Contribution, Communication and Exploration) make up DOP 5, points (a) to (e) (Ministry of Education,

1998b, p. 40). Montessori early childhood centres therefore were expected to identify the links between *Te Whāriki* and their curriculum and to illustrate that their curriculum is consistent with *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1998b, p. 40).

Education Review Office (ERO) (2002) reported that some Montessori early childhood centres, working in co-operation with Montessori Association of New Zealand have made excellent headway in linking their curriculum to the requirements of *Te Whāriki*. Thirty-eight percent of the Montessori centres, however, did not have effective programme planning. This was due to “lack of clear understanding of *Te Whāriki* and methods of planning to achieve the learning outcomes outlined in *Te Whāriki*” (ERO, 2002, p. 4). Interestingly, the percentage of Montessori centres demonstrating a lack of planning is comparable to the percentage found for all education and care centres (ERO, 2000).

Despite these limitations, Education Review Office found that 89 percent of the Montessori centres were able to demonstrate effective delivery of their planned programmes. This was marginally better than the percentage for all education and care centres (ERO, 2002).

The ERO report highlighted problems related to the procedures for monitoring and evaluating quality of the programme in 57 percent of the Montessori centres. In many cases this was the result of limited understanding of how the Montessori curriculum can be linked with *Te Whāriki*. Education Review Office noted that centres were evaluating the presentation and use of the Montessori materials but not the learning outcomes (ERO, 2002). As stated above, with many Montessori teachers having to upgrade their qualifications it is anticipated that having an understanding of the wider field of early childhood education and a working knowledge of the early childhood curriculum *Te Whāriki* will impact on their delivery of the Montessori method of education.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I argued that key individuals were responsible for spreading and establishment of the Montessori method in New Zealand. During the first phase of the Montessori movement Martha Simpson played a key role in the implementation of Montessori education in this country, which was mainly adapted in the state school system (see Chapter 3). During the second wave of development Goldsbrough's work further exemplifies the crucial role played by key individuals in establishing alternative educational philosophies. Groups of parents became aware of the Montessori revival in America and were keen to pursue this method as an alternative to the current early childhood care and education programmes. Goldsbrough played a pivotal role in the re-establishment of the Montessori method.

One of the reasons for the 'failure' of the Montessori method during its first phase was the lack of trained Montessori teachers. The teacher supply for Montessori classrooms has been and continues to be a critical issue throughout this second revival (Montessori Newz, 2003). The three-year course currently being offered at AUT is one way to ensure an ongoing supply of trained teachers. Chisnall (2003) is hopeful, too, that this degree programme will see an increase in research and recognition of Montessori's method in New Zealand. A further challenge for Montessori trained teachers will be implementing *Te Whāriki* so that their programme is consistent with the curriculum document. The changes stemming from Government policies create on-going challenges for Montessori's method in New Zealand and whether it can retain its coherence. The following chapter traces the establishment and development of one of the early childhood centres from the mid-1970s, exploring in more depth the difficulty in attracting and retaining qualified staff and the impact of Government policies on teaching practice.

**Part Three:
Montessori in
Contemporary New
Zealand**

Chapter 5

The National and the Local: Government Policy and One Montessori Early Childhood Centre

Introduction

This thesis set out to examine the ways the original ideas of Montessori have been reworked to situate Montessori's reemergence as a viable model within different historical and social contexts. A case study, investigating the establishment and development of a Montessori early childhood centre, materially illustrates how the "Montessori paradigm is culture sensitive and highly adaptable. The adaptability is why the Montessori approach is effective in diverse settings" (Barron, 1992, p. 276). Nonetheless, as already argued in Chapter 4, the integration of Montessori education within any country results in a culturally specific Montessori education (Rambusch & Stoop, 1992). This chapter examines the establishment and development of a Montessori early childhood centre, during the second phase of Montessori in New Zealand from the mid-1970s up until 2000. The main aim is to investigate how the policies and practices of the administration of the centre supported the delivery of high quality early childhood education in accordance with the Montessori philosophy. A secondary aim is to consider how Government policies impacted upon the development of Montessori education in New Zealand. Accordingly, the chapter begins with an overview of the development of Government policy in the early childhood sector during the 1970s.

Education Policy Developments During the 1970s

During the 1970s when Montessori centres were being established in New Zealand early childhood education policy development was gaining impetus. Montessori early childhood centres became part of the Early Childhood Care and Education

sector, a term which was later changed to Early Childhood Education, indicating the unity between the functions of education and care. Montessori centres were classified as childcare and were under the control of the Department of Social Welfare. This was the case for any new curriculum model other than the two main forms of early childhood education, Kindergarten and Playcentre.

Childcare was not regarded as an educational enterprise despite incorporating a range of early childhood programmes including private kindergartens and, from the mid-1970s, Montessori. In 1970 the government initiated its first Committee of Inquiry in early childhood education since the 1947 Bailey report. The *Report of the Consultative Committee on Preschool Education*, which became known as the Hill report, was released in 1971. Although noting a growth in childcare rather than preschool education the main focus was to “rationalise and strengthen playcentre and kindergarten” (May, 2001, p. 111). Government funding was needed to meet the increased demand for places. Increased funding meant more state intervention to ensure better co-ordination along with the recognition of the benefits of an early childhood education. As May (2001, p. 111) put it, this fit in with “governmental ideals of achieving equality of opportunity”. There was also the realisation that the push for provision of early childhood services such as Montessori was heavily reliant on community initiative but that this was only happening in middle-class localities.

In 1975 David Barney’s book, *Who Gets to Pre-School?* gave an overview of preschool attendance, highlighting how geography, socio-economic class and ethnicity factors impacted upon this. Barney demonstrated that although attendance was high, 46 percent of three-and-four-years olds were attending some form of early childhood programme in 1973, certain areas in the country had no facilities. He argued that the traditional programmes, kindergartens and

playcentres, needed to adapt their philosophy and structures to meet new challenges. Barney further noted the increased demand and growth of childcare.

It could be that these traditional pre-school groups are the most appropriate ones to run *full-day* facilities. It would represent a major change in thinking for the great majority of adherents of both groups. In fact, it would not be an innovation for kindergartens, which have a history, going back many decades, of providing lunches, afternoon naps, and afternoon walks for 'full-day' clients (Barney, 1975, p. 282) [italics in original].

Adaptation of kindergartens and playcentres did not take place. Instead new needs were met by new services including Montessori.

According to May (2001), the 1970s was a time when early childhood issues were linked with issues of equality for women, particularly during the 1975 United Nations International Women's Year. These issues became prominent in the political arena but change was slow with major policy shifts not occurring until the late 1980s.

During the mid-seventies a number of conferences encouraged a collective early childhood voice amongst early childhood organisations. In 1975 the Labour government held the Educational Development Conference, with the aim of encouraging debate around the country on education. The key recommendation for early childhood was "that provision be made for early childhood education to be available to all children" (May, 2001, p. 112).

Another important event in 1975 was the first early childhood convention held in Christchurch. The keynote address by William L. Renwick, Director General of Education, entitled *Early Childhood Education: A Moving Frontier*, outlined three reports that indicated shifts in the field. The first was the 1971 Hill Report. The second was the 1972 Labour Party Manifesto, which used the term early childhood

education to include other programmes beside kindergarten and playcentre. Lastly he mentioned the 1975 Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Women's Rights where childrearing issues were debated. His speech indicated that change was on the way but this proved to be a very slow process (May, 2001).

The Prime Minister's Conference on Women in Social and Economic Development in Wellington was held in early 1976. This was an important conference due to agreement on two premises. Firstly, raising children was the joint responsibility of both parents. Secondly, that it was in the best interests of children and society as a whole if both men and women were to participate in all levels of the sector of early childhood care and education (May, 2001, pp. 124-125). The substantial and persistent challenges encountered in establishing the Montessori case study centre was due to the commitment and involvement of both parents.

In 1978 Massey University hosted a New Zealand/Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) conference on early childhood care and education. During the conference the idea of diversity involving co-operation between services was an important aspect. Another point that emerged was that New Zealand did not have an "overall strategy or framework", highlighting how weak the state sector's role was in management and provision (Meade cited in May, 2001, p. 126).

During the 1979 International Year of the Child the second Early Childhood Convention was held in Christchurch. Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner was the keynote speaker and he introduced New Zealanders to the ideas in his recently published book, *The Ecology of Human Development* (1979a). He stated that "if it is only the Year of the Child alone then it will be a year of loneliness for children and an ill omen for their future and ours" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979b, p. 1). Bronfenbrenner advocated a "curriculum for caring" whereby the carers of

children needed to have caring activities carried out for them in the community (Bronfenbrenner, 1979b, p. 10). In addition Bronfenbrenner emphasised that children develop within a complex system of relationships, which are affected by multiple levels of the surrounding environment.

May (2001, p. 128) believes his visit was timely for the early childhood sector.

He was suggesting a theoretical framework that encompassed diverse family styles of childrearing (the microsystem), existing within an increasingly wider social and cultural network of relationships (the mesosystem) and political and economic structures (the exosystem). This allowed different early childhood groups to see a place and a role for themselves, whereas earlier developmental theories had judged particular early childhood institutions as acceptable or unacceptable according to the time spent by children in the daily presence of their mothers. The 'changing model' for early childhood services was moving beyond the provision of preschool education for the benefit of the child alone. A range of services should provide 'caring support' to children, families and communities.

According to Chisnall (2002) the Montessori movement in New Zealand with only a handful of centres established was not in a position to engage with Bronfenbrenner's ideas in relation to Montessori's writings. This was a function of the small number of centres rather than resistance to outside input that was characteristic of the Montessori movement in an effort to sustain the Montessori method.

The Establishment and Development of A Montessori Early Childhood Centre

Government Early Childhood policy during the 1970s provides the essential background to the following case study of one of the few Montessori centres during this period. In outlining the evolution of this Montessori centre, school records were used, along with interviews with former Montessori teachers and parents. Pseudonyms were used for each of the interviewees to protect their

privacy. The Montessori early childhood centre was not named, as stipulated by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC) (see Chapter 1). A non-participant observation approach provided a firsthand account of the contemporary operation of the centre during 1999-2000. Combined with interviewing, observation, and document analysis, this allowed for a holistic interpretation.

The Montessori early childhood centre used for this study is situated in a provincial North Island city. Like other Montessori centres established during this time, this centre was a local do-it-yourself venture. A strong community 'do-it-yourself' base was evident in other New Zealand early childhood services (Cullen, 1996). For instance, during the mid-1970s, Playcentres were at the height of their popularity and were more numerous than kindergartens. They opened through the "combined efforts of local parents and regional Playcentre associations committed to ensuring provision of early childhood alongside parent education" (Stover, 1997, p. 53). To further illustrate the active role of parents, the rapid growth of the Kohanga Reo movement in the early 1980s was "something not seen before in the history of early childhood provision in New Zealand. By 1985 there were 377 kohonga reo catering for approximately 5800 children. That they were mainly local do-it-yourself ventures was not unusual for new early childhood endeavours" (May, 2001, p. 181).

The majority of founding Montessori parents were well educated, with qualifications ranging from university lecturers, scientist, librarian, primary and secondary teachers, electrician, journalist and a potter. Middle to upper-socio economic groups tend to have more time and money to invest and develop early childhood programmes that suit their needs, while parents from lower socio-economic groups may not have the same resources.

When Montessori's ideas were first implemented in Rome the 'Children's Houses' served not only the needs of poor Urban Italian children and their parents, but also the wider community and its business interests (see Chapter 2). The organisation and running of the programme were primarily in the hands of Montessori and her associates. In contrast the initiators of the case study centre were very different as will be illustrated throughout the chapter. Parents played an active role in running the centre and shaping the programme to suit their needs.

Early Beginnings

In October 1976 Kay Mendal advertised for people interested in establishing a Montessori Association and/or school in a North Island city. "We began thinking about forming an association at the beginning of November [1976], but we officially got it going at the beginning of this year" (Lees, 1977). Mendal said she became interested in Montessori education as:

She has had close contact with the method, and because she wanted the best for her nearly three-year-old son. I have been a primary school teacher, so I am familiar with those methods, but in my opinion the Montessori method seems more meaningful and enjoyable for children (Lees, 1977).

One of the people that quickly responded to Mendal's advertisement was Glenda Avery. She recalled that she had first learnt about Montessori through a La Leche League article. The La Leche League International (LLLI) put out a series of Information Sheets. Number 53 was a paper presented at the American Montessori Society National Seminar held in Chicago, Illinois in 1963, entitled *The Infant as a Human Being* by Herbert Ratner (1971). This "was the first item I'd read about, and the introduction of my knowledge of, the Montessori method" (Interviewee #1). She also read an article from the English magazine called *Mother & Baby* (Hay, 1975) which was her "second source of knowledge about the existence of Montessori education" (Interviewee #1).

At the time I was a La Leche League Leader and in our literature of US origin mothers regularly referred to their children being at Montessori schools. I made a connection between Montessori and people who were sensitive to their children's needs – people who were concerned about the optimum and full development of potential physical, emotional and psychological growth in their children as League mothers were even if it meant going against the social norm (Interviewee #1).

Avery's direct comparison between La Leche League and Montessori, nicely illustrate the way cultural adaptations and adoptions actually occur.

The group held monthly meetings at Mendal's house during 1977, with the ultimate aim of setting up a school. The immediate aim of the meetings was to stimulate interest in Montessori education, with topics taken from the St. Nicholas Training Centre, a correspondence course administered from London, England [see Chapter 4; Appendix L: Montessori Training Institutes – Historical Perspective and Current Status]. Kent considered parent education an important part of the method, hoping that frank and open discussion would consolidate the aims of the group. Members were given topics beforehand to be discussed at each meeting, with Mendal stressing that “the success of the evenings depend on people expressing their views on education, whether they are Montessori or not” (Association Newsletter, 1977, May; see Appendix P – Montessori Topics).

As well as discussing aspects of Montessori's philosophy, parents had slide evenings, and arranged displays of equipment, which could be hand-made for the use of the children (Lees, 1977). Due to the Montessori equipment being very expensive the parents, like the teachers in the Wanganui district during the first phase of the Montessori movement, resorted to making their own materials (see Chapter 3). A subscription system was introduced to collect money to support the group's aims.

At the second monthly meeting held on 21 April 1977 the minutes noted that the Association was developing “a core of enthusiastic supporters” [15 people attended the first meeting] and it was agreed that the members would “discuss the possibility of setting up a school” at their next meeting. To staff the school, they looked at recruiting trained Montessori teachers from overseas due to the lack of available teachers in New Zealand. During the early phase of the revival many Montessori trained teachers were imported from Europe and Asia. One difficulty was that they were unfamiliar with New Zealand culture and through their training and experience were thoroughly imbued with the European Montessori view. As shall be seen this led to modification in their implementation of the Montessori method.

The Association received a letter from Mrs. S. de Zylva, who ran a teaching training school in Sri Lanka. She wanted to come to the city ultimately to set up a Montessori training centre for teachers, but would probably be prepared to teach if she knew that we had a school for her to come to (Association Newsletter, 1977, April). One of the teachers she trained, Ms. Laksmi Fernando had opened a Montessori school in New Plymouth, hence her connection to New Zealand (Honey, 1977). Following this information Mendal again stressed that “we still see the purpose of our meetings as two-fold: discussion of Montessori ideas to help us as parents and the setting up of a school” (Association Newsletter, 1977, April). The newsletter also reported that the first library books have been ordered, which financial members would be able to borrow on a monthly-base. The books on order were *The Secret of Childhood* and *Dr. Montessori's Own Handbook* (Financial Statements, 1977). Avery recalled that the main purpose in establishing a library was so “parents would learn about and understand Montessori” (Interviewee #1).

After a couple of meetings, it was suggested that a committee be formed to give support and to exercise a degree of control. At the May meeting there was an

election of members "formed for the direct purpose of setting up a school"(Association Newsletter, 1977, May). The meetings started to have a dual purpose.

In the future, now that we have a committee, I hope to separate the two so that we need only briefly mention our progress for the school, made by the committee. The main monthly meetings will deal mainly with discussion on Montessori educational ideas, hopefully giving help to mothers of babies and children of all ages (Association Newsletter, 1977, May).

Mendal kept the members up-to-date on the progress on de Zylva. She had contacted the Immigration department and was waiting to "hear of the likelihood of encouraging the highly qualified and experienced Sri Lankan lady, to come to [___] to teach in our Montessori school"(Association Newsletter, 1977, May). They heard again from de Zylva in July and "she wondered whether anything could be done in conjunction with [the local] University" in regards to training Montessori teachers (Association Newsletter, 1977, July). It was decided that the local Teachers College should be approached instead (Association Newsletter, 1977, July). Whether such an approach was actually made is not recorded.

The committee members decided that "very little can be done without equipment"(Association Newsletter, 1977, July). One member agreed to write to the Montessori equipment manufacturer in Holland concerning an agency here or making equipment under licence. In order to raise money both for the school and the equipment fundraising ideas were discussed, which were a combination of raising funds and promoting Montessori. The group also talked about suitable buildings where a school could be set up that would adhere to the health regulations (Association Newsletter, 1977, July).

Montessori Gains Momentum in New Zealand

The Association kept in contact with Montessori development in other parts of the country (Association Newsletter, 1977, July). For example, in July they circulated an article from *The Evening Post*, which contained information about the Wellington Association for the Montessori Method of Education (Inc.). The Wellington publicity officer, Joanne Graham, outlined the background of the Montessori method and “how there has recently been an international revival of interest in the methods, particularly in America” (*The Evening Post*, 1977). Graham mentioned that a “small group of mothers have begun a private pre-school learning group in Karori where the interest is particularly strong...There is also a separate group in Lower Hutt trying to establish a Montessori learning group” (*The Evening Post*, 1977).

As was the case in Wellington, the group made tentative efforts to establish themselves. Avery approached the local radio station and organised a radio broadcast concerning the group. The station agreed to broadcast times when the Association met. Another member, Paul O’Neil, was going to look into the legal aspects of setting up a limited company or a trust.

In August another letter was received from de Zylva. The Association wrote to suggest that de Zylva make immigration inquiries from her end as they were still waiting to hear from the Immigration Department in Wellington. As the Association was anxious to hire a teacher Mendal wrote to Binda Goldsbrough who arranges the “Montessori Workshops to see if there is any one in New Zealand interested,” as well as the Montessori Association in Australia for teachers (Association Newsletter, 1977, August; see Chapter 4).

The plans for building and/or finding a suitable venue for a school was considered not urgent at the moment as one of the members, Sophie Donner, said her house

could be used in the meantime. Donner recalled this worked out fine as a temporary measure (Interviewee #2). Finance was more of a concern. Money would be needed “initially to cover teacher’s salary, equipment (not much necessary to begin with), rent, overheads, furniture etc” (Association Newsletter, 1977, August). Fundraising was a slow and arduous process. A bank account was opened on behalf of the Association, with the first deposit of \$50.52 (Financial Statements, 1977). Some of this money went towards advertising throughout New Zealand for a full-time Montessori teacher. Four advertisements cost \$12.32 (Financial Statements, 1977). Indicative of costs for this time, four adverts were a large part of the limited funds available. There was one reply, “an offer of assistance on a part-time, voluntary basis”(Association Newsletter, 1977, October).

Margaret Campbell, who had responsibility for the library, stated that they now had several books for members to borrow. In May the library had three books but had since purchased more, including *The Discovery of the Child* (Financial Statements, 1977; Association Newsletters, 1977, May; October). Parent education was an important focus of the Association both in the building up of the library resources and encouraging discussion on aspects of Montessori education. At the October meeting the outlines of topics, taken from the St. Nicholas Training centre, were decided upon for the rest of the year. It was reported that a good discussion was had on ‘The Role of Parents’. Nonetheless, many of the newsletters strongly pointed out the necessity of members expressing their own ideas when the topics were under discussion (Association Newsletter, 1977, October).

The members were also shown a few slides from the New Plymouth Montessori pre-school. The Association made an effort to keep up with what was happening with Montessori organisations throughout New Zealand. The group also made contact with local early childhood providers. “We seem to be getting approval

from other educational organisations like kindergartens, play centres and teachers colleges - in fact, we have had a lot of interest from other places" (Lees, 1977).

By the end of the year a number of possible venues have been investigated for the establishment of a pre-school on Montessori lines. Like other ventures to establish Montessori centres this progress was due to a "small group of interested people" (Association Newsletter, 1977, November). A local running club building seemed to be the most suitable, conforming well to Montessori standards. Avery was a member of the club and she suggested it as an option (Interviewee #1). The only problem was the lack of a fence for an outside play area required by Social Welfare when applying for a licence. It was decided to hold the next meeting at the running club premises to give members an opportunity to view the site and to discuss the pre-school (Association Newsletter, 1977, November).

This was the last meeting that Mendal attended. The Mendals were thanked for all their work and wished all the best for their future in Perth, Australia. They left in pursuit of Montessori schools for their son. Avery believes Mendal "could be described as the 'Mother of Montessori' in [_____]. It was her individual action which saw the beginnings of the Association and it was her knowledge and inspiration which informed and inspired others to keep the Association going" (Interviewee #1). From the beginning support was forthcoming from a small group of families that were totally committed to Montessori.

Again fundraising was on the agenda as an area that needed urgent attention. "Voluntary work by this small establishment committee, and the generous nature of the [running club] will enable us to exist with very little overheads, but money is needed to equip the school"(Association Newsletter, 1977, November). Money was raised mainly through cake stalls.

The Association re-advertised on 16 January 1978 for a Montessori teacher, in the New Zealand Herald and the Auckland Star (Financial Statements, 1977). Some of the fundraising money went towards equipment for the school. With \$17.24 left in the bank the Association had yet to purchase education equipment when they received a \$200 Foundation Grant from the local City Council on 24 January 1978. This enabled the Association to purchase educational materials, paints, books, puzzles, paper and other essentials. As the record shows the process of establishing the case study centre was a slow, arduous, and incremental process.

'Playgroup'

Finding trained teachers was an ongoing problem for the Montessori community. Nonetheless, on 30 January 1978, the Association began a 'playgroup' at the running club building, under the guidance of Carol Wright. Although not a trained Montessori teacher the Association decided to set up the class "to give our children some pre-school experiences, incorporating Montessori principles in our operations" (O'Neil, 1978). Wright had replied to the previous advertising, offering her assistance on a part-time basis (Association Newsletter, 1977, October). In lieu of payment the Association gave her two payments of \$10.00 for petrol (Financial Statements, 1978).

A photograph in the local paper, taken on the first day, showed the children working with Montessori materials. Two children were doing dressing frames while another child was washing dishes. The two aims of the Montessori pre-school group were to encourage children to love learning and to concentrate on the job in hand. Cleaning shoes, doing up zips and safety pins and washing their own cups were some of the activities that the programme offered. The class was initially restricted to eight children to ensure a quiet working atmosphere and individual attention.

The playgroup held two sessions a week at the running club building, with the cost covered entirely by the parents. They began with seven pupils, five who were committee members' children (Financial Statements, 1978). By the end of the year the playgroup had ten children attending but "more have indicated interest if a proper school were established" (O'Neil, 1978). Avery remembered "during the first two years parents took equipment home in the holidays and week-ends. We also built up a considerable library so parents would learn about and understand Montessori" (Interviewee #1). Parent education was an important aspect of generating support for the cause.

During the first few months of 1978 the Association used the money collected from the playgroup fees to purchase further equipment for the school. In April they received a donation from the Community Services Council for \$100, which increased their bank balance to a healthy \$184.09 (Financial Statements, 1978). This enabled the Association to advertise again for a Montessori trained teacher within New Zealand in May 1978, a huge expense of \$26.80 for this time period. The Association was unsuccessful once again in finding a trained Montessori teacher. In order to continue offering the playgroup sessions one of the parents, Sandy O'Neil, took over the running of the programme (O'Neil, 1978).

Other Associations experienced similar difficulties in setting up their early childhood centres. A major difficulty was hiring trained Montessori teachers. Many were hired from overseas but this was a time consuming process due to attaining immigration approval. When the New Plymouth Montessori Association employed Carol McKeever, from Ireland, in 1978 it took about seven months from the confirmation of the appointment until immigration approval was finalised (Russell, 1983). Another problem was finding suitable premises. A further stumbling block was obtaining Montessori equipment. Some materials could be handmade by the parents and teachers but a large number of the specialised

Montessori teaching material had to be imported from the Neinhuis factory in the Netherlands at great expense.

Recruiting a Montessori Teacher

In September 1978 Ryan, a friend of McKeever, wrote to Rosalie Hay a committee member of the New Plymouth Montessori Association requesting information about the Montessori situation in New Zealand. She had read in the "Montessori Quarterly Magazine of July 1978 that there is a growing need for A.M.I. directresses in New Zealand. My mother is a New Zealander from Timaru in the South Island and I am interested in coming to New Zealand in the near future" (Ryan, 1978).

Ryan became interested in doing her Montessori training after visiting a school founded by her cousin in Dublin. "It was the first Montessori school in Dublin, and my cousin ran it successfully for about 20 years. It is still running today" (Cox, 1980). Ryan had trained as a secretary but when she toured the school she made the immediate decision to work with children (Cox, 1980). Ryan travelled to London and did her teacher training at the Maria Montessori Training Centre in Lyndhurst Gardens. She graduated with an AMI diploma enabling her to teach children aged from 3 to 6 years. She spent a year in "Yorkshire at a very good Montessori school as an Assistant Directress" (Ryan, 1978). Ryan was currently running a Montessori school in Galway with a friend of hers for someone else, teaching 37 children, aged 3 to 6 (Ryan, 1978; 1979e).

Rosalie Hay sent Ryan's letter to the Association, aware that they were looking for trained staff. O'Neil wrote to Ryan explaining that she was currently running the 'playgroup' at a local running club. "This is obviously far from satisfactory, particularly with my lack of practical experience in teaching, and qualifications, and also with several of the children at the stage of early reading and writing. I

find it rather frustrating!" (O'Neil, 1978). There were ten children who regularly attended the 'playgroup' but others had indicated interest if a proper school was established. O'Neil explained that:

...a number of interested parents attended a meeting last night who are prepared to support the setting up of a Mont. School here. It was decided to advertise locally for a teacher for the 1979 school year but to also invite you here if you are still interest in coming to NZ. Our priorities are to provide adequate facilities to encourage your participation and also to establish a definite job prospect for you which could help with obtaining a visa (O'Neil, 1978).

The Association did not hear from Ryan again until April 1979, due to family illness. Ryan was "still anxious to go to New Zealand to find a Montessori job starting next January" and inquired whether the Association was still interested in employing her (Ryan, 1979b). Due to a Postal Strike already into its eighth week, and likely to continue indefinitely, Ryan asked the Association to write to her brother in England to let her know if they would still like her to work for them. She also informed them that she was applying for a work visa and planned to give New Zealand House [in London] their name as a prospective employer. Furthermore Ryan offered to bring with her any Montessori equipment that the Association needed (Ryan, 1979b). The necessary reliance on the postal system due to the phone being too expensive and no electronic mail meant that the process of recruitment was very slow.

Ryan corresponded with the Association again three weeks later as she was afraid that her previous letter had not been sent from England. She wanted to inform them that the "New Zealand High Commission have just sent me a batch of forms, thro' my brother.... and asked me to send a copy of your letter offering me a job" (Ryan, 1979c). If the job was still open Ryan needed the Association to write to the New Zealand High Commission in London with her reference number for the application, stating that they were offering her a job.

Ryan did not hear from the Association so wrote again in September (Ryan, 1979d). Her visa was now with the Immigration Authorities in Wellington. She heard from New Zealand House and they required an updated letter offering employment. Ryan asked the Association that if they were still interested in employing her would they write to New Zealand House in London, to the Ambassador, or the Immigration Officer offering her a job. In the meantime Ryan planned on writing to the New Zealand Minister of Education, Mr. Wellington, on her friend, McKeever's advice, who was teaching in New Plymouth. McKeever, currently overseas, had recently visited Ryan. McKeever suggested to Ryan that she ask the Association to write to their local Member of Parliament. "This is what her employer did to her local M.P. in N. Plymouth" (Ryan, 1979d).

McKeever also reported to Ryan that:

...enthusiasm for the Montessori Method is tremendous in N.Z. This makes me all the more eager to go over as soon as I can. On top of this, Brenda, the girl I have been teaching with for the last 2 years here in Galway is now married in Holland and is working at the A.M.I. H.Q. in Amsterdam and met Mario Montessori and had a long chat with him. He is very interested hearing that I was going to teach in N.Z. and wants me to keep in touch with the A.M.I. about developments in N.Z (Ryan, 1979d).

This example illustrates once again the personal connection in spreading the Montessori method of education. Ryan mentioned, too, that her ex-employer offered her a lot of new Montessori Neinhaus equipment to buy. She offered to purchase it on behalf of the Association and sent it to them (Ryan, 1979d).

Marion Sedcole, on behalf of the Association, finally responded to Ryan in November 1979 (Sedcole, 1979). Sedcole had become interested in Montessori education while living in the United States with her family. Her eldest son attended a "Montessori pre-school there for 2 1/2 years, and on our return to New Zealand we were keen to send our second child" to one also (Sedcole, 1993). She

heard about the “playgroup operating [in the city] which had a Montessori orientation but in 1979 (we arrived back in N.Z. very late in 1978) it was practically in abeyance” (Sedcole, 1993). Her son attended “one or at the most two sessions which were quite sporadic in their timing” (Sedcole, 1993). The Association had advertised for a teacher in the local paper in early January 1979 and purchased more school equipment. Unsuccessful in hiring a teacher they re-advertised in February but without a teacher the playgroup did not operate until later in the year, during November and December (Financial Statements, 1979).

Wanting an early childhood Montessori education for both her children Sedcole advertised in the local newspaper a “meeting to gauge the interest in the formal establishment of a Montessori pre-school” (Sedcole, 1993). A meeting was held in June at the Sedcoles’ home, drawing:

...a reasonable number of people, several of whom committed themselves financially to the establishment of a pre-school. We were interested in offering sessions on a regular basis from rented premises (which had to be approved by the Social Welfare Dept.), using Montessori equipment and employing a Montessori-trained and qualified directress (Sedcole, 1993).

Sedcole could not recall whether she heard of the O’Neil at “that meeting or previously. I can remember meeting them only once when we visited their house shortly before” they moved from the city (Sedcole, 1993). Nonetheless it was the O’Neils who told Sedcole about Ryan.

In her letter to Ryan, Sedcole explained that the Association had applied in July to a national fund-raising organisation, the International Year of the Child Telethon Trust, for a grant and had been waiting to hear the result before contacting her (Sedcole, 1979; Minutes of the Council Meeting, 1980, April). “The result we heard a few days ago consists of somewhat less than 1/10th of our request: we have been allocated \$750 which we have decided to spend on equipment” (Sedcole, 1979).

The association was hoping for a more substantial grant to “establish an on-going preschool, but we are investigating all possible sources of assistance with which to supplement this grant” (Sedcole, 1979). Once again a key enthusiast was vital to the success of the centre.

The level of support for establishing an early childhood Montessori centre was strong. Sedcole told Ryan that she “could be assured of very loyal support and had working assistance from the small band of parents who are currently sending their children along to our “informal” sessions (6 very committed families)” (Sedcole, 1979). Furthermore they knew of at least “20 families who will definitely send a child “once the pre-school is established”, but who are not prepared at present to spend the effort to get it going. We are very confident, however, that once off the ground, it will fly - soar, even, but we do have to overcome the initial inertia” (Sedcole, 1979).

One reason for Sedcole’s optimism was that the existing early childhood programmes in the city were “very overcrowded and that there are long waiting-lists for new entrants, so we feel sure that there is a need for another pre-school, especially one offering an “alternative” type of programme” (Sedcole, 1979). Moreover Sedcole felt that having a well qualified, experienced Montessori teacher in the city would “act as a powerful stimulus and surely help towards the establishment of a flourishing school” (Sedcole, 1979).

The most that the Association could offer Ryan was a part-time salary and free board and lodging with one or more of our families for a couple of months. A full-time salary would depend on the number of students attending the proposed centre. Sedcole explained to Ryan:

If we are able to recruit 20 pupils relatively quickly you can “normalise” them, i.e. integrate them into the Montessori method, then we should be able to work on a full-time salary. To give some idea, a

state kindergarten teacher with 3 years' experience receives approx. \$7000 p.a. full-time. At this state, we must point out that your salary would have to be negotiable, as you will understand that we are not yet able to offer you a definite position, much as we would like to. Because of the relatively uncertain nature of this business right now, we would not want you to feel committed on a long-term basis (Sedcole, 1979).

The Association was in an awkward position as they felt that they could not really advertise for their cause without a teacher and without proper materials. Consequently they wanted to use Ryan's "presence and expertise to mount a strong publicity campaign" very soon after her arrival in the city (Sedcole, 1979). They wanted to open the school in early February.

Purchasing the Montessori Didactic Materials

The Montessori didactic materials are a crucial part of the method [see Chapters 2]. There were two problems associated with purchasing the materials. First, they were costly, and second the didactic materials were only available overseas, adding to the overall expense. Sedcole understood from O'Neil that Ryan had indicated that she was prepared to bring some Montessori equipment to New Zealand. "If this enters the country as "personal effects" (not "education materials"), it saves us 40% sales and import tax. The New Zealand Customs Dept. requires that these personal effects be "used", not new, but if you take the materials out of packaging, etc. this will probably suffice. It is not a strident regulation" (Sedcole, 1979). Sedcole sent Ryan the following comprehensive list that the Association hoped to spend the \$750 (N.Z.) grant on. She added that Ryan could go a little over this amount as they had \$250 in their bank account.

"MONTESSORI EQUIPMENT NEEDED:

Cylinders : at least one complete set

Pink tower

Long stair

Broad stair

Baric tablets

Colour Boxed sets Nos. 1-3

Sandpaper letters (or can we make these ourselves?)
Sandpaper numbers " " "
Alphabet letters and box
Spindle box and spindles
Golden beads: complete set & box
Geometric insets & cabinet (we have a plastic set, but would rather have good quality metal)
Musical chimes or bells in set (these may be too expensive, as we would prefer high quality instruments)"
(Sedcole, 1979)

Sedcole suggested that Ryan add to or delete from this list as she saw fit but a sequential range of materials would be desirable. Further Sedcole asked that she did not purchase things which parents would be able to make satisfactorily. In terms of reimbursement the Association suggested that they could pay Ryan when she arrived in New Zealand or they could arrange to send the money to her as soon as they heard from her. "Please let us know if you could do this favour for us, and if so, how you would prefer to be paid" (Sedcole, 1979).

Ryan replied to Sedcole's letter stating that she would "very much like to come" and help them set-up a Montessori school (Ryan, 1979e). She said that she had received a letter from Sandy O'Neil just before Sedcole's letter had arrived, emphasising that there was a lot of enthusiasm for the setting up of a Montessori school in the city. Upon receiving O'Neil's letter Ryan purchased her ticket to New Zealand, which was to depart from London on the 7th or 8th of February. This would delay starting up the school.

It will take a few weeks, I imagine to get things organised properly and to make the material that needs to be made. I enclose a list of material that I will bring out, and a list of the material that you could order within the next year if you can afford it [see Appendix P]. In this list the material would certainly not be used in the first 2 terms - provided all the children starting would be around the 3 year old mark. The 2nd list is of equipment which can be made satisfactorily. I have a Pink Tower and Broad Stair, and Red and No. Rods which were made by a local carpenter but unfortunately they have not been finished off very well, so I really don't think that it is worthwhile

bring them out. Would it be possible for you to have them made? And finished off well and of very exact measurements. I am sending you over a current Neinhuis catalogue for you to look at if you have not already got one. It gives the exact measurements for the above in it. This equipment can then be painted quite easily. I have ordered paint for the Pink Tower from Holland just to see the type they use and we can either get paint similar for it or order paint from them (Ryan, 1979e).

Ryan pointed out to the Association that a new school can “survive on very little real Montessori for quite a time as the children will not be able to use it anyway until they are really secure in school and are aware of the school ‘set-up’”(Ryan, 1979e). For the first term the Practical Life material would be the most important and such items could be purchased locally. Ryan thought it would be possible to start with a group of between 12 - 15 or 18 children. This could be build up to about 20 to 24 children with one Directress “but anything over would really necessitate a trained assistant” (Ryan, 1979e).

Ryan explained that the list she enclosed was in Irish Pounds and she anticipated that she “will have to pay a lot in air weight en route as the material is pretty heavy” (Ryan, 1979e). She asked the Association to send her a cheque for the material that she will be bringing to New Zealand. The Montessori materials were “all brand-new and I am purchasing it from my present employer who was going to set up another school a couple of years ago, but decided not to” (Ryan, 1979e).

Sedcole replied to Ryan letter stating “we are both very pleased and relieved that you are still interested in coming to [____] to help us establish the Montessori pre-school” (Sedcole, 1980). Sedcole agreed with Ryan that they would like to start with younger children, approximately 3 years of age. As for numbers, Sedcole could not:

...guarantee at this stage that we could begin with as many as 12-15 or 18 children - it may be a much smaller number. A lot depends on how

supportive and reliable parents are prepared to be, also on how successful our publicity is. We have been in *touch with other Montessori schools in the country and they all report that word of-mouth publicity by satisfied parents is by far the most successful advertising method*. You will appreciate that this will take a little time to build up. We may have to have an untrained assistant from the beginning, to comply with gov't regulations - we will check on this (Sedcole, 1980)[italics added].

Ryan wrote back to Sedcole letting her know her arrival date in the city, the 18th or 19th of February. She mentioned that she had “just received some pink paint from the factory in Holland for the Pink Tower just to see what type of paint they use” and had collected other odds and ends for the school (Ryan, 1980).

As pointed out earlier, the Association received \$750.00 from the Telethon Trust. Unfortunately the Association’s “communications with the Telethon Trust’s Executive Officer revealed that the grant could not be used for equipment as we had planned, as tax laws do not allow organisations such as ours to send grant money overseas” (Minutes of the Council Meeting, April, 1980). Ryan did bring some Montessori equipment with her. Jamie Morris, Robins’ successor, remembered that one of the founding families sent their own money to Ryan to pay for the Montessori equipment (Interviewee #3). This demonstrated a philosophical as well as a financial commitment to Montessori.

The Montessori Centre Opens

The early childhood centre opened on the 5th of March 1980 with 3 children, Ryan, and “rather limited equipment” (Directress Report, Annual General Meeting, May, 1981). The local paper published an article shortly afterwards which generated much interest and attracted new students (Cox, 1980). Sedcole recalled, “We purposely did not advertise the fact then that there were only three!” (Sedcole, 1993).

The three pupils were committee members' children. Robyn Duncan was the President, Sedcole was the Secretary and Dianne Mills was the Treasurer. Even with the early childhood centre up and running the Association still had plenty of hard work ahead. To become an incorporated society a proposed constitution was drawn up. The New Plymouth Montessori School sent a copy of their constitution and rules, which was amended by the Association (Annual General Meeting, 1980).

The Object was to:

Further the Montessori ideal within New Zealand by employing trained and qualified staff; by providing premises, "A Prepared Environment", and by supplying it with the Montessori materials, to provide our young children with an education of the personality, the senses and the intellect; and to raise funds necessary to achieve these aims (Constitution, 1980).

The accurate implementation of Montessori's model was important to founding members, so getting qualified staff was a high priority.

By June the centre had built up to 13 pupils in the morning class and 7 in the afternoon. For the centre to be an economically viable enterprise the Committee members were told that a minimum of "22 children in the mornings, and 6 in the afternoons after the government subsidies expired in August and October" was needed (Minutes of the Council Meeting, June, 1980).

Setting up a Montessori classroom was expensive. The Association had already spent \$750.00 and by July they were in financial position to purchase more equipment up to \$700.00, from the Nienhuis factory in Holland (Minutes of the Council Meeting, July, 1980). Also during July the Association received information from the New Zealand Association of Child Care Centres "regarding government subsidisation of children attending a pre-school". One of the parents appeared to be eligible to apply for a "capitation grant through the Dept. of Social Welfare and that all parents should receive tax rebates". It was agreed to join this National Association (Minutes of the Council Meeting, July, 1980).

Fundraising continued to provide extra financial support to the centre. The debate surrounding fundraising versus raising fees was one that was to occur many times over the years. In order to keep the fees down there was a huge emphasis on fundraising. In New Plymouth parents who did not participate in fundraising donated money. The Committee members resolved to adopt this same approach (Minutes of the Council Meeting, July, 1980). Montessori centres established during this time were dependent on fees, grants [Telethon Trust, Foundation Grant], donations [Community Services Council] and fundraising. Some assistance was available from the government through the Department of Social Welfare and the Labour Department [see below] but this was minimal.

By October the centre had achieved a roll of 22 children in the morning session and 8 in the afternoon, through extensive publicity of Montessori in the wider community. Ryan had spoken to the Parents' Centre, organised a display in the public library for two weeks, held an Open Day, which was a great success as there were two new enrolments in the morning class and six new enrolments in the afternoon (Minutes of the Council Meeting, October, 1980).

Professional Staffing Policies

As the centre became more established there was some discussion regarding a contract for Ryan. During the late 1970s and early 1980s the Kindergarten Teachers' Association (KTA) became a significant voice in shaping early childhood policies. One focus was negotiating more professional staffing policies (May, 2001). From the beginning the early childhood centre aligned itself more closely with kindergarten than with childcare due the educational nature of the Montessori programme. It also offered similar session times. During the first year Ryan was paid on the same basis as a kindergarten teacher with 3 years experience, and received the General Wage Order increases plus a bonus (Minutes of the Annual General Meeting, May, 1981).

Along with putting formal policies in place the question of whether the Assistant teacher should undertake a Montessori training course was raised. The only Montessori training available at this time was the St. Nicholas Montessori Correspondence Course (Minutes of the Special Council Meeting, October, 1980; see Chapter 4). Up until 1985 the Childcare Regulations allowed centres to operate with no trained staff. In order to hold an 'A' licence centres had to have one trained staff member however a range of qualifications was accepted including Montessori training. The Assistant was trained on the job. Ryan would show the assistant how to present the Montessori equipment as well as discuss Montessori's ideas and what they were trying to achieve in the programme. This is a modification forced on the teacher to ensure accurate implementation of the method.

During the first year of operation the centre had a total of 5 employed untrained assistants. Keeping untrained staff was difficult due to the low wages offered to them. The centre, an incorporated society, run by a parent committee was a non-profit organisation that operated on a limit budget. Although it would have been ideal to have assistants who were trained the reality was that untrained staff were cheaper.

Other Concerns

Another concern for the centre was that there was no written agreement with the running club, and they wanted assured premises. Sedcole contacted Glenda Avery, who had been involved in the initial set up of the centre, to inquire whether the club, which Avery was associated with, would be interested in having a written contract of lease for the building (Minutes of the Council Meeting, December, 1980). Negotiations were ongoing and it was finally reported at the 3rd Annual General Meeting that the centre was assured that the running club

committee was happy to have them as tenants and the present arrangement would continue (President's Report, Annual General Meeting, May, 1982).

The prompt payment of fees was another worry. Due to the ongoing lateness of fees coming in teachers' salaries would not get paid if this continued. The council resorted to many different strategies. They had tried the system of pinning envelopes on to children once a month, with the envelopes having the fee schedules written on them (Minutes of the Council Meeting, December, 1980). In 1981 it was decided that a notice with names and amounts owing would be posted on the bulletin board at the centre (Minutes of the Council Meeting, February, 1981). During the first term of 1981 the Association did not receive any grants, nor were the teachers' salaries being subsidised by the Labour Department. They were completely reliant on fees to run the centre (Annual General Meeting, 1981).

A further concern was the tendency for parents to withdraw their children to take them to kindergarten at age four. Within the Playcentre movement a similar trend has been noted (Stover, 1997). Kindergartens were regarded as preparing children for school and new entrant teachers' expectations were that children who attended kindergarten could sit on the mat, knew their numbers, shapes and colours, do painting and drawing as well as speak in front of others (May, 2001). This problem arose at the beginning of 1981, where the morning session was short four pupils, with no one ready to be moved up from the afternoon session, resulting in a loss of fees (Minutes of the Council Meeting, February, 1981).

Report on Early Childcare and Education

The committee received information concerning the State Services Commission (SSC) report on Early Childhood Care and Education in May 1981. A Discussion Document was enclosed for the committee members' perusal alerting them to possible changes in regulations. The Report was released late in 1981 after a nine-

month delay. No action was taken on any of the childcare issues during this period and then, in 1982, the government announced that the Report was being shelved for two years. The Report acknowledged the benefits of childcare both for family and society, and a policy framework was put forward whereby childcare would be included as part of the education sector which would include direct government funding (May, 2001). Unfortunately, the transfer of childcare services to the Department of Education, which would have a positive impact on funding for Montessori centres and the growth of the movement, would not take place until 1986.

Looking Ahead

Despite policy developments in the wider early childhood sector, the centre's main focus was on succeeding and surviving. Following the first year of operation the retiring President Duncan stated that a lot depends on knowledge and "one year is not very long to inform the public of the Montessori way" (Annual General Meeting, May, 1981). In 1981 the newly elected committee felt that that the centre required further exposure in order to become visible so that they would be more competitive when applying for grants. To educate the public an open day was organised, more publicity brochures were printed, and a venue in the city was approached to set up a display (Minutes of the Council Meeting, June, 1981).

Major Fundraiser

Instead of holding fundraising events throughout the year the Committee held a major one, a Chinese Dinner, raising approximately \$1700. One parent, Linda Jinks, took responsibility for the organisation. She had put her name forward to go on the committee because it was important to her and her partner to support their children's education and to be informed about what was going on. As well as being heavily involved in fund raising, monthly Committee meetings were held at her home for three years. When her children finished at Montessori she continued

to be involved in committee work at her children's primary and secondary schools, and was currently on the Board of Trustees at her son's school (Interviewee #4).

Professional Development for Teachers

During the first year of operation the Committee agreed to allocate one working day per term for both Directress and Assistant to attend other Montessori schools or meetings of an educational nature. The centre would bring in parents to relieve and run a non-Montessorian 'activities' day (Minutes of the Council Meeting, May, 1981). In April 1982 Ryan reported on her visits to other Montessori schools. She had visited Kapiti Montessori School, noting that they had limited equipment and the standard of the programme was low. Robins and her assistant had also traveled to Auckland. While there they visited two Montessori centres. Ellerton Montessori Pre-school was privately owned and currently had 12 children enrolled with parents paying \$25 per week. This was considerably more than the fees charged at the centre, \$13.50 for five morning sessions. The other centre visited was Hendersen Montessori Pre-School, a childcare centre with a Montessori room (Minutes of the Council Meeting, April, 1982; see Appendix O). Another reason for visiting Auckland was that a Montessori factory had opened there and money from fundraising was used to buy more equipment. The factory had limited stock so Ryan purchased what she could and ordered the rest. The Committee strongly supported the implementation of high quality Montessori programme through professional development as well as ensuring that the learning environment was equipped with the Montessori didactic materials.

Promoting Montessori in the Wider Community

During 1982-83 the Committee continued to promote Montessori education in the wider community by holding an Open Day and Parent Awareness Evenings. There was a strong emphasis placed by the Committee on raising the awareness of Montessori in the wider early childhood sector.

Although the centre had a full complement of pupils and was now well-established fundraising was still required in order to maintain the centre as well as purchase additional equipment. Jinks once again agreed to organise a Chinese Dinner. This was successful due to the efforts of a few supportive parents. Jinks and another parent had to draw on friends of friends from outside the centre to have the numbers to make the event possible. Several families contributed nothing or failed to show up on the day to help. The point was made in the November newsletter that fees could only be kept down by wide based parent support (Association Newsletter, 1982, November; Interviewee #4).

In 1982 the National government imposed a wage-price freeze, which was to last till 1984. The centre was just managing to survive financially despite its general strength and well being. At the end of 1982 parents were informed that the fees would increase once the price freeze ended (Fees Newsletter, November, 1982). Meanwhile it was imperative that the centre's roll be maintained at 28 in the morning and 15 for the afternoon sessions (Minutes of the Council Meeting, February, 1983).

Montessori Workshop

During the May holidays the Assistant, Kay Beattie, attended a 2-week Montessori workshop organised by the New Plymouth Montessori Association. With financial assistance received by the McKenzie Trust, Sylvia Middleton, an experienced Montessorian from Australia, ran the workshop. The primary reason for having the workshop was to allow people who had completed the St. Nicholas correspondence course to have enough practical experience with Montessori equipment to sit their exam for the St. Nicholas Diploma. Beattie reported that the workshop provided an intensive programme covering many aspects of the Montessori philosophy and materials. Fourteen people from all over New Zealand attended, representing nearly all the Montessori centres throughout the

country. Beattie felt that "such workshops and courses in the future would make a direct contribution to the growth of Montessori in New Zealand" (Association Newsletter, June, 1983). A further indicator of the Committee's emphasis on ensuring trained staff was supporting Beattie to attend the workshop.

Finding Qualified Staff

Finding qualified Montessori staff again posed a problem for the committee when Ryan notified the Committee in writing that she would be resigning in September 1983. Parents had to be reassured that the centre would not close down if a suitable replacement was not found by September.

We have written to various individuals who had expressed an interest in coming to New Zealand, and currently are corresponding with people in Canada, and Sri Lanka. Advertisements have been placed in the Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch newspapers, and also through our overseas contacts, in Canadian and U.S. newspapers. We have also advised the New South Wales Montessori Associations and the American Montessori Institute, of our needs as part of our on-going effort. We have been advised by the Labour Department that an early applicant for the job, (who has since found a job closer to home) has been granted permission to enter this country. This is most encouraging, since immigration procedures can take considerable time to finalise, and we hope to transfer that permission to any other suitable person ultimately recruited (Association Newsletter, August, 1983).

In July 1983 the Committee received an application from Jamie Morris, an A.M.I. trained teacher from Canada (Interviewee #3). A recent graduate Morris wanted to teach in Australia or New Zealand so wrote to the A.M.I. headquarters in Holland to find out whom to write to. She was given Binda Goldsbrough's name as the contact person in New Zealand. Goldsbrough sent Morris addresses of all the Montessori early childhood centres. Morris wrote to each one and heard back promptly from the President, Colin Jones on behalf of the Committee (Jones, 1983a). Morris was "unaware that they had been advertising for a teacher" (Interviewee #3). In early August Morris spoke to Jones on the phone and was

offered the teaching position. The necessary paper work was completed by 26th September and Morris arrived in New Zealand on 30th September. Morris recalled that the president's main goal was to find a qualified Montessori teacher to replace Ryan with some overlap time. "I had two hours with her on the week-end before taking over the running of the class on Monday" (Interviewee #3).

On Morris's arrival all the children gathered at the airport to meet her. A photo of this was on the front page of the local Saturday paper, generating a huge amount of publicity for the centre from prospective parents as well as the local University, who wanted to make a video recording about the local preschool, to use in their early childhood education programme (Association Newsletter, November, 1983).

New Directions

Having successfully hired a suitably qualified Montessori trained teacher, the committee started making plans to build their own centre. From early on the committee had been on the lookout for more suitable premises and had contacted the local city council for sites to lease, and at the Annual General meeting in 1984 resolved that "this committee goes ahead with the lease and the [possibility] of erecting a two classroom custom built building be looked into" (Annual General Meeting, February, 1984).

Consistent pressure on the waiting list resulted in the 1985 AGM passing a resolution authorising the Committee to obtain a plan, specifications and prices for a two classroom centre (Annual General Meeting, February, 1985). The local city Council had agreed to grant the centre a "Grace and Favour" type lease when a site was found. This was specifically for non-profit making groups that the Council saw as providing a worthy amenity to the city. The Council's current policy was to have an initial lease for 20 years with provision for renewal for a further 20-year period (Association Newsletter, November 1984).

During 1985 the centre's building sub-committee drew up full working plans and obtained prices on a "labour only" basis for a two classroom block accommodating 30 children in each room. In addition, land has been secured from the City Council and planning permission obtained to erect an early childhood centre on the site. A building permit would be granted when the lease documents for the site were signed. The committee was not prepared to proceed with this significant step, however, without the renewed support of the membership (Association Newsletter, February, 1986). The enormous amount of voluntary work put into this project illustrates the commitment of local members to the Montessori philosophy.

Funding for the New Premise

Fees were set by the Committee to cover the cost of running the centre and the building project was to be financed separately. This was to be done through fund raising, a debenture scheme and a mortgage. Moreover, a building levy of \$5.00 per week per family was to be imposed in addition to normal tuition fees (Minutes of the Council Meeting, May, 1986). At the October Committee meeting the fundraising sub-committee reported that a number of parents were at their financial limits and that pressure for fundraising or monetary involvement may turn them away from the centre. Lance Jinks commented that in the centre's first 3 to 4 years support was forthcoming from all but 3 of the families because the bulk of them were totally committed to Montessori, a commitment not only in the financial sense. Another parent, Mandy Smith said the feedback she had was that fundraising should be for the existing centre not for a new building (Minutes of the Council Meeting, October, 1985; Interviewee #14). This same argument was to repeat itself again with each new proposal to extend the centre.

Impact of Government Policies

The 1985 Child Care Regulations required that the centre obtain a licence from the Department of Social Welfare. This stipulated that no registered child care centre shall be permitted to exceed a maximum of 50 children. In an effort to get this rule waived the centre applied to the Director General of Social Welfare citing the special circumstances surrounding the operation of a Montessori centre. Despite being given the authority to waive the regulation he chose not to. The centre could not run two parallel morning classes of 30 children and still comply with the terms of their licence. A reduction of the morning classes to 25 children would give rise to an unacceptable increase in fees to comply with the DWS child/supervisor ratio.

The building sub-committee, which included the Directress Morris, felt that the solution to the problem was to operate one class with 5 morning sessions of 30 children and 2 afternoon sessions of 15 children, with the second class having its sessions as a mirror image of the first. The morning classes would be for the younger children, with the main class of 30 pupils being held in the afternoon. This would not go over the maximum of 50 children allowed on the premises at any one time. As a prerequisite to the building plans proceeding this form of organisation needed to be considered acceptable to the membership (Association Newsletter, February, 1986).

The Annual General meeting to discuss the proposal only drew 60 percent of its members. For the building project to go ahead at least 75 percent of the members needed to be in favour. The meeting passed the motion that "members be circulated with updated details of costings, repayments schemes, plans as presented to AGM to obtain firm support and council be given approval to act on 75% agreement" (Annual General Meeting, February, 1986).

A survey was sent out with the March Newsletter (1986) to current full members [42] and associates [35]. Thirty-one full members and eight Associates replied, with thirty-two in favour of proceeding, a 75 percent majority. There was concern that the pledges for debentures were too low. This was important, as the centre would not receive an Education Department grant due to being too low down on the list. Those who attended the centre paid the real cost of education they received. Parents who chose Montessori as an alternative to free government funded options were expected to pay their fees and make an active commitment to the centre in other ways.

One parent, Mike Smith, felt that the newsletter report was misleading and that the Association should not proceed with the building on the present information. After much heated debates the possibility of a one - room building instead was raised, with Martin Cairns, the chairperson of the building sub-committee, asked to undertake this costing (Minutes of the Council Meeting, March, 1986; Interviewee #14). Finally at the May meeting the committee passed the motion "that the association proceed to erect a one room classroom and concrete pad on the site...with the intention that a 2nd classroom proceed at the earliest opportunity" (Minutes of the Council Meeting, May, 1986). From its early beginnings progress was driven by a small group of dedicated parents, and this continued to be the case.

Montessori Events in the Wider Community

In October 1985 the fourth National Montessori conference, hosted by the Kapiti Montessori Society, was held. At that stage there were 13 Montessori early childhood centres throughout the country - Dunedin, Christchurch (2 classrooms), Nelson, Wellington (2 classrooms), Kapiti Montessori Society, Kapiti Children's Workshop, New Plymouth (2 classrooms), Palmerston North, Ellerton Montessori School, Henderson Day Care Centre, Acorn Day Care Centre, Daybreak Children's

House and another one in Tauranga. Although diversity characterised early childhood programmes, the 1980s saw an increasingly cohesive early childhood movement emerge. The valuing of the early years along with educators' and parents' desires for programmes that met different aims and goals, not only influenced the development of Montessori, but was also reflected in the emergence of the Kohanga Reo movement. In 1982 the Māori 'immersion' Kohanga Reo burst onto the scene as a dramatic and successful form of early childhood education (Cook, 1985; May, 2001). As the government reacted to the impact of changing attitudes to childcare, limited funding, through direct grants to centres, became available and assisted in the further development of the Montessori movement.

The main discussion at the National meeting was a proposed Montessori Training Programme in New Zealand. There was a growing need for qualified Montessori teachers and since it was obvious that New Zealand was not yet in a position to start its own training institution, the alternative was Correspondence or Home Study Montessori courses. The National Association was looking towards providing some of the back-up that students would receive if attending a training course overseas, for example, lectures and demonstrations, some tutoring if required, some attendance at Montessori centres, provision of workshops and examinations without undue delay and at reasonable expenses (Association Newsletter, November, 1985). A Montessori training panel was established to carry this out (see Chapter 4).

Raising the profile of Montessori in education circles was one way to stimulate students into considering Montessori training after completing their degree. As interest in Montessori grew in New Zealand there was an increasing demand for trained teachers and it was important to draw suitable people towards Montessori training (Association Newsletter, June, 1985). In June 1985 Jane Pettigrew, the official examiner of the London Montessori Institute, paid a visit with Binda

Goldsbrough to the centre. Pettigrew was in New Zealand to conduct workshops as an integral part of the correspondence course offered by the London Institute. Twenty-five students who were at various stages of their training attended the workshop (Association Newsletter, June, 1985).

In June 22 Montessori teachers from all over the North Island held their second term in-service day at the centre. This proved to be a very valuable forum for the exchange of practical information about how each centre operated and also provided an opportunity for the National Association training panel to make progress on a New Zealand Montessori training scheme. It appeared that Massey University would offer a course in 1988 (Association Newsletter, July, 1986).

New Premises

After years of deliberation and planning the builder started work on July 18, 1986 and the centre moved to its new premises on 13 October 1986. Once the builder finished parent labour was required to finish off the building. Although most families helped it was due to the efforts of a few families that the bulk of the work was carried out. Morris recalled that there were concerns that a new building would place heavy financial constraints on the parents and many would be forced to withdraw their child as a direct consequence (Interviewee #3). Mike and Mandy Smith were the only family to withdraw their child from the centre due to the imposed building levy. Their oldest son had attended Montessori whereas their youngest had been at the centre for only 5 months (Minutes of the Council Meeting, August, 1986; Interviewee #14).

1987 was a year of consolidation for the Association, finishing off tasks inside and outside the new centre as well as ensuring a continuing sound financial position (Association Newsletter, March, 1987). The annual meeting of the Montessori Association of New Zealand was held at the centre's new premises. One of the

guest speakers, Eve Reilly, the head teacher of New Plymouth Montessori school, spoke on 'Montessori primary schooling in New Zealand'. Reilly had completed a three-year A.M.I. Montessori course that covered both the early childhood and primary curriculum. The following year the first primary school opened in Wellington (see Chapter 4).

In 1988 *Education to be More*, which became known as the Meade Report was released, with promises of increased and equal funding, along with charters and other administrative changes to support quality services. The benefits of early childhood education to both the individual and society were outlined in the report (Meade, 1988). The report also recommended that each early childhood centre be governed by a Board of Trustees, similar to what was proposed for schools. Although unacceptable to the early childhood sector at this time, the case study centre did eventually adopt this model of governance.

As pointed out by May (2001) there was overall support for the broad principles outlined in the report. This was despite centres and organisations pondering where they would fit into the unified blueprint.

At the Annual National Montessori conference held in Nelson one of the guest speakers was Val Burns, the director of early childhood education at the Education Department. Having been directly involved in drafting *Education to be More*, Burns advised the meeting to read the report thoroughly and make one's views known through submissions and public debate. She strongly urged the Montessori community to support change. Of most interest was a discussion on bulk funding for early childhood education. With funding from the government Montessori education had a much greater chance of appealing to a wider range of children (Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc., Newsletter 14, November, 1988, p. 11).

It has been argued for many years that Montessori education is elitist because of the expense; that only middle and upper class parents can afford the fees. While the Montessori movement has largely shrugged off that label, the practicalities of running a preschool mean a large element of fundraising activities when efforts could be better expended in direct education (Montessori Association of New Zealand, 1988, p. 11).

In 1990 when the new funding did come into effect the majority of centres, Montessori included, had their funding increased by approximately 50 percent. According to May (2001) the intention of the increased funding was to improve the quality. This shift in government policy was crucial to the continued growth of Montessori in New Zealand.

More Changes

In the midst of changes in the wider early childhood sector, the Directress Morris announced in June 1988 that she would be leaving in June 1989 as she and her partner were going overseas for six months (Minutes of the Council Meeting, June, 1988). Morris recalled that the committee all agreed that her replacement should be A.M.I. trained (Association Montessori Internationale), to ensure a high quality standard and a smooth transition due to the face-to-face training. The available Montessori teaching organisations had programmes that differed in length, course content, student teaching and supervision. It was assumed that teachers from a diverse field of training would have different skills, attitudes and behaviours in the classroom. The Committee and Morris “expected that the A.M.I. training along the lines originally conceived by Montessori would ensure a high standard” (Interviewee #3).

There is no way to insure the quality of any particular teacher coming from a specific teacher-training programme, but A.M.I. teachers tended to have a much stronger focus in providing a theoretical basis and logic for the use of the specialised Montessori materials. According to Faust (1984) A.M.I. trainees are

known to be much more narrowly orthodox in their interpretation of Montessori's method. She believes this is due to their "greater appreciation of the details of Montessori and ensuring efforts to include all the details without convening the ability to be sensitive to some of the deeper flexibility inherent in Montessori's philosophy" (Faust, 1984, p. 203).

In the past the Committee found that it was quite impossible to find someone with this qualification by advertising in New Zealand. Hence there would be considerable cost involved in advertising overseas and the committee expected that they would have to pay for the person's airfare to New Zealand, and initial accommodation costs as well as Medical Insurance, a requirement laid down by the Immigration Department (Association Newsletter, October/November, 1988).

In December the Association sent out advertisements for the head teacher's position and in January they had an application from Susan Allen, a student currently doing her A.M.I. training in Toronto, Canada (Minutes of the Council Meeting, February, 1989). Allen accepted the job, which was reported at the Annual General Meeting (Annual General Meeting, February, 1989). A minor setback was that she only agreed to sign a contract for 18 months rather than for 2 years. Two years was long enough to see one group of children through the programme. As it was difficult to recruit suitably qualified staff this was reluctantly accepted (Minutes of the Council Meeting, April, 1989).

During the past couple of years, parental involvement in running the centre had fallen on a core group of dedicated parents. The committee surveyed the parents concerning fundraising, and the majority preferred to give a financial donation to cover all fundraising requirements for the year. For those opting not to pay, small-scale fundraising would continue to obtain the remainder of the necessary funds (Association Newsletter, October/November, 1988).

Allen arrived just as major changes were occurring in the wider early childhood sector. On October 1st, 1989 the reform of education became a reality. Each centre received a 'Purple' Management Handbook, laying out the new guidelines that needed to be addressed. The most significant step was the introduction of Ministry of Education funding, for which each childcare education facility would provide and negotiate a charter. The charter was determined from Ministry of Education guidelines and there was a statement of objectives and practices drawn up in consultation with parents/whānau. The three major themes to be promoted within the charter were:

- Equal opportunities in education;
- Parental and community involvement; and
- Acknowledgement of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The Charter sub-committee of the case study centre carefully considered the charter handbook and guidelines, especially in relation to the rule and regulations of the centre. They proceeded to make a draft of the principles for the charter with the intention of combining the required themes started above with the rules and regulations already in place and the principles of Montessori education. This process exemplified the necessity for an imported educational philosophy to accommodate itself to local official requirements.

Before continuing further the sub-committee needed approval from the Association. There were pros and cons involved here, which the committee presented to the Association. Pros were:

- The Charter would give parents a further guarantee of childcare standards.
- Government controlled evaluation and improvement procedures i.e. periodic reviews by Ministry of Education officers.
- Gives a written management plan, which includes, for example, aspects of – Health, Safety and Environment, Relationships with parents/whānau, Special Needs (for physically handicapped and gifted children).

- Commits the centre to ensuring all staff are trained.
- A bulk funding grant may allow the Association to extend aspects of the centre. For example more outdoor equipment, after school outings, and a 2nd classroom.
- A reduction in school fees by approximately 2/3rds. The committee was unable to be more accurate as they had not been informed of the size of the grant. But they would be losing their \$7,00 trained supervisors grant, without the charter fees will rise to 10 - 15 percent.

Cons were:

- The A.M.I. (Association Montessori Internationale) which the head teacher currently held may not be recognised by the Ministry as a suitable qualification for the director of the centre.
- The Ministry may introduce unacceptable standards.
- The review team (reviewing our adherence to the charter) may not be sensitive to Montessori principles.
- Possible increase of staff/child ratio may be required. This would interfere with Montessori principles, which encouraged children to relate with each other in their own community rather than being dominated by adults (Association Newsletter, November, 1989).

There was overwhelming support for the centre to proceed with the Charter, with the condition that the Montessori principles were in no way compromised (Letter to Parents, December, 1989).

Writing the Charter

With the introduction of school charters the Ministry of Education was charging both parents and schools to take a hard look at the way we educate our children. The President of the Association, Alice Jacobs, reported that:

Preschool education has long been considered at the bottom of the pile but the advent of considerable Government grants is enabling us to feel proud of being involved in establishing a stable and healthy base for the education of our children. People are beginning to realise what many Montessori parents have known for years - preschool education is important (Association Newsletter, February/March, 1990).

The Charter sub-committee found that the Montessori philosophy and method could be incorporated into the Charter relatively easily. The teacher, Allen, was on the sub-committee to ensure it reflected the essence of the Montessori philosophy. One of the areas covered within the Montessori method was cultural awareness. The centre's charter needed to include the principle that "it is the right of each and every child to be enriched in an environment which acknowledges and incorporates the dual heritage of the Treaty (of Waitangi) partners" (Association Newsletter, February/March, 1990). This newsletter was circulated to all parents and associate members outlining the Maori perspective in Education. A copy of the 'Treaty of Waitangi' was also sent out with it.

To assist Montessori centres to become a Chartered Centre the Montessori Association of New Zealand (MANZ) formed a charter development group, to give guidance and their interpretation on all aspects of the Charter and Management plans. Commenting on policies and practices in early childhood centres that should reflect the dual cultural heritage of the partners to the Treaty of Waitangi MANZ stated:

Although Maori cultures can be, and in many school is already integrated into the curriculum at the discretion of the Directress, this principle may cause some Centre managements difficulty in adapting their monocultural perspectives, particularly where there are no Maori users of the centre (Montessori Association of New Zealand, no date, p. 4).

MANZ suggested that the place to incorporate the Montessori method in the application of those principles is the Management Plan. The case study centre took this advice. Under 'Learning is not limited by race or colour', they wrote:

Our curriculum will honour the promise of the Treaty of Waitangi to the Maori people on Maori language and culture. It will recognise, respect and respond to the aspirations of the tangata whenua and all cultures which make up the society of Aotearoa/New Zealand (Charter, 1991).

As part of the consultation process the Montessori Association of New Zealand (MANZ) held a two-day course in Wellington in March 1990 for Montessori teachers on how to incorporate the Treaty of Waitangi principle into the Montessori curriculum specifically. Both Allen and her assistant attended the course. A meeting was also held with Mina McKenzie (Komatua of the Rangitane People) to discuss with her, and get ideas on, how to implement Maori language, songs and culture into the centre. Allen, Alice Jacobs and the Liaison Officer attended the meeting. To meet the requirements of the Treaty of Waitangi it was necessary to culturally adapt the Montessori method.

Alice Jacobs reported that work on the charter progressed slowly. Each of the Ministry of Education work days she attended gave her the opportunity to discuss with other parents/teachers at Kindergartens/Playcentres, etc. problems they were encountering and how they dealt with them. This enabled the committee to be aware of some of the pitfalls before they reached them and therefore prepare for them adequately (Association Newsletter, February/March, 1990).

Impact of the Charter

With the charter going ahead the committee discussed lowering the fees due to the anticipated bulk funding in a couple of months time. Martin Cairns recommended that the fees be 1/3 of what they were and the price differential removed. It was not necessary for the school to make a profit. Carolyn Jones remembered that she

argued against the lowering of the fees (Interviewee #5). The discussion continued about decreasing the fees but to a lesser amount. If the fees were too low there was a concern that people may be attracted by this and not by the Montessori philosophy. Also mentioned was the 2nd classroom that had yet to be built, which was Jones' argument (Interviewee #5). A compromise was met, 1/2 fees reduction instead of 1/3, which would be reviewed in six months. Another point raised was payment for voluntary work done for the centre (Minutes of the Council Meeting, February, 1990).

At the Annual General Meeting the setting of fees was discussed. Again, Carolyn Jones recalled that she stated that the centre was shortsighted to lower fees when money was needed for expansion, in particular the second classroom due to the long waiting lists (Interviewee #5). Martin questioned why should present parents pay for a future classroom. The group agreed that a second classroom was a good option but that future parents should contribute. This could be funded in the same way as before with debentures and a mortgage. Alice Jacobs noted that government funding meant enormous areas of change with the possibility of a new classroom but first the centre needed to consolidate until it was known exactly what was going on with the funding (Annual General Meeting, February, 1990). To guide centres on how to use their bulk funding, in 1991 the Parent Advocacy Council recommended the following ways:

- Reducing fees
- Improving staff conditions
- Improving centre facilities
- That reporting procedures should be set in place on how funds are spent (Mitchell, 2002, p. 9).

The centre needed to up-grade their facilities in line with requirements of the Ministry of Education for Chartered early childhood centres. Plans were

underway for a new playground, carpet was laid in the foyer to provide an area in which the children could play when it was too wet to be outside and soundproofing was put in the ceiling of the classroom (Association Newsletter, August, 1990).

By September the draft charter was prepared and parents were asked to come to the monthly committee meeting to discuss and provide feedback. A few alterations were made and the final draft was sent out to parents and Association members (Minutes of the Council Meeting, September, 1990). There were no replies with changes so the Charter was submitted (Minutes of the Council Meeting, October, 1990). The Ministry of Education required all Charters to be submitted Ministry by March 1st 1991 otherwise all state funding would be cancelled. The Charter sub-committee complied with the requests of the Ministry and the first bulk grant for 1991 went through without holdup. In May the centre's Charter was accepted by the Ministry of Education unchallenged (Minutes of the Council Meeting, May, 1991). With on-going government funding the centre was able to reduce fees and improve the overall facilities.

Another Staff Change

In June Susan Allen informed the committee that she would not be renewing her 18-month contract. The Committee advertised both nationally and internationally, with their preference being an A.M.I. trained person (Minutes of the Council Meeting, July, 1990). In November Cynthia Mountsier, an American with an American Montessori Society (AMS) qualification was hired (Minutes of the Council Meeting, November, 1990). Mountsier planned on flying to New Zealand on 19 January 1991 but was delayed due to the New Zealand Qualification Authority (NZQA) wanting more information about her qualifications. NZQA along with the Education Review Office (ERO) were set up independently of the Ministry of Education when *Before Five* (Lange, 1988) was implemented.

During the 1990s the level of qualification for people wanting to teach in early childhood education and the licensing points required were contested. According to May (2001) there was a consensus view that the three-year Diploma of Teaching (DipTch) taught at the Colleges of Education would be the benchmark qualification for licensing purposes. This required that all early childhood services had to have at least one person with this qualification or an equivalent. Due to a small majority of people having this qualification a phase-in period introduced by the Labour Government. They approved a four-year time-frame for early childhood practitioners to upgrade to the DipTch, which consisted of a system of points that were given to people's qualifications, with the DipTch set at 120 points. Eighty points were needed for licensing but for chartering and receiving funding a centre needed to have a person with 120 points or equivalency. The role of the New Zealand Qualification Authority was to accredit teachers' qualifications, and tell them what courses they needed in order to gain their equivalency diploma, along with issuing the diploma (May, 2001).

Mountsier needed her 120 points so that the centre could receive bulk funding. She did not arrive in New Zealand until the 26th of February (Mountsier, 1991). Hiring suitably trained staff from overseas was still proving to be difficult and time consuming, with one reason being the need to adhere to government policy.

Life Member

At the Annual General Meeting in February Martin Cairns was elected the first honorary life member of the Association. Cairns had been involved with the centre since 1982 and held many different positions on the committee including chairperson of the building committee. He was the driving force behind the building of the centre, and put considerable time and effort into this. Once again, this demonstrates the important role that key enthusiasts play in spreading the Montessori method.

The National Montessori Association

The retiring President, Alice Jacobs, noted that the Montessori Association of New Zealand (MANZ) had problems in the past year. The majority of the Executive Council has resigned as a consequence. Jacobs felt, however, that it was important the centre maintain close contact with the National body as the government was working on a National Curriculum for early childhood (see Chapter 7). Negotiations would only be with National Education bodies not individual early childhood centres regarding major issues (President's Report, Annual General Meeting, February, 1991).

New Ideas

With a new head teacher came new ideas. Mountsier worked out how to better utilise the present centre's facilities. Morris, a former teacher, recalled that Mountsier discussed this with her before going to the Committee. Morris knew Mountsier as she had stayed with her when she first arrived in New Zealand (Interviewee #3). Mountsier proposed the development of a new classroom on the existing concrete slab adjacent to the present classroom and outlined how this would be used to the Committee. The general opinion of the Committee was very positive in principle, with everyone very happy to go ahead and start planning. But first a Special General Meeting was called to discuss the proposal (Association Newsletter, May, 1991).

At the meeting one of the founding parents, Glenda Avery, whose youngest daughter now attended the centre, asked if there would be undue pressure on Mountsier with increased enrolments and class numbers. Mountsier explained that she had been involved with this very same type of proposal at a previous school she had been teaching at with 145 children. There would be another Montessori trained teacher working alongside her and she thought this would have a very positive effect on the school as far as bringing in fresh ideas for the curriculum of

the centre. Another parent asked whether a primary class had been thought of. The previous teacher, Susan Allen and now Mountsier both felt that the centre numbers were not high enough to feed into a primary school and that the fees would be phenomenally high. After much discussion the meeting accepted the proposal in principle pending financial costings (Minutes of Special General Meeting, May, 1991; Interviewee #1).

Second Classroom

By the end of the year the second classroom was built and new staff were hired, one of which was an A.M.I. trained teacher from England. At the beginning of the 1992 school year the staff numbers had increased to four full time teaching staff and one cleaner. In February the President, Greg Wilson, suggested that the new committee should look at a two-committee structure: a Management Committee dealing with finance, staff and general running, and a Parent Teacher Committee dealing with fundraising and social events and parent/staff liaison (Minutes of the Council Meeting, February, 1992).

Increase in Fees

In March parents were notified that there would be an increase in fees. The centre was \$17,000 under budget due to a communication glitch. A member of the Ministry of Education stated in writing that the centre could claim for the 2 hour afternoon sessions. Instead the centre was penalised for the number of students and number of sessions for term one. The afternoon sessions since had been extended to 2 1/2 hours to get around this. Consequently after reducing the fees 18 months previous it was now necessary to increase them (Minutes of the Council Meeting, May, 1991).

A questionnaire about fundraising versus levy was carried out, with 17 returns. At the monthly meeting one parent mentioned that she was surprised at the drop in

fees that had occurred in the first place. In the late 1980s the centre still had full waiting lists and had very little fundraising. Bulk funding was used to reduce fees. Carolyn Jones recalled that she once again stressed that she was against reducing fees at that time as she favoured putting any excess funding aside for building a new classroom. She stated if it was not for the “commitment of original parents there would be no Montessori centre today. Parent planning then was long term, not short term. All people involved in the past looked to the future. Families were happy to be involved because it was parent-run and because of a commitment to philosophy” (Interviewee #5). Another parent highlighted the centre’s vulnerability because of present reliance on government funding (Minutes of Council Meeting, May, 1992).

At the meeting it was stressed that the committee needed to present as clearly as possible to all parents the financial situation and long-term goals for the centre, and the parental commitment required meeting these. One of the founding parents, Glenda Avery, believed that a lot of parents felt uniformed and resentful of fee increase because of lack of knowledge of the centre’s financial situation (Interviewee #1).

With her later Montessori involvement Avery felt that parents needed to learn about and understand Montessori to ensure their commitment. She had hoped to do this by encouraging parents to donate books to the centre library and purchase videos on Montessori but was unsuccessful. Another idea she had was that parents should attend a series of about four information evenings prior to their children starting at Montessori and they would receive a certificate of attendance. This would also be for potential Montessori parents, teacher aides, college of education students, to ensure a ground well of information and thus support for the Montessori method but the Committee supported neither idea. As already pointed out, for the founding parents of the centre, parent education was one of

the aims. Furthermore Avery was in agreement with another founding parent, Marion Sedcole, who emphasised that Montessori should be valued for itself rather than just as an alternative to existing institutions (Interviewee #1).

A Special General Meeting was held to discuss the current financial situation and the need for a fee increase of 25 percent. The centre was looking at obtaining a leasehold agreement for leasing more land at their current premises. Originally it was proposed not to proceed with the new classroom until the leasehold agreement was obtained but this was still ongoing. Also raised was the fact that many families are on the Department of Social Welfare subsidy. Comments from those that were present stated that the centre should not have to carry those who cannot pay or do not wish to fundraise. It was reported that the problem began with the lowering of fees two years ago, attracting lower income bracket families (Special General Meeting, June, 1992).

One parent, Sonja Timmins, felt very strongly that Montessori education should be available to as many children as possible. She recalled that when she was President in 1994 one of her challenges was to ensure that the centre not only provided a quality programme, which was efficiently and well managed, but that it would be an affordable option expanding its scope and influence (Interviewee #6).

Along with the increase in fees was the concern that a number of committee members were not attending meetings. This was an on-going problem, leaving a small number of volunteers responsible for the running of the centre. It was suggested that such members should be contacted if repeatedly absent and asked whether they wish to continue on the committee (Minutes of Council Meeting, August 1992). All of this discussion illustrates that adaptation of Montessori to the

local system was accompanied by rigour and debate. This centred on what parents were prepared to pay for an alternative education for their children.

At the beginning of 1993 the Committee hired Martha King, a former assistant to run one of the classrooms. King had traveled to Canada to undertake the full-time A.M.I. training and upon graduation wanted to return to teach at the centre. King became interesting in Montessori education when she and her family were tramping the Milford Track in January 1985. Morris, who was running the centre at that time, was part of the group of trampers and told her about Montessori. King gained more knowledge of Montessori by working at the centre through the work experience scheme set up by her high school. At the beginning of 1990 she was hired as an Assistant, working alongside Allen and later Mountsier. She began her Montessori training through the St. Nicholas Correspondence course but was dissatisfied with aspects of it. After lengthy conversations with Mountsier and with Morris she decided to do face-to-face training, using inheritance money to fund this. To train overseas was expensive, costing King over \$20,000. She chose to train in Toronto, where Renilda Montessori, Dr. Montessori's granddaughter ran the year-long teacher training programme (Interviewee #3). Yet again, this highlights how personal contacts are responsible for spreading the Montessori method.

Reorganisation of the Management Structure

At the 1993 Annual General Meeting the motion was passed that a working party be put in place to prepare a proposal for establishing a Board of Trustee or executive to manage the running of the school (Annual General Meeting, March, 1992). This reflected the growth of the centre and the associated demands of running the larger enterprise. The sub-committee eventually decided that the concept of a BOT was not in the best interests of the centre. Instead a re-

organisation of the committee and the way it works was suggested. This would involve formally establishing sub-committees to do the groundwork of the committee, establishing formal policy and protocol, to guide the committee and to alter the committee positions to provide continuity of experience. Such changes would provide greater involvement of parents in the running of the centre, more accountability to parents and more business-like practices (Association Newsletter, May/June, 1993).

Mountsier, now teaching in her fourth year and Martha King mentioned that they were finding that they were spending increasing time on activities such as working bees, fundraising, and so forth. The meeting agreed that Directresses should not need to be involved in anything other than classroom activities (Minutes of Council Meeting, March, 1992).

At the beginning of 1994 there were staff changes once again. King resigned to move to Australia for personal reasons and Susie Apperton, a qualified Montessori teacher, was hired. One of the Assistants resigned to go back to University and a qualified early childhood teacher, Ruby Church, was hired. Church had no previous experience with the Montessori philosophy. After completing her early childhood diploma she thought she would work in a Kindergarten. Due to personal reasons Church did not want to leave the city. At that time the local Kindergarten Association had a policy of not hiring first year graduates so Church was forced to look at other options. After being exposed to the Montessori philosophy her views changed considerably and to further her knowledge of Montessori she enrolled in the Apperfield Montessori correspondence course run by Binda Goldsbrough (Minutes of the Council Meeting, February, 1994; see Chapter 4). At the Annual General Meeting it was reported that the centre's staff was academically more qualified and had more experience than at any time in the past. The facilities of the centre were modern and the classrooms well equipped.

These two factors coupled with some enthusiasm and vision would enable the centre to plan for the future. To assist with this the proposed changes to the management structure were presented and approved (Annual General Meeting, March, 1994).

Long Term Direction

The land area of the centre had dictated the number of children able to attend the centre at one time. The centre obtained permission to increase its roll up to 50 children at any one time without acquiring more land. The long term direction of the centre was to acquire the adjoining vacant land but in May 1994 this was sold to another party. This limited the centre's option for the future at its present site (President's report, Annual General Meeting, March, 1995). The goals during 1994 were to institute and establish the sub-committee system, foster the centre's community spirit, provide on-going improvements to the centre, and look at the long term direction of the centre.

Mountsier left at the end of 1994 and Susie Apperton took over as head teacher. Winifred Cook was hired to teach in one of classrooms. Although Montessori trained there was a problem with her English ability and in February by mutual agreement her contract with the centre ended. Ruby Church, the assistant, accepted the centre's offer for the position of Directress. Although she had not completed her Montessori correspondence course she had an early childhood qualification. Staff changes continued to be an on-going concern for the centre, due to age of the staff and the social trend for people to be more mobile in their careers. The centre from its beginnings was able to attract a number of high caliber applicants for all vacancies. The quality of the staff was central to the success of the centre, particularly in the early stages.

Sub-Committees

In terms of management there had been rapid changes in legislation and a marked increase in beauracracy that required the management of the centre to be carried out in a more professional manner. The workload caused by these changes and requirements had steadily increased while the amount of time available from volunteers on the committee was decreasing. Pressure from administration on the head teacher was also increasing.

Sub-committees were set up to run the centre more effectively. These were Staffing, School Community, Property Management and Development, Finance and Policy. In August the Property Management and Development Committee suggested that the Association needed to change and expand its activities. There was a need, too, to promote the Montessori method in the wider community. The sub-committee had begun to consider co-locating a primary and early childhood centre on the same site. The committee needed to identify costs and the benefits of moving the existing centre onto a new site and identify suitable sites for purchase, lease or subsidised lease, together with cost (Minutes of Council Meeting, August, 1995).

In 1995, during the third term, the centre hired a Secretarial Assistant, to assist with management. Timmins recalled that total reliance on voluntary good will was no longer necessary or possible, and the sound financial position of the centre allowed an alternative to assure the continued, and often more efficient, running of the centre. She stated that while society generally was struggling with how to best cope with the decreasing pool of volunteers, as people's lives became increasingly busier, the centre was lucky to be supported with a core group of people from the centre's community. Issues of fairness, equity and 'over using the few' continued to be expressed (Interviewee #6). This continued to be an issue the Association struggled with due to the changes of the scale of the enterprise.

The Association was told that there would be an increase of fees at the beginning of 1996. Timmins made it clear to the centre community that there was extra assistance available for anyone who had difficulty, as cost should never be a barrier preventing children from experiencing the benefits of Montessori (Minutes of the Council Meeting, November, 1995; Interviewee #6).

There was a reasonably high turnover of staff, with most staying 1 - 2 years. The committee felt that the Assistant teachers needed to undertake training in order to fill the vacancy of Head Teacher should the need arise. A shortage of Montessori trained teachers throughout New Zealand continued. When Ruby Church's position was advertised the centre did not receive one applicant. Training the Assistant teacher would take 1-2 years. The Apperfield Montessori correspondence course could be completed in one year, but preferably two at a cost of \$2000 approximately. To have continuity with the children it was desirable to have a teacher at the centre for 2 - 3 years (Minutes of the Council Meeting, May, 1996).

Administration Structure Addressed

Timmin's aim as President for 1996 was to establish a more centralised administration base capable of running the centre without the heavy workload required from some volunteers. If the centre were to expand further it would need to run more effectively. It was proposed that the centre would be better served if run by a more efficient small Executive who would be responsible for the day-to-day management of the centre, which was already set out in the centre's Charter. She suggested the following officers, President, Secretary, Treasurer and Head Teacher (Minutes of the Council Meeting, August, 1996). The motion was passed at the next meeting for the formation of Executive. The meeting agreed that an

honorarium be paid to the executive for the day to day management of the centre (Minutes of the Council Meeting, August, 1996).

In order to expand the committee suggested starting a building fund. "It is only fair that the next generation be asked to contribute to this" (Minutes of the Council Meeting, September, 1997). Historically this always happens - the present users benefit from the developments funded by previous users.

At a special meeting held in November it was suggested that new policy, budgets and financial decisions should go to a full committee for approval in principle and out to the centre community for consultation. Lack of consultation had led to a lack of community spirit surrounding the centre (Minutes of Special Meeting, November, 1996). A critical requirement of a quality system is a good understanding of the needs and expectations of customers. Although the children were the ultimate customer of Montessori it is the parents who are really the primary customer and the centre's Executive did not have adequate survey procedures in place to determine the needs and expectations of parents. As a result the perceptions of parents needed to be in line with those of the Executive.

Primary School Plans

Since 1992 the centre had been investigating the possibility of developing a Montessori primary school in the city. Parents were anxious to have their children continue their Montessori education. The current committee wanted to put a financial stake in the ground and start putting money aside to give future parents the means with which to either re-locate the existing centre to a more viable long-term site, or to grow the centre into a primary school. To gauge the level of parental support a questionnaire was sent out (Letter to Parents, November, 1996). Although the response rate was low, the majority of parents were in favour of expansion, and a fee increase was implemented.

Tania Baxter, in her President's report in November 1996 outlined the changes that took place over the year. At the end of her report she expressed disappointment at the verbal and written accusations that had been leveled at the Executive. On a personal note she stated that she had resented "every accusation, as during the year, I have personally ensured, that every activity and transaction can be directly accounted for. No member of the Executive committee has gained financially, or taken advantage of any of the schools resources for personal use" (President's Report, November, 1996). Baxter further stated that 1997 would determine the success of Montessori as we know it in the city. Fees needed to be set at a realistic level as she believed currently the centre was delivering a quality service but was only charging bargain prices. With an increase of fees then the centre could be confident that they would be able to get to their ultimate goal, a Primary school (President's Report, November, 1996). It is evident from the case study evolution that as institutions expand rapidly and systems change tensions can also arise.

Early in 1997 the Association was given an update of the search for a Montessori primary school. After much investigation the committee was seeking support from parents to establish a second early childhood centre that could later be expanded into a primary school. This option included purchasing two sections in a new subdivision on the other side of the city. A developer would then build two early childhood classrooms to the committee's specifications ready for occupation in January 1998. The committee proposed that the centre buy one section and enter into a lease to buy agreement on the second section. With the establishment of a second early childhood centre there would be enough Montessori educated children to ensure the viability of a primary school. Three factors were identified as crucial to ensure a primary school could be started:

- There needed to be a big enough group of children to feed into the Montessori primary programme due to a significant number of families who would still choose traditional education.

- The organisation needed to generate enough cashflow to ensure the viability of an early childhood centre as well as absorb the set-up cost of the primary school.
- The Association needed to secure teachers who are both Montessori trained and also hold New Zealand Primary School teaching qualifications.

After lengthy discussion the meeting passed the motion that the executive was authorised to spend up to \$10,000 on further investigation of the site but not to pay out a non-refundable deposit on the land (Minutes of the Special Committee Meeting, March, 1997).

In mid-year, after further investigation, a vote was taken whether to proceed with the new building. Three hundred and two votes were issued. The results were 110 in favour, 14 against, 5 abstain and 8 invalid. A minimum return of 30% was reached, with a 75% majority in favour was received, and that the proposed expansion proceed. The motion was passed with all in favour (Minutes of the Council Meeting, August, 1997).

The Executive suggested that Tania Baxter be made an Honorary Member at the 1998 AGM. This motion was passed in recognition of her tremendous contribution to the centre. She had worked virtually fulltime on a voluntary basis to ensure the centre was computerised and completely able to meet all its audit requirements. She had also been the main driver in organising the new building (Minutes of the Council Meeting, November, 1997). Like Cairns, the other Honorary Member, Baxter's contribution illustrates that expansion of the centre was due to a few enthusiastic parents.

At the beginning of 1998 the Head Teacher resigned for personal reasons. With the new building site going ahead this put added pressure on the committee. The

centre advertised but did not have a suitably qualified person apply. In the absence of a Montessori qualified and experienced applicant replying to the Head Teacher vacancy one of the parents on the Executive offered to take up this position for Term 2 and 3. Jamie Morris had been the Head Teacher at the centre previously from 1983 to 1989. Since 1994 she had been a parent representative on the centre's committee (Interviewee #3).

Board of Trustee Model

At the 1998 Annual General Meeting a new constitution was accepted, with a change in committee structure from the traditional to the more modern Board of Trustees style. The change was made as the centre was expected to expand during the coming year, doubling its current size. The centre also employed an Executive Officer to manage the essential daily operations of the centre and to ensure all requirements are met. The expectation was that this role would grow in the foreseeable future as the centre expanded so that the Executive Officer would undertake the management role and that the committee would take on the Governance and Policy Setting/Review role of the Board of Trustees, as it is seen in other schools and organisations.

The Association is now a considerable sized operation, specialising in the delivery of high quality early childhood education under the Montessori philosophy. It is important that we continue to improve our management and administrative skills to ensure that the school has all it requires to meet its prime objectives. It is also important that we continue to employ well qualified and experienced staff, particularly in the senior positions and continue to provide ongoing training and promotion opportunities for all staff (Hopkins, 1998 Overview).

For some time the Association had full waiting lists without needing to advertise itself to gain new enrolments. Word of mouth was still the major means for communicating the benefits of Montessori to the community. Jamie Morris recalled that the centre "received 2-3 enquiries per day and 3-4 new enrolments per

week" (Interviewee #3). The pressure on the waitlist and the fact that many families over the years wanted their children to go on to a Montessori Primary School prompted the push to expand the centre in recent years, with a new site opening in late 1998. The site was big enough to permit further expansion to primary level in the years ahead, and it was hoped to pursue this as soon as practical after the current development was completed and finances permitted. To aid this, it was hoped to hire a teacher with both State Primary and Montessori Primary qualifications and experience in addition to early childhood qualifications. It was anticipated that the process to offer a Montessori Primary programme would be lengthy so the Association wanted to get underway before the primary buildings were considered [Interviewee #7].

The new site project began in January 1998. The parents finished off the painting, the landscaping and setting up the classrooms [Interviewee #10, #3]. By July the new building was complete, new staff were hired and it was up and running for the third term. The official opening was on Saturday 12 September 1998. By September the office had relocated to the new building. By fourth term the other classroom was up and running. This represented a significant new phase in the development of Montessori in the city.

To set up the new site once again significant fundraising needed to be undertaken. The Association's reserves were needed to fund the carpark and the more expensive Montessori equipment and furniture to date. The President, Harry Inkle stressed that all parents needed to play a part in ensuring that the benefits of Montessori are available to future generations. Fees and government bulk funding were needed to cover the annual operating costs to the Association, and to build and maintain a certain level of reserves, whereas fundraising needed to cover those extras, in this case the new building set-up costs (Association Newsletter, November, 1998).

Inkle had been on the committee for four years. He was involved in and was one of the main supporters for the expansion of the centre. He saw this as an ideal opportunity for both the centre and the wider city community to promote and provide more high quality Montessori education for children. He believed that it was critical to provide continuity between successive committees, especially in 1998 as the centre faced expansion with their new building and the change of committee structure. Changes in regulations and requirements were occurring all the time and it was important that the Association plan at least two to three years in advance. As the long term goal of the Association was to establish a Montessori Primary one way to do this was to be able to retain the older children up till age 6, increasing the numbers until it is viable to consider building a Primary School (Interviewee #7).

The results of a recent survey showed parents were reluctant to get involved on a committee level, were happy to pay a fee and leave it at that so an increase of fees was imminent to meet costs. Certain members of the committee voiced their concerns at this with the possibility of prospective newcomers dropping off and it becoming difficult to maintain the roll (Committee Minutes, October, 1998; Interviewee #12). The questionnaire results indicated that of the 39 returned (out of 110 sent out) 29 families indicated in some way they saw Montessori as a service for which they paid fees and either did not have extra time or did not see it necessary to have further involvement (November, 1998).

With the new building site the waitlist was depleted. Numbers were down in terms 3, 4 and 1st term in 1999, which resulted in the centre losing a term's fees in bulk funding. This necessitated a major programme of advertising and public awareness, which had not been necessary since its early beginnings. Things were very tight financially [Interviewee #11]. Interestingly before going ahead with the building the centre paid to have a report carried out concerning the feasibility of

the project. The report stated that if the new project was to succeed an increase in public relations activities and promotion would be required to stimulate enrolments for the new site. Moreover, the report maintained that the centre did not have a good demographic picture of the parents who belong to the Association. This, it claimed, would be important for future promotional activities (FR Development, 1997). A strong emphasis on community publicity was vital for attracting parental support and student enrolments when the centre was first being established, and it appeared necessary to come back to this, particularly parent education.

Due to the shortfall in bulk funding the committee found it necessary to increase the fees in 1999, which received a negative reaction [Interviewee #11]. The Association needed to build up their reserves in order to pay off the capital on the development of the new site. This was necessary to support the long term goal of offering Montessori Primary education for the 6-9 year and beyond.

At the next meeting the Head Teacher, Miranda Adams, spoke in response to the fee increase. She said that the parents at the old site wanted to see some input into their centre as they saw the new building site benefiting from the increase and not them [Interviewee #15]. The treasurer wished for it to be noted in the minutes that he complimented the committee on their bold move to increase the fees to ensure the continued viability of the centre (Minutes of the Association Meeting, March, 1999).

Adams had taken over from Morris at the beginning of 1999. She had trained and taught in London, England before returning home to New Zealand. In line with her experiences overseas, Adams pushed for parents to leave their children at the centre till they were six and she believed that she had a good reaction thus far. She also felt it was important to promote the centre as a preschool not a kindergarten

(Minutes of the Association Meeting, February, 1999). Encouraging a group of children to stay at a Montessori early childhood centre past their 5th birthday tends to be more successful when there is a Montessori Primary school available or a number of classes under one management structure (Reilly, 1997). Only a couple of parents kept their children at the centre till they turned 6 (Interviewee #3).

The overall staffing structure of the centre continued to evolve. It was intended that the Head Teacher, Adams, would become Administrative Principal over both sites, assisted by the Executive Officer. Due to change in staffing she was still needed in the classroom so the role of Principal was shared between Adams and the Executive Officer. This was something that could be worked towards.

In six short years the Association had physically doubled in size. There was a change from a wholly parent managed centre with a large committee to a much smaller Board of Trustee style committee with employed staff managing the centre. It had grown to quite a moderate sized business that needed key business and management skills in its committee and senior staff to run properly [Interviewee #12; #16].

It has always offered very high quality Montessori programmes, at a reasonably cost, to our children, and this is I think the corner stone of the Association's success. Dr. Maria Montessori has given us a wonderful educational philosophy to implement and we must do it in such a way as to benefit as many children as possible in our catchment area. We must always keep the children uppermost in our minds, and in doing so, we will achieve the mission of the Association, that should ensure its ongoing success and viability in the future (President's Report, Annual General Meeting, 1999 - 2000).

The largest problem for the Association and the greatest challenge in the short term is the lack of funding to achieve objectives. This is the single biggest barrier towards the centre achieving any of its long-term goals. Recruitment of trained

Montessori teacher is another major stumbling block toward any further expansion of the Montessori centre.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter the establishment and development of one of the earlier Montessori centres during the second phase of Montessori in New Zealand was examined. The centre was a local do-it-yourself venture with a strong emphasis on key enthusiastic individuals, which parallels the national scene with Binda Goldsbrough (see Chapter 4). This 'do-it-yourself' approach to Montessori was also typical of other New Zealand community-based services such as the Playcentre movement, indicating a New Zealand way of doing things.

During this second phase the Montessori movement developed in a very different cultural context. The case study centre attracted middle to upper-socio economic parents who were well educated, and they tended to have more time and money to invest and develop early childhood programmes that suited their needs and those of their children. The tendency of Montessori parents to work through committees at grassroots levels to establish and spread Montessori education locally and nationally, and the close links between communities and schools all impacted upon the Montessori movement.

There were common themes throughout the chapter. First, there was a strong emphasis by the parents on community publicity. This was necessary to attract parental support and student enrolments. Parent education was an important part as this and the founding parents believed that learning more about Montessori would consolidate the aim of the group. They build up a considerable library to support their learning. The Committee also found that word of mouth by satisfied parents was by far the most successful advertising method. Secondly there was a strong emphasis on fundraising, to keep the fees low. Extra funds raised were also

used to purchase Montessori equipment. Finally, the case study parents placed a strong emphasis on sticking to the Montessori philosophy. This entailed ensuring that the centre had the specialised Montessori materials, and most importantly that they hired trained Montessori teachers to provide a high quality programme.

The following contextual policy constraints reinforced the need for all of the above points. The first being that the New Zealand Government provided limited financial support for the establishment and development of Montessori centres. To survive the centre had to fundraise. Secondly, the centre had to adhere to the Government's requirements for the early childhood sector. The effects have been twofold: (i) the centre had to meet government regulations for licencing purposes, first from the Department of Social Welfare and then from 1986 the Department of Education. This changed to the Ministry of Education with the Education Act (1989); and (ii) the hiring of trained Montessori teachers needed to adhere to government requirements.

In the next two chapters different aspects of the Montessori programme are examined through Montessori teachers', parents' and former pupils' perceptions of the nature and value of Montessori education.

Chapter 6

The Views of Teachers, Parents and Pupils

Introduction

In this chapter Montessori teachers', parents' and students' perceptions of the nature and value of Montessori education, and their understanding of the Montessori philosophy are examined to demonstrate how the Montessori system of education undergoes some degree of transformation in a different cultural context. This perspective was gained through exploring how parents learnt about Montessori, how teachers learnt about it and why they became Montessori teachers. Also considered were how parents selected the Montessori centre, the importance of the location, the number of children per class, the teacher-child ratio, the Montessori philosophy, the structured environment and specialised materials, age of entry and their child's completion of the programme. The advantages and disadvantage of attending an alternative early childhood centre were also explored, along with teachers' and parents' perception of how successful Montessori education is for preparing children for state primary schools. Former pupils were interviewed to ensure that their voices were also heard in this study. Case study data are presented and considered in relation to responses from a survey of Montessori teachers and the views of expert teachers, where appropriate, to demonstrate how Montessori education is being subtly altered through the interplay of all these cultural, political and social factors.

How Parents Learnt About Montessori

Parents whose children attended the case study centre learnt about Montessori education in a variety of ways. The majority of parents found out through word-of-mouth by the recommendation of their friends, acquaintances or family. From its early beginnings advertising by satisfied parents seemed to be the best form of publicity (Minutes of the Council Meeting, August, 1980). On

pupils' enrolment forms there was a space for parents to note how they learnt about the centre. Although very few filled this in, most stated they had found out from other parents, listing the names of the families whom did the recommending. This continued to be the major means for communicating the benefits of Montessori education in the wider community (see Chapter 5). Judith, for instance, learnt about Montessori through her friends whose children attended the centre, and it also fitted in with her religious philosophy. She and her friends were Jehovah Witnesses and their children from a very young age were expected to participate in the religious services. What appealed to them was the orderly learning environment, where their children engaged in constructive, productive learning (Interviewee #8).

According to Smith and Barraclough (1997) parents with more education and material resources are better able to choose early childhood centres which demonstrate high standards of quality. Pam, who used to recommend the centre, illustrates this. She and her partner used to tell all their friends how great Montessori was, but had ceased to do so. They were very pleased with their oldest daughter's education at Montessori. They were not so pleased with their youngest daughter's last year at Montessori. There was a change of head teacher and Pam, a trained primary teacher herself, felt the teacher did not deliver a high quality programme. However, they made the decision not to withdraw their daughter as they thought it would be too disruptive taking her away from all her friends and putting her in a new learning environment (Interviewee #9).

For some, educational literature proved to be the catalyst. Glenda Avery, one of the founding parents, gained her information on Montessori through a La Leche League article. She was a La Leche League Leader in the mid-1970s and in the literature the organisation received from the United States mothers regularly mentioned that their children attended Montessori schools. Avery made the connection between Montessori education and people who were

concerned about the “optimum and full development of their children” even if it meant going “against the social norm” (Interviewee #1; see Chapter 5). Another parent, Barbara, was living in Sydney with a young child when she went into a book shop with a friend who had children of the same age and she pointed out Elizabeth Hainstock’s book, *Teaching Montessori in the Home: The pre-school years* (1968). Barbara purchased the book and after reading it was determined to send her son to a Montessori early childhood centre. She moved back to New Zealand and saw an advert in the paper advertising the Montessori centre. “I was just so pleased that there was one” in the city (Interviewee #10). Jason, too, learnt about Montessori through educational literature. He read *The Learning Revolution*, which reported on two television crews who had traveled the world in 1990 searching for the “world’s best ideas in creative findings” (Dryden & Vos, 1993, p. 257). Jason was so impressed they gave Montessori top prize for excellence that he and his partner decided on a Montessori early childhood education for their two children (Interviewee #11).

To identify parents’ reasons for choosing, staying at and leaving a school Glenn (1993) conducted market research with the parents of the Franciscan Montessori Earth School in the United States. The school catered for both early childhood and primary Montessori education. Glenn found that parents choose the school based on positive impressions on their first visit, as was the case with Faith. She had visited her local kindergarten but was not overly impressed. Looking at other options, she included a visit to the Montessori centre. Faith was impressed with what she saw, in particular the safe, secure learning environment. This was an important aspect as she was, at that time, “overly protective of her daughter” due to the recent death of her baby. She was also impressed with the head teacher’s warm manner, commenting that this was another deciding factor (Interviewee #12).

Another factor was that the Montessori early childhood centre took children at age two-and-a-half. One parent, Samantha, had her two boys close together

and they were very active (Interviewee #13). Being able to start her oldest son much earlier than kindergarten was the deciding factor. Barbara mentioned this too. Her son had been attending the Montessori centre for “ages” when she got a call from the local kindergarten, where he had also been enrolled. She took him along and thought “no way”. She found the environment there uninviting and continued his education at the Montessori centre (Interviewee #10).

The parents found out about Montessori in a variety of ways. For the majority, however, word of mouth by the recommendations of their friends, acquaintances or family was their main source. This was similar to Chisnall’s (2002) findings when she sent a questionnaire to parents at three Montessori centres in New Zealand.

How Montessori Teachers Learnt About Montessori

Along with the parents’ voices I was also interested in how teachers learnt about Montessori and why they made the decision to become Montessori teachers. A postal survey was sent to Montessori teachers currently teaching in New Zealand, who were members of the Teachers Division of the Montessori Association of New Zealand, to elicit this information. Some of the results of the survey [see Chapter 1 for information on the response rate], discussed below indicate that like the case study parents teachers learnt about Montessori in numerous ways. Twenty-four percent [N=9] of respondents found out about Montessori from friends. For instance, *Respondent #16* stated:

Approx. 7 years ago a v. [very] good friend of mine was reading about Montessori & after having a lengthy discussion with her - I was hooked and couldn’t image a better way to spend my days.

A further 21 percent [N=8] of the respondents had acquaintances whose children attended a Montessori programme. The following two examples demonstrate this:

Respondent #26

Children of friends were attending Mont. pre-school in USA approx. 30 years ago.

Respondent #35

Through friends in the UK, who had children at Montessori preschools.

Additionally, 21 percent [N=8] learnt through attending a post secondary school qualification and/or through educational literature. Some responses are cited below to illustrate:

Respondent #7

A very small amount at University while majoring in Education & History for a BA. I was intrigued, chatted with Eve Reilly [Executive Officer of the Montessori Association of New Zealand (MANZ) and an experienced Montessori teacher] through a friend and thought I'd check it out further.

Respondent #9

While I was at University 1964-68. [The respondent did her University qualification in the United States during the early stages of the revival of the Montessori movement, see Chapter 4].

For 18 percent [N=7] of those surveyed they learnt about Montessori through personal investigation, visits or inquiry. For instance:

Respondent #2

Observed at a Montessori School when looking for a place to send my 3yr old.

Respondent #28

Television Documentary - The Children on the Hill (in the 60's), a friend visiting a St. Nicholas Open Day in London (late 70's) and then a book about her method (early 80's) led to a phone call to the local pre-school to enrol my own children.

An additional 8 percent [N=3] found out about Montessori through their job, which the following responses demonstrate:

Respondent #29

Working in a Montessori Pre-school.

Respondent #5

I was offered a job [as] a reliever in a Montessori classroom.

A final 8 percent [N=3] of the respondents had parents who had been involved or interested in Montessori education. *Respondent #15*, for example, stated that her “mother from Christchurch was educated at Sacred Heart College CHCH by nuns using Montessori equipment [and] methods in 1939 or the preceding years”. These responses indicate that the teachers, similar the case study parents, learnt about Montessori in a variety of ways.

Reasons for Becoming Montessori Teachers

One of the reasons for undertaking this research was to investigate why people choose to become Montessori teachers (see Chapter 1). A summary of teachers’ survey responses highlighted three distinct categories.

Category 1 - 13 percent [N=5] of the respondents stated they were dissatisfied with the mainstream educational system. Samples of responses are as follows:

Respondent #13

Disillusioned with Government kindergarten teaching.

Respondent #36

I was trained, disillusioned, “retired” teacher. The more I found out about Montessori, the more I needed to find out. It met my needs as a teacher.

As educators and parents voice dissatisfaction with aspects of the New Zealand education system alternative schools such as Montessori and Rudolf Steiner are seeing a surge of interest (Fyee, 1998).

Category 2 - 16 percent [N=6] of the respondents became Montessori teachers because it was a requirement of the job, as the following examples illustrate:

Respondent #3

I needed to train to fill a position that was offered to me.

Respondent #18

Sort of fell into it - my daughter was attending the school and the directress, who was working alone at the time, decided she needed some help with a particular new intake and I agreed to join her.

Category 3 - for the majority, 71 percent [N=27], it was Montessori's philosophy of education that was the deciding point, for instance:

Respondent #14

After much reading of Montessori's works I realised that I believed in her philosophy and wanted to teach her theories.

Respondent #28

Initially the method seemed so logical (especially the Math!); a wonderfully simple presentation by the Montessori directress during my first observation brought it all to life: and later reading about Montessori's philosophy and hope for the future through working with children... all contributed to the decision.

Respondent #16

I whole-heartedly agreed with her philosophy. I love children, I wanted to work with children - my year's training was one of the most memorable years of my life and I couldn't wait to be in the classroom.

When a selected group of experienced teachers were asked to comment on the above they were in agreement that these three categories reflected why people become Montessori teachers today. *Experienced Teacher #1* was "delighted to see that Category 3 held the highest category" [see Chapter 1, for information on how the experienced teachers were selected].

Selecting A Montessori Centre

One problem for many of the case study parents is that they had limited relevant information/concrete examples to draw upon when selecting a centre for their children. With only one centre established in the city there were no standards for comparison. One former teacher, Morris, requested prospective parents come and observe the programme before enrolling their child. During her time at the centre there was huge pressure on the waitlist as parents could enroll their child from birth. With limited spaces available she wanted to ensure that they had "some understanding and commitment to the Montessori philosophy" (Interviewee #3). To help parents make an informed choice another former teacher, Susie Apperton, provided a list of things to look for in a Montessori classroom. This situation reflects Smith and Barraclough's (1997)

findings that parents had limited experience with the range of quality found in various early childhood centres. Parents in their study had little basis on what to look for and could only make a comparison with what was found in their home environments:

Most of the parents in our study (86 percent) felt that they had their first choice of quality but only five percent had actually visited different centres before deciding on which one to use. Hence many parents may never have seen good-quality care giving them no basis for comparison and choice (Smith & Barraclough, 1997, p. 21).

In the early 1990s the only other information available on parents' choice of early childhood programmes were *Consumer* articles which examined different childcare options (1992) and provided guidelines for choosing early childcare and early childhood education programmes (1994), but Montessori was not a programme considered.

As Montessori became more established as an alternative early childhood programme information became more readily available to both parents and teachers. For example, *Education Horizons* placed Montessori on the cover of their March 1999 issue, containing one article outlining the philosophy of the programme (Bonnet, 1999) and one describing a visit to Montessori primary school as well as another alternative, Rudolf Steiner (Jerums, 1999). The focus was on the primary sector with the point being made that evidence is still lacking whether alternative schools compete effectively with the mainstream sector. Welch (1999, p. 30) writing in the *Listener* stated that for an increasing number of New Zealand parents Montessori schooling is "offering an undefinable something extra". He noted however that he suspected that:

Many middle-class professionals choose Montessori or Steiner schools for their children because they want them to have something special – in particular, less crowded classrooms and greater individual attention – but can't afford the more expensive private schools.

The article highlighted the fact that both alternatives attracted a predominately well off and Pakeha clientele. This was certainly true of the case study centre parents. In two research projects carried out at the centre they were identified as predominantly in the middle to upper socio-economic bracket, with high levels of tertiary education (Brooke, 1992; Smith, 1995).

Location of the Centre

Parents were asked how important the location of the Montessori early childhood centre was relative to their home or work. The location was not an important factor. Instead the parents based their choice of the early childhood centre largely on philosophical reasons rather than convenience. Farquhar's (1991) findings that convenience was a major influence on choice were not borne out by this research. She had examined parents' reasons for choosing their child's current early childhood centre. This was part of a larger study into parents' understanding of quality in three different types of early childhood programmes in New Zealand. Her paper's focus was on findings revealed when day care centre managers and staff were for the first time required to consult with parents and find out their views as part of the charter development process. Farquhar found that convenience and programme appearance were important factors in centre selection. Montessori early childhood centres, however, were not included in her study. Like Farquhar, Wylie, Thompson, and Kerslate-Kendricks (1996) also found that the main reason for parents choosing their child's first early childhood centre was a suitable location. This Montessori case study confirms that, as far as alternative services are concerned, different factors are involved in centre choice, especially the philosophical components. With regard to Montessori, factors such as the prepared learning environment and the didactic materials, and encouraging children to become independent, autonomous learners, were important considerations behind parental commitment to sending their children to the centre.

In the first year of operation of the case study centre the Committee took on the responsibility of organising carpools for “driver-less families” in order to build up their numbers (Council minutes, July, 1980). During this period the Committee members felt that the main disadvantage of the location was the distance that parents had to travel. One former teacher, Ryan, however felt that the advantages of the location outweighed this (Minutes of the Council Meeting, June, 1980). The rented building was surrounded by open land and as it was away from the city centre there was very little traffic and good places nearby to go for walks with the children (Ryan, 1983). Duncan, one of the founding parents, on the other hand, felt there was a danger of “encouraging an atmosphere of “elitism” about the school by remaining in our present location” (Minutes of the Special Council Meeting, October, 1980). She believed children were penalised because they could not attend unless they had parents with two cars or parents who had flexible working hours.

Number of Children Per Class

Group size was an important factor for case study parents when choosing the centre. Some of the parents commented on “overcrowding” (Interviewee #12) at other early childhood programmes, and in particular the “large number in kindergartens” (Interviewee #10). One parent who had three children that attended the centre noted that the teacher gave “lots of individual attention to her child”, as there were not too many children (Interviewee #5).

The size of the group is one indication of a quality early childhood service. Wylie, Thompson, and Kerlake-Hendricks (1996), in the first phase of the longitudinal project, *Competent Children at 5: Families and Early Education*, described the competencies of 307 children in relation to their family background, home activities, the time spent in an early childhood centre and the quality of their current early childhood experience as they approached their fifth birthday. The project also rated the early childhood settings. Their findings indicated that the quality of centres was related to:

- staff having an early childhood qualification;
- the highest salary paid to staff;
- the type of early childhood service;
- teacher to child ratio; and
- group size.

The number of children per class in the case study centre was limited by the terms of its licence. The Department of Social Welfare initially issued this until the transfer of childcare services to the Department of Education in 1986. The centre was unusual in that it was granted a ratio of 1:15 with a limit of 30 in the morning session. In the afternoon session the centre was allowed up to 18 children with a ratio of 1:9. Early on the Committee decided a maximum of 15 in the afternoon session was optimal for their purposes (Association Newsletter, July 1984). Parental comments indicated that they associated lower numbers with a higher quality programme.

Teacher-Child Ratio

The teacher-child ratio was not as important as class size for the case study parents when choosing the Montessori centre. Smith (2000) outlined guidelines providing indicators of good quality childcare programmes. In relation to the teacher-child ratios she stated high quality ratios for half sessions was one adult to ten children. The teacher-child ratio at the centre did not compare well to Smith's guidelines.

In terms of the 'ideal' teacher-child ratio in a Montessori learning environment there are differences of opinion about what Montessori suggested. In some of her writings she wrote that one or two adults were all that were required to satisfy the needs of 40 to 50 children. Montessori spoke of limiting the number of teachers within the learning environment in order to protect the child from the teacher. She commented on the tendency of adults to interfere with the learning processes of children and believed that if there was a large classroom

of children then the teacher would be less able to do so. Furthermore, children learn to be more self-reliant and seek assistance from their peers rather than relying on the teacher for all their questions and problems, which she considered preferable (Montessori 1912/1964).

The classroom outlined by Montessori did have a number of adults however. There was a nurse, a cook and teacher assistants, who while not all actively involved in the classroom certainly provided assistance and adult contacts for the children (Montessori, 1912/1964).

The Montessori Philosophy, the Structured Environment and Specialised Materials

Duncan, one of the founding parents, felt any prospective parents should be interested that it was a Montessori centre. She stated that this could be either by pre-knowledge, or from example [meaning the children who attended the centre] or a wish to learn about it to see if and how it would be to an advantage to their children. Having a dread of elitism she did not want to think that any child would attend the centre because it was the “in” thing to do or because “Mrs. Jones sends Mary there as it must be the right thing to do; or the mere fact that it is ‘one of those “alternative” schools” (President’s Report, Annual General Meeting, 1981). She and her partner sent their child to the case study centre because they believed in and were committed to the Montessori philosophy.

The Montessori materials and the prepared learning environment, one of the major components of the Montessori Method, were factors that were mentioned consistently as important in parents’ decisions to send their children to the centre. Faith liked the quiet, organised atmosphere of the learning environment (Interviewee #12). Another parent, Barbara, liked the Montessori materials, which were very different from what she saw at kindergarten and that there “were no toys”. Moreover she commented on the variety of things

that her children did, such as “they would sing, they would go for walks”(Interviewee #10). For Pam the programme offered an individual approach to education that she thought would benefit her children (Interviewee #9).

Age of Entry and Completion of the Programme

All the case study parents started their children at the Montessori centre at age 2 1/2, and the majority had more than one child attend the programme. One parent, though, Faith, withdrew her second child from the centre. Her eldest child completed the programme and they were very pleased with the education she received. It was important to both her and her partner that all their children were treated equally. Her daughter had attended Montessori so her son needed to be given the opportunity as well. However, there had been a change of teaching staff and Faith did not have confidence in the ability of the new Head Teacher. The teacher was in the final stage of her Montessori training and Faith was not happy that she was untrained. Consequently they withdrew their son. They felt the programme was only as good as the person delivering it and did not feel that they were getting their money’s worth (Interviewee # 12).

Most parents, though, mentioned their commitment to the Montessori philosophy and the importance of their child completing the programme to ensure their “optimum and full development” (Interviewee #1; #3; #11). As Sullivan puts it, the Montessori programme provides a good alternative to mainstream education due to the focus it places on balancing the child that is taught. “I think the people who sent their children to alternative schools have very strong views about education...if they are going into [the] system they have a real edge with that parental concern” (Sullivan quoted in Fyre, 1998, p. 8).

Advantages of Attending the Montessori Centre

The case study parents were also asked what their children gained by attending the Montessori centre. One of the founding parents, Sedcole, stated that her and her partner's experience with "Montessori education have all been very positive" and they think that it is an "excellent system". Their children all did "well academically" and they felt "sure that part of that success is due to the advantageous start they had" in early childhood education (Sedcole, 1993). Some advantages noted by parents was the fact that their children had some familiarity with "pre-reading skills and writing", which made their children feel confident about going off to school. Justin, for example, reported that his daughter in her first couple of weeks at school progressed rapidly through the reading levels (Interviewee #11). Another parent, Barbara, stated that the first day her child started school the New Entrant teacher showed the principal how she could "write and sound out her words" (Interviewee #10). These parents felt that Montessori had given their children a good grounding in preparation for school.

Morris, a former teacher, noticed that over the years there were two main reasons for parents sending their children to Montessori. One was that parents wanted their children to be "successful academically, with an emphasis on reading, writing and mathematics". Others were more concerned that their children "acquire a positive attitude towards schoolwork such as attention to tasks, completion of tasks and following directions" (Interviewee #3). The Education Review Office (ERO) (2000) notes that the New Zealand Council of Educational Research (NZCER) found that one significant factor in determining school performance was whether or not children were allowed to complete activities in their early childhood centre (see also Wylie, Thompson, & Hendricks, 1996). This had a considerable impact later on a child's perseverance at school activities. The Montessori learning environment encouraged children to complete activities once the child had chosen them.

The majority of parents reported positive experiences of the centre. Linda, for instance, noted that over the time her children spent at the centre they had gradually built up their concentration span and had great attention to task (Interviewee #4). She recalled that one of her daughters would spend a large majority of the session doing the 'Washing the Table' practical life exercise. Others reported that their children were able to take and follow directions, were observant and had good hand-eye co-ordination. Further comments were that children "related well to other children", were "self-confident" and "self-disciplined" [Interviewee #17; #19]. The parents also reported that the children were patient, they had developed a love for learning; the children had good concentration and they quickly adjusted to new work [Interviewee #7, #18]. Moreover one parent commented that her child was "capable of working on her own", which had been encouraged at Montessori (Interviewee #4).

Reading through the Council minutes of the centre it was noted in early 1982 that one parent mentioned "good comments" from a local school "about the 3 Montessori school children there" (Minutes of the Council Meeting, March, 1982). Positive feedback was also recorded at the Annual General Meeting in 1984 when a member of the committee stated, "Primary Schools are becoming more receptive to Montessori trained pre-schoolers". However, another parent at the meeting, Margaret Dane, disagreed stating that it "depends on the school and the teacher". One of the founding parents, Richard Sedcole added that the "local College of Education had been observing at the centre, had made a video and they were aware of the Montessori Method" (Annual General Meeting, February, 1984).

Disadvantages of Attending the Montessori Centre

The Montessori early childhood centre drew people from all over the city. For some children when they went off to school they ended up not knowing anyone in the new entrant classroom [Interviewee #9]. One parent, Barbara, noted that when her oldest son went to primary school in the mid-1980s there

were no other Montessori pupils. He told her "I wish you had sent me to an ordinary kindy". Knowing no other children isolated her son. Ten years later when her other two children attended Montessori the transition to primary school was much easier, as "teachers were a lot better at accepting Montessori" (Interviewee #10).

One problem noted by some of the parents was that primary school teachers were unable to give their child individual attention. This was particularly problematic if they started school with a large group [#12; #13]. Parents found that there was a different attitude to their child's work, as the child was not allowed to work independently and do his or her own thing, and a feeling of vulnerability in the new big playground with much less supervision (Interviewee #3; #20).

Generally, the Montessori-educated children settled into primary school easily. The main problem highlighted was the fact that some children experienced a feeling of not getting the individual attention they wanted. However, this would vary with teachers according to how their classroom was organised, their style of teaching and so forth. Overall the parents were well satisfied with their children's Montessori early childhood education and were pleased that they had sent their children to the centre. Such perceptions obviously helped create a positive community image for the centre throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

Teachers' Perception of How Successful Montessori Education Is

When undertaking this research I was also interested in how well Montessori education is working in New Zealand, in terms of children being prepared for the mainstream primary school system and the perceived value of the education. I asked the surveyed teachers to comment on this and their

responses were similar to the case study parents in that they were generally very positive, as demonstrated by the following:

Respondent #7

Very successful. A good quality pre-school education prepares all children well for state primary. Montessori particularly - as most children leave with independence - an ability to choose an activity, complete it with focus and enjoy learning and discovery [of] new knowledge. They have usually had a good social experience and are able to relate well to their peers and other adults. The language rich environment of a good Montessori programme prepares them well for the state primary language curriculum, the Montessori maths materials also prepares children very well for the state primary maths curriculum. It gives an excellent concrete experience of maths that will often be presented later in a more abstract way that must surely be an advantage.

Respondent # 22

My observations and from talking to primary teachers Montessori children seem to be well prepared for primary school. The more academic and structured nature of the programme makes primary school less of a culture shock than if they had come from many other ECE centres. Does also depend a lot on how open the teacher is to Montessori, phonetic reading, children that may be quite advanced in maths, etc.

In New Zealand children start school on their 5th birthday although the compulsory age of attendance is 6 years. The next response outlines how one teacher has adapted her programme to better meet the needs of her students.

Respondent # 28

Generally, very successful. The aims of the programme - to aid the development of independence and concentration are key plus strength in literacy and math skills. Difficulty with latter in that this is normally not able to be followed up in the first 2 years due to the N.Z. emphasis on reading. Children entering at age 5 1/2 - 6 years are more rounded but because of less total concentration on reading may take a short time to catch up. (This is from parent feedback). (*I have modified my programme to put more emphasis on reading where children are going to the state system.*) [italics added].

Many of those surveyed felt that children need to complete the three-year cycle in order to obtain the full benefits of a Montessori education and, if possible,

send the child to a Montessori primary school. This ties into the goals of many of the schools, which included starting up a Primary Montessori.

Respondent #12

We aim to retain children in our own school, i.e. transition to Montessori Primary. However, I feel children leaving at 5 years miss the best part – the blossoming and incredible self confidence the children develop in their third year of preschool. Those that leave have skills in being part of group co-operation, an interest in reading/maths, etc., so this is good preparation for school.

The experienced teachers agreed that the above comments reflect how successful Montessori education is currently in preparing children for the state primary sector. For *Experienced Teacher #5* “these comment reflect what feedback we’ve received and observed as well”. *Experienced Teacher #1* wrote that she believed:

That striving for the optimum (& I’m aware for many reasons this [is] not always possible) 3 years in the pre-primary Mont. environment helps the child to ‘adapt’ to any future environment. Important also for the state primary teacher (for children who go into the state schools) to have the ‘confidence’ to follow the child’s work ethic ie allowing them to complete a cycle of activity etc.

The teachers’ responses indicate that they believe the Montessori system is preparing children well for the primary sector.

Montessori Teachers’ Feedback from Parents

Teachers were also surveyed to find out what kind of feedback they get from former parents. On the whole the comments were usually very positive and this was backed up with the parents enrolling their younger children, as the following comment demonstrates:

Respondent #16

Extremely positive – many of our pupils are 2nd, 3rd, and 4th siblings – that commitment speaks for itself.

Another aspect that came through was the parents' dissatisfaction with the primary state system and stating that in hindsight they wish they had left their children in the Montessori programme longer. The next two respondents illustrate this:

Respondent #9

Without exception every parent who has purposefully chosen to have their child "stay till 6" has never regretted a minute of it and said it was worth all the hassle of trying to keep answering peoples' queries and comments and keep focused about it. They loved the easy way their children came to the reading fluency, to say nothing of the wide-ranging awareness. Just last week I had a family whose 2nd child is due to start say that knowing what they do now they would have left the older on after all (they bowed to the pressure of grandparents who were school principals!). I have learned that this is not a decision that parents can make when their child is 4 turning 5, its too late by then and they are vulnerable to all the gossip and misconceptions. You have to start at pre-enrolment visits, upon enrolment, and just patiently doggedly keep extolling the genius of the programme throughout all your parent evenings for the first 2 years!

Respondent #15

Through the grapevine. Often after our one month phone call to former parents we learn that parents say that they "seriously considered bring their child back to Montessori pre-school for longer".

The teachers responses also highlighted the parents' satisfaction of their child's school preparation and their introduction to early literacy and numeracy skills.

Respondent #23

Excellent feedback - they are generally very grateful for the foundation the children had at Montessori. Our ex-pupils consistently do well at school, academically and settle easily into the school environment.

Respondent #28

Usually comments from parents will relate to how well children are getting on in reading or how they are in a special group for math etc.

Respondent #37

Usually very positive; they have enjoyed feeling part of the Montessori community, knowing that home and school were working together for the benefit of the child. They are the parents

who want the best for their children, and appreciate the foundation given. Many saw themselves as “learners”, willing to look at the Montessori approach to rewards and punishment, fantasy and imagination, etc. rather than follow traditional patterns of thought. Any “disgruntled” parents have been the “pushy” ones, who did not fully understand the Montessori philosophy, and pulled out before the child had become normalised or completed a full cycle.

The above feedback is similar to what the experienced teachers received from former parents.

Experienced Teacher #1

Absolutely – parents also say it’s an eye opener when they go to primary school after. Gone are the days when each child is greeted personally and each parent is spoken to every day. I do appreciate the sheer numbers in primary schools which renders this impossible.

The performance of Montessori early childhood-educated students when they move on to the primary state schools appear to be positive according to parents and former teachers, providing an affirmative answer to the question about whether Montessori students are being prepared for and successful in traditional schools.

Feedback From Former Pupils

Montessori teachers were also asked to consider what kind of feedback they got from former pupils. In this regard the teachers’ comments were generally positive, as the following example affirms:

Respondent #3

They are friendly and remember their time at our school. One girl sewed a hole in her T. shirt and her friends asked where did you learn to sew. Her answer was Montessori of course!!

However, a large number of replies included negative comments regarding the state primary school system, in particular how Montessori children are held back or become bored, as illustrated below:

Respondent #4

Mostly wonderful positive feedback however some state teachers are not catering for the level of learnings these children are at and as a result some boredom sets in – and that lust for the love of learning. If a child can spell mat at 4 why do they have to do it when they are 5 1/2. Sad stuff.

Respondent #10

Generally very positive, the pupils still have a love of learning though at times they miss the diversity of the programme and its freedom when they enter state schools. Parents report a lack of mathematics in school.

One teacher, *Respondent #21*, noted that former pupils appear to have very little memory of the content of the programme.

Recently questioned in their late teens pupils have said:

“I remember getting a bee sting in the sandpit”.

“I remember clapping the teacher’s name”.

“I remember the golden beads”.

The experienced teachers commenting on the above responses, also pointed out that children have difficulty in recalling aspects of their early Montessori experiences.

Experienced Teacher #3

I have noticed that when children first enter primary school that the parents are delighted with how forward their children are and we get a flurry of warm, fussy comments but as time passes, the Montessori experience seems to be dimmed as whole families get caught up in the school thing. My own daughter, now 12, who went on to a State Primary & is now at Intermediate, recalls very little except –geometric solids, in particular the ovoid & ellipsoid.

Experienced Teacher #5

We have had great feedback from our State Schools – and support. I don’t think the children recall information until they are reintroduced to it – such as when they start learning about continents, geometric shapes, squares & cubing, etc. “Memory traces”.

Former Pupils’ Voices

Returning to the case study data, former pupils were interviewed to ensure that their voices were heard in this study. When asked if they could remember their teacher’s name the majority, 56 percent [N=10], could. Many of the older

participants, for example, were able to including Brad [22 years]; Matt [22 years]; Bailey [22 years]; and Claire [23 years]. One of the reasons for asking this question was that prior to my undertaking this research young adults who remembered that I had been their Montessori teacher in an early childhood centre had approached me on a number of occasions. I was curious what else former pupils recalled from their time at Montessori.

The pupils were also asked if they remembered about other children who were at the Montessori early childhood centre with them. Forty-four percent [N=8] were able to recall children they were friendly with but this appeared to be the result of attending the same primary school or if their families were acquainted and kept in touch. By way of illustration Fran [11 years] could name a couple of children that she attended Montessori with. A group of them all went to the same primary school, and had periodically been in the same classes. It was mainly the younger respondents that could remember their peers. For the older respondents they had attended the Montessori centre during the 1980s when there was only one classroom. It was not unusual for them to attend a primary school or be in a class where they were the only one who had attended the centre [Interviewee #3; #10].

When asked about their time at Montessori some of the pupils were able to identify specific materials. For instance Matt [22 years] recalled playing with "the farm", which had horses, pigs, cows, sheep and so forth. Sarah [11 years] remembered "cards with shapes on them" and the "blocks that you build up and the rods, and painting". Another child, Duncan [9 years] replied that he liked "playing in the playground and my teacher". He also mentioned the "big masking tape circle" on the floor. Two former pupils, Finn [8 years] and Max [18 years] who did not complete their early childhood education at Montessori simply stated, "I don't know".

When former pupils were asked what was different about going to primary school, one respondent, Robin [9 years], noted that she could not choose her own work. Sarah [11years] relayed that, "it was different because you did different things. School was harder, you learnt different things. Montessori was just like a place to go to socialise and to learn about shapes and colours". Again the younger respondents were able to make some comparisons, while others could not remember. As Hainstock (1997, p. 7) states, in relation to her own daughters' Montessori education:

How vividly they remember the day-to-day routine of their early Montessori training is not important. What is important is the resulting benefits and patterns that training established for them to build upon as they matured. The true value of the Montessori method come when the child is able to *use* the tools and skills learned in earlier years and, in turn, to share them with others [italics in original].

In agreement with Hainstock, teachers highlighted that former pupils appear to recall little of their Montessori experiences. *Experienced Teacher #5* believes that children recall information when they are reintroduced to the Montessori learning environment, and this is illustrated in the following example:

When Wa Ora Montessori school opened on September 15, 1988 with 10 children aged 6 – 9 years, many of the children's memories of the environment and how the classroom was structured had faded. Several of the children had attended a Montessori early childhood centre as 3 and 4 year olds. The classroom initially appeared foreign to many of them, until the once familiar geometric solids were re-introduced and they began to recall the objects and their names (Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc., Newsletter 14, November, 1988, p. 20).

Montessori Teachers' Interpretation of the Montessori Method

As this thesis is concerned with the ways in which the original ideas of Montessori have been reworked in New Zealand to suit a different historical and social context, I asked in the survey if teachers had made any changes to the way that they taught since doing their training. Some of the teachers

reported that, after having gained experience teaching in a Montessori programme, both in New Zealand and overseas, they were confident to make changes.

Respondent #7

Yes, I think I have seen Montessori in action in such a real way – flexible, sensitive, egalitarian (in the way 2 teachers work as a team rather than the traditional Directress/Assistant role) and meeting the needs of NZ children and their families. I hope that my teaching reflects this also. I like to think the children in my class are free to explore and take risks with warm, loving supportive guidelines. Our culture is a robust culture and is something to celebrate. However the ordered Montessori classroom is achievable – with the personalities and culture of the Kiwi children being allowed to grow. Humour is something I didn't feel much in my training and is something I use and need every day.

Respondent # 8

Yes, I think I have become less formal. Training in UK was very formal and adjustments need to be made to cater to the NZ lifestyle of children.

Respondent #14

Teaching in real life is different to the training situation where you practice by the letter of the book. Actual teaching has to be more flexible.

Respondent #36

Oh my! I hope so! I'm 13 years older and wiser; I make very different judgement calls. I've adjusted myself, the curriculum and the Method to 3 very different age groups (3-6, 6-9, 9-12) – but my focus remains on functional independence and the development of spirit/passion/connection/excellence/tenacity.

The ability to be flexible using the Montessori didactic materials and structure is extremely challenging, and requires a clear view of attitudes and purposes. A more flexible and eclectic approach to Montessori within New Zealand is evident by these responses, which seem to indicate that there is a 'New Zealand approach'.

For other teachers the changes they made were in relation to the Montessori didactic materials. This is highlighted in the following two comments.

Respondent #17

Yes, I have found from experience that some Montessori presentations do not work well, such as the Impressionistic charts. I also use Information technology, e.g. Internet, CD-ROMs whenever possible.

Respondent # 23

Yes. We no longer use the sandpaper letters - we use the English phonetic programme Letterland which has use appeal to children - our reading levels have soared. Sandpaper letters are boring - in this day I believe Montessori would have changed.

A few had not made any changes. For example:

Respondent #16

Have not done sufficient teaching to have made significant changes. Still a die hard Montessorian!!

Respondent #30

Not really - I am probably a little more lenient than described in [Montessori's writings] but as long as the final product is the same it must be all good.

The experienced teachers, when asked to comment on the above, were in agreement that the statements were in line with what is currently happening in Montessori programmes. *Experienced Teacher #1*, though, strongly made the point that:

The training is just the start - and there is so much more to the philosophy than the materials. Each child is so different and so we as educators must tailor to suit each child's needs whilst not compromising the fundamental principles.

There is the expectation that a curriculum model as old as Montessori should have changed as new ways of understanding how children learn and develop are constantly emerging through questioning, building on and improving the discoveries of earlier theorists. Over time certain aspects of the Montessori curriculum have changed. The Practical Life curriculum area, for example, needs to reflect the culture of the country as well as the cultures of the children

in the centre. In the case of New Zealand this means that centres need to represent Māori and other cultures within their centres. The ERO (2002), however, found that 27 percent of Montessori centres needed to improve their representation of te reo me nga tikanga Māori.

Chattin-McNichols (1992a) has identified other changes in the method since its beginnings. In the Language curriculum area nearly all the material and activities in both early childhood and primary classrooms were developed by people other than Montessori. The 'root' materials including the Metal Insets, the Sandpaper Letters and the Movable Alphabet are still present but new materials have been created. Even though this curriculum area continues to grow and change it was, nevertheless, surprising to learn that one centre had replaced the Sandpaper Letters [see *Respondent #23* above]. "The best Montessori schools and teacher education programs are true to Montessori's empirical traditions; they are constantly making small changes and adjustments and carefully observing children's reactions" (Chattin-McNichols, 1992a, p. 21). As mentioned previously, though, these are related to the sequence or further development of the materials, not a re-examination of her fundamental pedagogical premises (see Chapter 2).

The introduction of computers has been another change to the original Montessori education curriculum. Information communication technologies (ICT) software and uses can be consistent with Montessori's approach. However, *Respondent #17* was the only one who mentioned the use of Information communication technologies (ICT).

Even with the changes outlined above most of what Montessori describes in her books can be seen today in Montessori early childhood centres. Chattin-McNichols (1992a) believes the reason for this is that the Montessori curriculum is still as 'up-to-date' as when it was first developed. I am in agreement with Turner (1992, p. 44), who points out that it is clear that some "accommodation has occurred because of cultural and temporal differences". For example

'Letterland' is also used in mainstream centres in New Zealand, although structured progress have been challenged by some early childhood educators as inconsistent with *Te Whāriki* (Cullen, 2001). Further, there has been increasing emphasis on the use of IT in the early childhood sector.

Discussion

Generally the perceptions of present and former Montessori teachers, and former parents regarding the nature and value of Montessori education, and their understanding of the Montessori philosophy, appeared to broadly coincide. Their comments varied between aiding the development of independence and concentration to the strengths in early literacy and numeracy. The build up of concentration in a Montessori learning environment is encouraged through repetitive use of the didactic materials and completing each task before beginning another activity. As noted above, NZCER found that one significant factor in determining school performance was whether or not children were allowed to complete activities in their early childhood centre. This had a considerable impact later on a child's perseverance at school activities (Education Review Office, 2000; Wylie, Thompson & Kerslake-Hendricks).

Both teachers and parents stated that children seem to be well prepared for primary school. The findings of the recent report by the Education Review Office (ERO) (2002), based on Accountability Reviews or Assurance Audits carried out at 91 Montessori early childhood centres between January 1997 and June 2001, found that the strength of Montessori centres was their focus on developing literacy and numeracy skills. Forty-one percent of the ERO reports highlighted these aspects of the programme. Many of the teachers surveyed, furthermore, felt that children need to complete the three-year cycle in order to obtain the full benefits of a Montessori education and, if possible, the child should then be sent to a Montessori primary school. With the rapid growth of

Montessori primary schools around the country this will be an increasingly available option for parents (see Chapter 4).

It is important to be cautious when interpreting the case study results as the participants were drawn from one Montessori centre and considered in relation to survey responses and the views of expert teachers, where appropriate. Nonetheless, it provides an affirmative answer to questions about whether Montessori pupils will be successful in mainstream education. Another factor is that the centre attracted middle to upper socio-economic families who might be expected to show strong academic achievement regardless of the type of schooling their child receives. The research evidence indicates that family income is more important during the early childhood years than at any other period for schooling outcomes (Mayer, 2002). The New Zealand Competent Children Project findings also highlight the huge influence of family income, education, and occupation on their children's outcomes (Wylie, Thompson & Kerlake-Hendricks, 1996). Demographic details taken from the list of former pupils identified the group as predominantly middle to upper socio-economic, two parent, two children families. This was backed up by a study done by Brooks (1992, p. 13), where she found the respondents from the case study centre had high levels of income, employment and post secondary level education. Moreover, it is also difficult to rule out the influence of parental motivation, in that Montessori early childhood centres may attract families who are particularly committed to and involved with education.

Chapter Summary

Several themes emerging from the case study and survey data support the argument that informal networks were vital for the spreading of the Montessori system of education. The majority of parents found out about Montessori through word of mouth by the recommendation of their friends, acquaintances or family. This was similar to Chisnall's (2002) findings when she sent a questionnaire to three Montessori centres around New Zealand. Moreover, like

Simon and Simon (1986), I found that many parents had limited relevant information/concrete examples to draw on when selecting a centre for their children. Hence, a strong emphasis on community publicity was a necessary aspect to attract parental support and student enrolments to the centre, as illustrated in Chapter 5.

People made the decision to become Montessori teachers for a variety of reasons. For the majority of the survey respondents, 71 percent [N=27], though it was Montessori's philosophy of education that attracted them to make the decision.

The next chapter further explores the ways in which the original ideas of Montessori have been reworked to suit a different historical and social context and what this looks like in practice, in the context of the case study centre.

Chapter 7

Te Whāriki and Its Impact on Montessori

Introduction

In the previous chapters I illustrated the ways in which the original ideas of Montessori have been reworked to suit a different historical and social context. In this chapter I go on to examine how the underpinning theories of *Te Whāriki* impact upon the delivery of the Montessori programme through direct observation of the interactions between teachers and children in the classroom and the use of the Montessori materials. I also draw on responses from the survey undertaken by Montessori teachers along with the voices of expert teachers (see Chapter 1). In 1996, Prime Minister Jim Bolger launched *Te Whāriki*, the national early childhood curriculum. From August 1998 early childhood services, including Montessori, have been required to demonstrate that they are running their programmes according to the Principles, Strands and Goals, which are outlined in *Te Whāriki*. These were incorporated in the Ministry of Education's (1998b) document, *Quality in action: Te Mahi Whai Hua, Implementing the Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices in New Zealand Early Childhood Services* (DOPs). Correspondingly, this chapter begins with an overview of the development of *Te Whāriki* in the early childhood sector during the 1990s.

***Te Whāriki* – The Early Childhood Curriculum**

Te Whāriki (1996), the first national early childhood curriculum, was developed in the early 1990s. During its development, the early childhood sector was responding to submissions, policy changes, reviews, reforms, and constant revisions and alternations that were being directed from national and government policy (see Chapter 5). The idea of an early childhood curriculum began in the late 1980s, with a number of week-long in-service courses held at

Lopdell House in Auckland held by the Department of Education. Representatives were selected from the early childhood sector, including Montessori, to discuss and plan for the changes ahead (Chisnall, 2003b). The recommendations arising from these courses were significant influences in the *Te Whāriki* proposal document (May, 2001).

In 1991 the contract to co-ordinate the development of the early childhood curriculum was given to the Early Childhood Curriculum Project, under the co-direction of Margaret Carr and Helen May. The project was briefed to “embrace a diverse range of early childhood services [including Montessori] and cultural perspectives; articulate a philosophy of quality early childhood practice; and make connections with a new national curriculum for schools” (May, 2001, pp. 243-244).

As part of the emerging National Curriculum Framework for the primary sector, the Ministry of Education supported the development of a national early childhood curriculum for children from birth to five years. Government had always been interested in compulsory school curricula but this was a new step in the pre-compulsory sector (Middleton & May, 1997). Early childhood services each had their own approach, including Montessori, and curriculum was a term infrequently used. Understandably early childhood organisations, including the Montessori Association of New Zealand (MANZ), were cautious in their reaction to a national curriculum, as it was felt this would impact on both their independence and the essence of their diversity (Carr & May, 2000). Accordingly, MANZ joined the Federation Early Childhood Education Organisations NZ Inc (FECEO), along with several other organisations including Barnardos and Rudolf Steiner, to co-ordinate opinion of the Early Childhood Sector and present a strong voice to government (Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc., 1991).

Carr and May (1993, 1996) were also concerned that the proposed national curriculum for schools would encourage more systematic assessment in early childhood. The development of *Te Whāriki* was in response to this concern as much as to promote and define an early childhood curriculum at a national level.

The curriculum development exercise included a fourteen-month consultative process with all the services and organisations in the early childhood sector. Murrow (1995) noted that this resulted in widespread support from teachers, even when in its draft form. As May (2001, pp. 244-245) explained, it was important to the writers that the curriculum reflected the “Treaty partnership of Maori and Pakeha as a bicultural document model grounded in the contexts of Aotearoa-New Zealand”. The writers found this a challenge, as there were no previous models for guidance. With the collaboration, however, of Te Kohanga Reo National Trust and Tamati and Tilly Reedy, who presented a Maori curriculum framework based on the principle of empowerment, a set of draft principles and aims were produced at the end of 1991. This concept of empowerment was important for Maori, and “‘empowering children to learn and grow’ became a foundation principle” (May, 2001, p. 245). Carr and May (2000) further explain that a set of aims for children, later renamed Strands, were developed in both Maori and English but not as translations. The parallel domains for both Pakeha and Maori included:

Mana Atua	Well-being
Mana Whenua	Belonging
Mana Tangata	Contribution
Mana Reo	Communication
Mana Aoturoa	Exploration

Goals for learning were given for each aim and these outlined the implications for infants, toddlers and young children. One of the tasks the curriculum project set out to do was demonstrate a “continuity of learning, caring, and

development (i.e. curriculum)" for this age group, but it was important to ensure that within these common goals, the arrangement of the curriculum guidelines could "articulate the distinctiveness of different developmental stages as well as different philosophical approaches [such as Montessori] to meeting those needs" (May, 1991, p. 7 cited in Te One, 2003, p.31) [Helen May's personal *Te Whāriki* archive]. The draft was a radical approach to early childhood curriculum, and became a focus of interest for early childhood practitioners in many countries (Carr, 1998).

According to May (2001, p. 245) the document's final title, *Te Whāriki*:

...suggested by Tamati Reedy, was a central metaphor. The early childhood curriculum was envisaged as a *whāriki*, translated as a woven mat for all to stand on. The Principles, Strands and Goals provided the framework which allowed for different programme perspectives [including Montessori] to be woven into the fabric.

The central expectation inherent in *Te Whāriki* is that each service will articulate their curriculum in a conscious, culturally-situated manner, through the process of talking, reflecting, planning, evaluation and assessment. This view of curriculum as "distinctive patterns" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 11), differed from the more traditional views of curriculum, which provides a set of prescribed aims and content (Nuttall, 2003b). However, as Flear (2003) maintains, a curriculum with many perspectives presents a danger that early childhood professionals will respond in ways unanticipated by the writers of *Te Whāriki*. She suggests that teachers might think that *Te Whāriki* is what they already do hence there is no need to reflect on their practice or to change what they do. When teachers from around New Zealand were surveyed in 1999 and asked how *Te Whāriki* had impacted upon their programme, some of their responses demonstrate this:

Respondent #27

Only as far as knowing how the Montessori programme fits into *Te Whāriki*.

Respondent #30

Its made a lot more paper work – its nothing new, its stuff we are already doing and aware of.

Respondent #34

From a personal perspective *Te Whāriki* is a reworded definition of the [Montessori] curriculum. Whilst we don't work directly with it we have spent time showing how we meet the goals during staff meetings.

These comments support Cullen's (1996, p. 18) concern that "the guidelines will be interpreted on the basis of existing philosophies and practices with an "overlay" of the new terminology".

The writers of the curriculum document merged developmental and socio-cultural theory, acknowledging a debt to Piaget and Erikson, as their theories had been heavily influential in earlier curriculum practice, which stressed learning through play. May (2001) states that *Te Whāriki* was also underpinned by the theories of Urie Bronfenbrenner and Lev Vygotsky, thereby placing the learning experiences of children within a broader social and cultural context. According to May (2001, p. 246), the contributions of Vygotsky and Jerome Bruner highlighted "a more active role for the teacher, whose task was to 'scaffold' children towards more complex thinking". However, Cullen (1996) suggested that there were tensions between the developmental and socio-cultural appropriateness inherent in *Te Whāriki's* philosophy. Further, Cullen was concerned that the professional development contracts were run by educators who were unfamiliar with the theoretical underpinnings of the document. For Cullen the issue of training was crucial. She stated that "for the busy practitioner, implementation of *Te Whāriki* is likely to be constrained by a superficial understanding of its rationale and implication for practice" (1996, p. 18). By 2000 Cullen (2003, p. 272) was more confident concerning the abilities of practitioners to "cope with the complex theories underpinning *Te Whāriki*, in view of the evolving research culture associated with growth in postgraduate

study, and the emergence of journals aimed at practitioners and researchers in early childhood education”.

The curriculum document views children as active participants in their own learning, and able to develop their own “working theories about themselves and about the people, places and things in their lives” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 44). It is acknowledged in *Te Whāriki* that children bring valuable experiences to the early childhood setting. Accordingly, the aim of early childhood education is to allow children to fully express these capabilities, in order “to grow up as competent and confident learners and communicators, healthy in mind, body and spirit, secure in their sense of belonging and in the knowledge that they make a valued contribution to society” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 9). Carr and May (2000) point out that curriculum development such as *Te Whāriki* sits within the wider political and educational contexts for achieving high quality experiences for children. Issues such as funding, regulations, accountability and training issues affect this. When the early childhood curriculum was developed it was assumed that early childhood centres would have adequate funding and qualified staff to ensure quality programmes. By 2000 they were able to report that the majority of early childhood centres are now using *Te Whāriki*, “albeit with some variety of interest, interpretation and insight” (Carr & May, 2000, p. 68). The following section explores how Montessori teachers are using the early childhood national curriculum.

Montessori Teachers’ Response to *Te Whāriki*

Teachers were surveyed around New Zealand to gauge how the implementation of *Te Whāriki* has impacted upon their programme (see Chapter 1). Although the responses were varied there was acknowledgement that the ideals of *Te Whāriki* have been looked at and interpreted on the basis of Montessori philosophy and practice. The following responses illustrate this:

Respondent # 10

It has contributed to a lot of brain storming, discussion and an awareness of what our materials and curriculum contributes. I feel that Montessori and *Te Whāriki* go hand-in-hand, although proving it to the Ministry definitely increases one's work load.

Respondent #28

Mostly in terms of the importance of "family and relationships" - incorporating and making family/whānau welcome and comfortable in the centre. Also the concept of exploration is one I think about and support more since *Te Whāriki*. (But note: Exploration as one of the key human tendencies - M [Montessori]). Also changes in programme planning and documenting and relating to parents in different ways, e.g. information about the child.

Respondent #31

Our charter is written using the principles and strands of *Te Whāriki* which is an easy document to get the grip of. We appraise our programme every Friday at our staff meeting and plan strategies for improvement.

In 2002 experienced teachers were invited to comment on the above and they all felt this reflected what is currently happening in Montessori programmes in regard to the early childhood curriculum document, *Te Whāriki*. In particular, *Experienced Teacher #1* stated:

Yes - I believe it is. What helped for our school was to link each of the materials in our environment with the strands and goals of *Te Whāriki*.

The findings of the report by the Education Review Office (ERO) (2002), based on Accountability Reviews or Assurance Audits carried out at 91 Montessori early childhood centres between January 1997 and June 2001, notes that while there is no requirement for early childhood centres to implement *Te Whāriki* directly, centres which meet the requirements of DOPs 4 and 5 need to be consistent with *Te Whāriki*. In particular, the goals of *Te Whāriki*'s five strands (Well-being, Belonging, Contribution, Communication and Exploration) make up DOP 5, points (a) to (e) (Ministry of Education, 1998b, p. 40). Therefore, Montessori early childhood centres are expected to identify the links between

Te Whāriki and their curriculum and to illustrate that their curriculum is consistent with *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1998b, p. 40).

The ERO (2002) reported that some Montessori early childhood centres, working in co-operation with Montessori Association of New Zealand have made excellent headway in linking their curriculum to the requirements of *Te Whāriki*. Thirty-eight percent of the Montessori centres, however, did not have effective programme planning. This was due to “lack of clear understanding of *Te Whāriki* and methods of planning to achieve the learning outcomes outlined in *Te Whāriki*” (ERO, 2002, p. 4). Interestingly, the percentage of Montessori centres demonstrating a lack of planning is comparable to the percentage found for all education and care centres (Education Review Office, 2000). Despite these limitations, ERO found that 89 percent of the Montessori centres were able to demonstrate effective delivery of their planned programmes. This was marginally better than the percentage for all education and care centres (Education Review Office, 2002).

The report highlighted problems related to the procedures for monitoring and evaluating quality of the programme in 57 percent of the Montessori centres. In many cases this was the result of limited understanding of how the Montessori curriculum can be linked with *Te Whāriki*. ERO noted that centres were evaluating the presentation and use of the Montessori materials but not the learning outcomes (Education Review Office, 2002).

The Impact of Quality in Action on Montessori Centres

As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, from August 1998 early childhood services, including Montessori, have been required to demonstrate that they are running their programmes according to the Principles, Strands and Goals, which are outlined in *Te Whāriki*. Montessori teachers were surveyed to find out how Quality in Action, the Revised Statement of Desirable

Objectives and Practices (DOPs) had impacted upon their programme. For 63 percent [N=24] of the Montessori schools DOPs has had a positive impact, which is demonstrated by the following comments:

Respondent #28

A bit early to say although I am working on re-writing our Strategic Plan and Management Plan to incorporate the new DOPs. The requirement for educators to keep abreast of current theory etc. is one I am please about and certainly feel as staff take new course we can look critically at the Montessori programme...but usually discover that there are links in all the current thinking back to Montessori's amazing mind! E.g. scaffolding, dispositions, even the current reading debate!

Respondent # 29

We have looked at our policies and procedures, reviewed them and we ensure that we work within these procedures. It has made us more aware of our obligations to children/family.

For 36 percent [N=14] of the respondents they felt that DOPs has not had an effect on their programme except to increase their workload in terms of administration, for example paper work.

Respondent #4

Too much paper work for management. I rarely look at Charter except when ERO come and visit.

Respondent #9

It hasn't. It's just a matter of writing down what we do and/or actually thinking about we do enough to be able to describe it.

Respondent #15

Stayed the same - encompassed all but keep more child development records.

Respondent #31

Not a lot. Our Charter has been written using *Te Whāriki* as the guideline but as Montessori education is all encompassing with the curriculums as we teach it, we cover our DOPs and statements of Quality in Action. This has also been highlighted in our ERO reports.

The expert group was asked for any comments concerning the above statements. *Experienced Teacher #1* noted that:

Incorporating D.O.P's into our charter was a HUGE amount of work. I am delighted with our finished result as we aimed to fully incorporate the M. philosophy through out each of the D.O.P.s. I haven't pursued Q. in A. [Quality in Action] yet but really like the idea of self-review. Speaking personally I believe we committed Montessorians self-review an awful lot, we incorporate *Te Whāriki* (it 'fits' beautifully with Montessori) but we don't have it all documented as the Ministry require. Though if a school accepts funding – these are the requirements.

Experienced Teacher #5 stated:

It is good practice to put your plan/goals/objectives in writing – then get on with it. Reviews are good each year or so to check to make sure new staff, etc. are aware of all policies, plans, procedures, etc.

According to Nuttall (2003b, p. 180) teachers can only negotiate their role in relation to the constraints and possibilities of their own definition of curriculum. In view of other New Zealand research (Jordan, 2003; Lidington, 2000) which indicates that on-going rather than one off professional development is necessary to effect changes in teachers' practice, it is likely that on-going professional development could assist teachers to implement the curriculum document.

In the previous chapter the surveyed teachers were asked to comment on how successful the Montessori programme has been for preparing children for the compulsory primary sector. Respondents were also asked which of the curriculum areas (Practical Life, Sensorial, Language, Math, Cultural Subjects and Art) were the most important for assisting with this goal. Ninety-two percent [N=35] of the respondents supported all curriculum areas as being important, as exemplified by the following:

Respondent #5

For an adequate preparation all areas are important as long as they are balanced in time and importance. An emphasis on

anyone in particular would be inadequate for life preparation as well as state school preparation!

Respondent #18

All – its all interrelated and you cannot determine which area has the greatest influence for each individual child. Some need preparation in practical routines and actions, while others need more emphasis on language/math, etc. – none of it is irrelevant and all of it contributes to the child and the person they become.

A small minority, 8 percent [N=3], did outline which curriculum areas they thought were the most important. For *Respondent #8* it was the language area, where she highlighted the need to “integrate the phonetic approach with the ‘Look and Read’ of state primary so that child is not having to re-learn an approach”.

When asked if they thought the above responses reflect current practice in Montessori early childhood programmes, four of the five experts stated in the affirmative. *Experienced Teacher #1* noted that this was:

A hard one to answer. Should our main goal not be preparing them for life & for this, in my opinion is Practical Life, practical life & practical life – all other ‘skills’ flow from the above foundation. Though to answer your statement – prep. for State Primary school – children need to be able to sit on their bottoms, comply with instructions and read. I see many M. [Montessori] schools pushing reading either to comply with parent wishes or to prepare for school. I have been guilty also on occasion but it still goes against the grain of my understanding of the Montessori philosophy – follow the child.

These two examples illustrate how aspects of Montessori’s method have been adapted and modified in response to parental expectations, particularly in regard to preparing children to read before entering primary school.

Commenting on which of the curriculum areas they felt were the least important, and why, the majority of the respondents, 70 percent [N=27], could

not single out one area. They instead reiterated that all areas are important, as illustrated by the following:

Respondent #7

Each area is important as the others as they balance each other and together provide the basis for an holistic education which caters for the needs of all children.

Twenty percent [N=8] of the respondents singled out Culture and Art curriculum areas as being the least important. For instance:

Respondent #2

Possibly cultural and art. Most state primary schools provide opportunities for developing knowledge in these areas, however not to the depth of a Montessori school.

Respondent #18

Probably the cultural subjects as the children never (in my experience) get to utilise Montessori information and learning in State schools (or private Primary schools either).

The remaining respondents, 8 percent [N=3], questioned the use of the advanced literacy and math materials in an early childhood centre. For example, *Respondent #34* stated "whilst I greatly value the importance of language and maths I feel too much emphasis is placed on them both in M [Montessori] schools and primary".

When asked if these responses were in line with what they think is presently occurring in Montessori schools in New Zealand the five experienced teachers differed in their opinions as is indicated below:

Experienced Teacher #1

Yes I believe it is. Many Montessori schools (by their own admission) do not put as much emphasis on the cultural areas. I feel they are 'pivotal' to working towards a peaceful & harmonious community.

Experienced Teacher #2

The Art & Cultural curriculum is ingrained in all aspects of the classroom so its often hard to see it happening, unlike the other areas that's materials sit on the shelves.

Experienced Teacher #3

Not really. I agree that all areas are important as children have a desire to know about the world and everything in it. However, I feel that people who suggested that culture & art were least important perhaps aren't aware of a primary school curriculum which involves both of these areas in some depth.

Experienced teacher #4 was brief and to the point. "I hope not. Culture is very important". Finally, *Experienced teacher #5* felt:

Sad about this and don't agree with it but - yes, I feel art & cultural subjects aren't given the same value as say, maths & language - didn't Montessori believe world peace could come about only from children being educated on others? Also - it is sad that children don't always have the opportunity to express their emotions through art.

The Education Review Office (ERO) (2002) in their report were in agreement with Experts #1 and #5. In regard to curriculum, the report found that 41 percent of the centres highlighted the development of literacy and numeracy skills (ERO, 2002, p. 3).

Two main areas of concern were highlighted by the report, which were the provision for the development of gross muscle skills and fostering of creativity, self expression and dramatic play. The report also noted that the development of creativity in a Montessori setting differs from the mainstream view. This resulted in some centres not meeting the requirements of Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (DOP 5(d)) where centres "plan, implement and evaluate curriculum for children in which:...children discover and develop different ways to be creative and expressive"(Ministry of Education, 1998b, p. 47). The report did, however, note that "some Montessori educators argue that the use of Montessori materials, while not fitting with normal models of "free expression", fits with the creative interests of young children and helps them to gain control of drawing implement" (ERO, 2002, p. 4).

Montessori early childhood centres are able to demonstrate that they are running their programmes according to the Principles, Strands and Goals set down in *Te Whāriki*. However, as indicated by the ERO (2002) some Montessori teachers have limited understanding of how the Montessori curriculum can be linked with *Te Whāriki*. This suggests that the successful implementation of the early childhood curriculum document is dependent on on-going professional development, a factor illustrated in the following section.

Professional Development

When *Te Whāriki* was introduced the Ministry of Education funded professional development to support the early childhood sector. According to Carr, Hatherly, Lee and Ramsey (2003) assessment practices have now been included in these, particularly since the mandating of assessment principles in the Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (DOPs) released in 1998. Prior to undertaking the observations in the classroom I attended three professional development workshops for the Montessori teachers in this case study. These were held during June, August and October in 1998, and were run by Eve Reilly, Executive Officer of the National Montessori Association (MANZ). Funded by the Ministry of Education, Montessori schools were able to contract Reilly, an experienced Montessori teacher. The majority of the teachers had limited knowledge of *Te Whāriki* and DOPs.

One of the workshops was on how *Te Whāriki* and the Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (DOPs) could be effectively incorporated into the Montessori philosophy and curriculum. Reilly explained that it was not necessary to break down the curriculum to meet the individual goals of *Te Whāriki*, as this would take away the holistic curriculum approach to Montessori. The Montessori curriculum did not need to fit into *Te Whāriki* but the case study centre still needed to demonstrate that it was operating according to the four principles, five strands and eighteen goals outlined in the

curriculum document in order to receive funding from the Ministry. The curriculum is illustrated below but without the learning outcomes for each goal (Ministry of Education, 1996).

Guiding Principles

Whakamana The early childhood curriculum will empower the child to learn and grow	Kotahitanga The early childhood curriculum will reflect the holistic way children learn and grow	Whanāu Tangata The wider world of family, Whanāu and community is an integral part of the early childhood curriculum	Ngā Hononga Young children learn through responsive and reciprocal relationships with people, places and things
---	--	--	---

Aims for Children

Mana Atua	Well-being
Mana Whenua	Belonging
Mana Tangata	Contribution
Mana Reo	Communication
Mana Aoturoa	Exploration

Goals for learning and development

Well-being	Belonging	Contribution	Communication	Exploration
The health and well-being of the child is protected and nurtured	Children and families feel they belong here	Opportunities for learning are equitable and each child's contribution is valued	The languages and symbols of children's cultures are promoted and protected	The child learns through active exploration of the environment
Their health is promoted	Connecting links with the family and the wider world are affirmed and extended	There are equitable opportunities for learning irrespective of gender, disability, age, ethnicity or background	They develop non-verbal communication skills for a range of purposes	Play is valued as meaningful and spontaneous play is important
Their emotional well-being is nurtured	They know that they have a place here	They are affirmed as individuals	They develop verbal communication skills for a range of purposes	Confident in and control of one's body is developed
They are protected and safe from harm	They feel comfortable with the routines, rituals and	Opportunities to learn with	They experience the cultures'	They learn strategies for active

regular events	and alongside others are encouraged	stories and symbols	exploration
They know the limits and boundaries of acceptable behaviour		They discover different ways to be creative and expressive	They develop working theories for making sense of their living physical and material world

To illustrate how the Montessori programme fits in with *Te Whāriki*, the workshop discussed each of the curriculum areas and then linked them to the Strands and Goals. The Practical Life area is used here as an example to demonstrate how the process was undertaken. This area includes exercises such as care of self (dressing and washing hands), care of the environment (washing tables and dusting), control of movement (exercising fine and gross motor skills), and use of the social graces. Montessori referred to these as Motor Education (see Chapter 2). Each of the Strands and Goals were looked at to see if the self-help skills met the learning outcomes outlined in *Te Whāriki* and how. When there was agreement amongst the workshop participants that the learning outcomes were addressed by children doing Practical Life exercises these were noted down as a, b, c, and so forth.

PRACTICAL LIFE

Strand 1: Well-being

Goal 1

Children experience an environment where their health is promoted.

Learning outcomes: Children develop:

- a: increasing understanding of their bodies and how they function
- b: knowledge about how to keep themselves healthy
- c: self-help and self-care skills for eating, drinking, food preparation, toileting, resting, sleeping, washing, and dressing
- d: positive attitude towards eating, sleeping, and toileting

(Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 48)

Goal 2 a, b,c,d,e,f,g

Goal 3 a,b,c,d,e,f,g

Stand Two: Belonging

Goal 1 e,f

Goal 2 a,b,c,d,e

Goal 3 a,b,c,d

Goal 4 a,b,d,e,f

Strand Three: Contribution

Goal 1 a,b,c,e,g,h

Goal 2 b,c,d,e

Goal 3 a,b,d,e,g

Strand Four: Communication

Goal 1 a,d,e

Goal 2 b,h

Goal 3 -----

Goal 4 b,c,d

Strand Five: Exploration

Goal 1 a,b,c,d,e

Goal 2 a,b,c,

Goal 3 a,d

Goal 4 b,c,g,i,j

This exercise showed that the Montessori curriculum was consistent with *Te Whāriki*, thereby indicating to the teachers that what they were doing in practice was fine as they were meeting the learning outcomes. However, Te One (2003) found that for many teachers it was difficult to implement *Te Whāriki* in a way that did not just confirm their existing practice. In this regard Montessori teachers did not seem to differ from many mainstream early childhood teachers.

Along with exploring the other curriculum areas in a similar manner, the teacher's role was addressed. Prior to carrying out this exercise the teachers' role was brainstormed by the group. Comments included preparing the learning environment, promoting children's confidence, self-motivation and discipline, establish routines that meets their needs, demonstrate respect for people, the environment and culture, and so forth. One of the challenges of *Te Whāriki* is for teachers to reexamine their practice. According to Nuttall (2003b,

p. 163) “the socio-cultural, constructivist theoretical assumptions of *Te Whāriki* means that the way teachers negotiate their role, implementing such a curriculum, is itself part of the ‘weaving’ of life in the centre”. During the brainstorming session, the role of the teacher was discussed in relation to appropriate Montessori practice (see Chapter 2) and then linked to the Strands and Goals. All the learning outcomes were addressed except for the first two Goals in Well-being, as indicated by the following:

Strand 1: Well-being

Goal 1 a,b,c,d

Goal 2 a,b,c,d,e,f,g

Due to the lack of engagement with the actual curriculum document the end result was a limited understanding of how the Montessori curriculum could be linked with it, a fact noted by the ERO in their 2002 report. Centres were evaluating the presentation and use of the Montessori materials, which would also include the role to the teacher, but not the learning outcomes (Education Review Office, 2002).

The Case Study Montessori Programme

In Chapter 2 the physical environment of the ‘Children Houses’, including the actions of the teacher, were outlined. Three components of Montessori’s method for the age group 3 to 7-year-olds were discussed: motor education, sensory education and language education. As pointed out earlier, Montessori teacher training programmes now divide the curriculum into five basic areas: practical life, sensorial, language, math and culture. Materials not outlined in Montessori’s books are now an established part of a Montessori learning environment, referring to the modification of the philosophy to a different time and context.

Direct observations of the teachers and children in the case study were carried out during the morning session in two-week blocks, over four different periods

in the 1999 school year. Each observation was three hours long, giving a total of 120 hours observation. Along with investigating how the original ideas of Montessori have been reworked in New Zealand to suit a different historical and social context, I was interested in whether teachers' stated goals corresponded to the implementation of the programme goals.

The Learning Environment of the Case Study Centre

The Montessori early childhood setting where the observations were carried out was a purpose built school consisting of two classrooms. As mentioned in Chapter 5, the centre was parent owned and operated, run by a school council, similar to a primary school's Board of Trustees. Each classroom catered for 25 children in the morning session, which ran from 8:45 to 11:45. The same children attended the 5-day programme, with a mixed aged grouping of 3 to 5 year olds. Each classroom had two teachers. In the classroom where the observations took place, the head teacher was Montessori trained, with a St. Nicholas face-to-face qualification from London. Her assistant had a Nanny certificate and was currently doing the Aperfield correspondence course. Half way through the observation period the head teacher left, to return to England after three years at the centre. Her replacement had an Apperfield Montessori Diploma as well as an early childhood diploma of teaching.

The environment was designed to meet individual children's individual and cultural needs, interests and abilities. The teachers prepared the class in the mornings prior to the children's arrival, in relation to children's evolving strengths and interests, which was an on-going process. The choices provided are not static, and with the change over of head teachers the environment was re-arranged to meet the needs of both the teacher and the children. Montessori learning environments are not identical from one culture to another, and this is particularly noted in the Practical Life area. The centre also had a part-time person who ran the outdoor programme; again this was set up with Montessori

activities designed to meet the learning and developmental needs of the children.

Montessori felt that the learning environment needed to be aesthetically pleasing and well-ordered (1914/1965b). The classroom had a very good supply of Montessori materials, imported from overseas, which were organised into the different curriculum areas. The materials, displayed on low open shelves, were accessible to the children and arranged to follow a progression of difficulty. Material placed on the top shelf was the simplest for a child to complete, with the progression moving from left to right. Each area was set apart by some arrangement of the room, for example, placement of the shelves, changes in type of flooring, and so forth. Finally, the room was arranged in such a manner that the materials on the shelves can be taken out by the children and moved easily to a work area on a table or a mat. Montessori believed that a child's environment needed to be orderly, hence everything has a place and a function.

There were child-sized tables and chairs scattered throughout the room. The number of chairs was smaller than the number of children attending as many of the activities are done on a mat on the floor. On one part of the floor was an elliptical shape, about an inch wide, used for the Montessori exercise of walking on the line, a large motor activity that can be combined with music. It was also used for group time, although this is not strongly supported in written descriptions of the Montessori method.

As discussed in Chapter 2, we rely on Montessori's books and lectures for descriptions of her method, but we also need to look at the on-going classroom practices in a variety of cultural settings. Certain aspects have changed in response to new ideas on child development but these are mostly in relation to sequence or further development of the didactic materials, not a reexamination

of her fundamental pedagogical premises. In the next section each of the curriculum areas and how they are currently used is examined.

Teacher Records

The teachers recorded what exercises/materials the children have worked with during the day. This was done on a sheet of paper where both teachers wrote down, under the children's names, materials they had worked with throughout the morning. For example, one child was recorded as doing the life cycle of the frog, colour mixing, broad stairs, and the spindle boxes. Teachers filled this form in during the session or soon afterwards. Individual work records for each child were made up from this information.

Children's files contained observations done on the child, examples of work as well a list of the materials they had covered. This included ticking system where each material was ticked when presented to the child, another tick if he or she could do it competently, and what needed to be presented next. There was no specific links made to *Te Whāriki* in terms of learning outcomes. It was suggested at the professional development workshops held in 1998 that teachers could provide more in depth profiles for each child, including focusing on 2 or 3 children for a week. In depth profiles are also consistent with *Te Whāriki's* focus on children's interests (Jordan, 2003; 1999). All the teachers would be involved and goals would be discussed for each child. This would assist in the evaluation of the programme. There was no evidence of this being carried out during the observation period. The Ministry of Education (2003) found that teacher education and professional development, together with providing support for using curriculum resources was essential input for those teaching in the early childhood services. For instance, Carr, May and Podmore (1998) have produced a resource for helping teachers in carrying out child assessment.

Parent interviews are held once a year, or more often if requested. Parents' comments were also taken into consideration. The current research on children's learning and teaching highlights the importance of the partnership/relationship model of learning that builds on children's sharing meaning and shared experiences (Ministry of Education, 2003). This supports the necessity of effective links between the child's home and the early childhood centre. The children's records did not indicate where parents' voices were heard. Assessment such as teaching and learning stories allow for teachers and parents' voices to be heard (Podmore, May & Mara, 1998).

The Areas in a Montessori Centre

Practical Life

The practical life exercises include care of self, care of the environment, control of movement, and use of social graces. Montessori referred to these as motor education and she believed that a child's self-esteem could be promoted through allowing actual participation in the real, everyday activities necessary for the ongoing functioning of the group, which could include washing tables, washing dishes, preparing snacks and taking care of plants. All these exercises were part of the centre's learning environment.

The practical life area within different cultures does vary significantly, as these activities are pertinent to daily living in one's own culture. One exercise that Montessori included in her programme, for example, was the making of clay pots, which had as its aim the production of objects that were useful for society. This is no longer part of the recognised materials for this area. A piece of equipment still in use is the collection of wooden dressing frames, each with different materials attached to it such as buttons, zippers, buckles and so forth. The centre had a velcro dressing frame as many children wore shoes with velcro strips. This is an example of adapting the materials to suit a different historical and social context.

Montessori believed that when the teacher presented materials to the children, including the Practical Life area, words should be limited so as not to distract children from focusing on what they were to learn. Children were taught all movements through presentations such as how to pull out a chair, pick up and lay down objects, polish shoes, wash the tables, and set the table. Every exercise is broken down into a series of steps, which are carefully sequenced and with the direct purpose of assisting in the child's co-ordination, proficient and self-retrained movements. Throughout the observation of the practical life area there was little evidence of one-to-one interaction with the teachers, except when a child was being introduced to the material or they were doing it incorrectly. When presenting a Practical Life exercise the teacher did not converse/interact with the child, except for the bare minimum. This is evident in the following example.

Monday 29 May 1999

9:00am

The teacher encourages Zano to do a practical life exercise. Zano is four and a half years old and he speaks English as a second language. He chooses the carrot cutting exercise. He takes the tray, which contains everything he needs including a knife, one carrot, a cutting board and a glass bowl, to the nearest table. Zano places the tray on the table, organises the carrot on the board and tries to cut a piece of carrot. It flies in the air. The teacher notices and comes over to show him how to cut properly. First he cuts off the end and then cuts a piece to eat. The teacher again comes over to ask him to put the end pieces in the rubbish and to finish cutting up the carrot before eating it.

Zano continues to cut up the carrot and looks around. He states to Robert [4.3 years] sitting next to him, "I've got Tellituby custard today" [He stays for lunch]. Zano then begins playing with the knife. Robert does not reply but gets up and goes and gets a piece of carrot. Zano takes the carrot and balances the knife over the carrot like a sea saw, and says, "Carrot. Carrot". Robert replies, "Da, da, da". Zano then starts licking the knife. "You licked it," states Richard. Zano then has another piece of carrot and as does Robert. Once again Zano puts the knife in his mouth. "Would you like some more carrot?" asks Zano, and starts cutting the carrot, "Cut it". He then cuts a piece and tries to hand it to Robert. Robert points to the glass bowl where the piece is suppose to go.

Zano asks Robert if he would like "more carrot", and proceeds to cut another piece.

Suddenly other children start to gather around to get a piece of carrot. Sarah [4.3 years] asks Zano, "Are you my friend?" Another child, Claire [4.4 years] come over and stands very close to Zano. She, too, asks, "Are you my friend?" She then tried to take the knife from Zano and cut herself a piece of carrot. The teacher notices and comes over to ask Claire to leave as she is disturbing Zano's work. As the teacher walks away she notices that Zano has put the knife in his mouth. She kneels down beside him and stays until he finishes cutting the carrot to ensure he does not put it back into his mouth. Zano has trouble cutting the thicker part of the carrot. He appears to concentrate very hard, screwing up his face as he presses down on the carrot. When cut he places the carrot piece in the glass bowl.

9:10am

Zano then goes over to the art table to offer Mike [4 years] a piece. Mike says, "I am going to take two pieces". The bowl is empty. Zano puts his work away on the shelf where he got it.

This example, along with many others, illustrated how children were encouraged to complete what they were doing. Zano, like many of the older children, tended to engage socially with others as they did activities. Moreover, like Zano, many of the children chose to do practical life exercises first when they arrived at the centre, before going on to the more difficult work. This may provide an opportunity to think about what they might like to do next.

Many of the observations undertaken in the practical life area revealed much fantasy play linked to what the children were doing, as illustrated in the next example:

Monday 30 August 1999

10:47 am

Two children, John [4.3 years] and Mike [4.4 years] are sitting at the morning tea table.

Mike: I'm thirsty. John, want a coffee?

John: Yes.

Mike: (Fills up John's cup with water, right to the very top.)
Drink it quickly so it doesn't get cold.

According to Chattin-McNichols (1992b) research carried out by Torrence in 1988 found that 97 percent of Montessori early childhood centres reported they had fantasy play happening. It appears to happen much more often in the practical life and sensorial areas.

Practical life exercises are seen as the foundation for the rest of the curriculum areas. They are the primary focus for the child's first year. Children are introduced to the other areas during this time but practical life exercises are the basis. It was important, therefore, that children were encouraged to use them everyday. To draw the children to the materials the teachers needed to change them constantly. The practical life activities were done equally by both genders

Sensorial Education

The sensorial area of the learning environment offers children experiences in refining their senses. Montessori believed that the education of the senses was the basis of intellectual development. They were designed to develop children's increasingly refined ability to differentiate qualities of size, shape, texture, colour, and so forth. The sensorial materials are carefully sequenced to allow children to move from one material to the next with distinctions of size, shape, and so on becoming finer and finer. An example to illustrate this is the colour tablets. Their purpose is to isolate one colour at a time. The first box contains six tablets - two red, two blue and two yellow. When first presented to children they pair them and learn the corresponding names. To increase the difficulty, another box contains both primary and secondary colours, which again the child matches. The tablets are all the same size, shape and texture with the only difference being the colours.

As Chattin-McNichols (1992a) states, it is important to clear up the mistaken notion that none of the Montessori material is open-ended, that all have only one right way to be used. It is certainly true that each Montessori teacher learns a limited set of particular presentations for each of the didactic materials. It is also the case the children are typically required to have the teacher's short lesson on the use of a material before they are free to take it from the shelf to work with it. Teachers, too, do intervene when materials are used destructively. Nonetheless, it is not the case that children are prohibited from experimenting with the materials. Over the period of the observation there was a large amount of experimentation and exploration with the materials. This occurred after the materials had been presented in the manner outlined by Montessori. An example to illustrate is as follows:

Monday 22 November 1999

9:00am

Three children, Harry [4.7], Mike [4.6] and Sam [4.9] have got out mats ready to do the Red Rods, the Broad Stair, Pink Tower and the four boxes of Knobless Cylinders.

Sam: Let's play that game, that police game.

Harry: No.

Sam: Remember that police game?

Harry: Yea.

[Throughout the observations at the centre these three children have made up imaginary games with all the materials. Today they are pretending the mats are water and the Broad Stairs are boats. They use the Knobless Cylinders as sirens. They begin to argue about who should have the cylinders.]

Harry: Just argue about it when I'm gone. (He was going to go but decides to stay).

Mike: I want those cylinders.

Harry: Let's just keep on with our game.

9:15

The argument has been solved and they begin to play together again. This time, at Sam's suggestion, they play 'goodies and baddies'. The cylinders are used as people.

Sam: Look at how much people I have got.

Harry: Look at all my people.

Mike: (Pushed a piece of the Broad Stair towards Sam) Oh here's a Broad Stair.

Sam: Okay guys, let's make the stairs move. Oh yeah, we are not making boats, we are making stairs.
Harry starts building the Broad Stair.
Sam: No Harry. That's not what we are making.
Harry continues to build the Broad Stair.
Sam: No Harry. Repeats this over and over again until Harry gives in.
Harry: Okay, what do we have to do?
Sam: We has to make nearly all the Broad Stair with a hole in the middle.
Sam and Harry begin to make the Broad Stair with a hole in it. They then roll the Knobless Cylinders in the hole they created.
Mike: We need some to be the police.

The three boys continue to experiment with these materials until almost 11:00. Only once did they use the materials in the way that Montessori suggested when redirected by the teacher at 10:30 to do so. The centre encouraged open-ended exploration.

This emphasis on exploration is not something that Montessori encouraged in her writings. Furthermore, many of the Montessori teacher-training programmes are quite strict in the ways in which materials were to be presented and used. The amount of free exploration being fostered is an area that needs further investigation, particularly in regards to the constant criticism that Montessori centres stifle children's creativity.

More free play/exploration was encouraged after the change over of head teacher. One can only speculate that the New Zealand early childhood ethos of free play/exploration could contribute to this. Gin, the head teacher, was a trained kindergarten teacher prior to doing her Montessori training.

Language Education

As pointed out by the Education Review Office (ERO) (2002), Montessori centres have a strong focus in the areas of language and numeracy. From its early beginnings Montessori education has been known for its method of

teaching writing and reading to young children with relative ease, and Montessori presented learning to write and read as an extension of sensory education (see Chapter 2). The preparatory activities for reading and writing are incorporated within the practical life and sensorial materials. Some of the practical life exercises and all the sensorial materials observed in the centre were used by Montessori in her 'Children's Houses'. These help develop the fine motor and perceptual skills needed for writing and reading.

Montessori created specially developed didactic materials to assist with reading and writing. Still used today are metal insets, where children trace outlines and the insides of geometric figures, using coloured pencils. I noted that these were not well used in the classroom. One can only speculate that children may have similar activities in their home environment so they are not as appealing to them. Sandpaper Letters are another well known Montessori didactic material. Children trace the sandpaper using their fingers and counter-clockwise motions. Montessori believed that this would fix the visual image of the letters in the child's muscular memory. Using a phonetic approach, children are given the sounds of the letters as they trace the letters. The sandpaper letters were used everyday that I observed, and one example is as follows:

Friday 28 May, 1999

9:10am

The teacher is doing the sandpaper letters with Joe [4.2]. First the teacher goes through Joe's letters [each child has a card with the letters that they have been presented]. He seems to be having a problem identifying the sounds. The teacher presents these letters again to Joe. First she places the letter in front of Joe and made the sound, while tracing it. The teacher reinforces each sound by asking Joe to say it. After tracing three letters, she asks him to do the next stage, either the sandbox or trace the letters on the chalk board. Joe chooses to use the later. First, the teacher traces the 'o' and shows Joe how to draw it, then erased the letter. She invites Joe to do this but he has a bit of trouble. The teacher shows him again but this time leave the 'o' on the blackboard. Once Joe traces this they move on to the next letter. When they finish writing his name, Joe asks, "What is that?" The teacher explains, "It is your name. See all the letters. They are in your name. Would you like

to write your name? Well done!" When Joe had finished his name another child took his place, as he did not want to do it again.

This example illustrates another of Montessori's beliefs that children's explosion into writing occurs before they learn to read. The movable alphabet is also used to assist children to write. Children are introduced to it when they have learnt a number of sandpaper letters. Again, this was an activity that was not used often. It can be awkward for a younger child to get off the shelf and the whole exercise can be very time consuming both for the child and when presenting it to the child for the first time. Using the sand tray and chalk board may have been one way the teachers addressed this problem.

There were many other language activities to extend the children observed throughout my time at the centre. When the children arrive they were encouraged to pick out their name, which is laid out on a table near the door. This assists them to learn to recognise their name. Lots of stories were read in the library corner and a story was always read during mat time. Many of the language materials in the classroom had been developed since Montessori's death. Once again this demonstrates how the Montessori method has been adapted and modified, but only in relation to the materials not the philosophy.

Mathematics

Like language, writing, reading and arithmetic are considered later developments, which naturally follow the child's education of the senses, around the age of four. Montessori borrowed many of the concepts and materials on which she based her materials, but her formulation and use of them led to the creation of materials that allow children to move from the concrete to abstract concepts with relative ease. There is an extensive collection of materials that make up this area but as most of the children in the centre left at age five the centre only had the basic ones.

When children are first introduced to the math materials they are shown the number rods, which consist of red and blue rods representing the quantities one through ten. The teacher assists the child to count the alternating red and blue sections of each rod as they are arranged in stair-like formation. The smallest rod is one, the next rod is two, and so forth. The number two rod is a unit and yet it is equal to two of the one rod. To following illustrates this.

Tuesday 7 December 1999

10:27 am

Carl [3.7] approaches the teacher and she asks him what he wants to do. The child points to the number rods. The teacher tells him "Okay, go and get a mat". The child gets out a mat and brings the number rods, one at a time to the mat. Meanwhile the teacher sits down by the mat. When all the rods on the mat the teacher asks Carl "Which one is the longest?" Carl points to the largest. The teacher then places this at the top of the mat starting on the left hand side. "Which is the next longest?" Carl points and is correct. The teacher places this underneath the longest rod and ensures that they are aligned on the left-hand side. This continues until it is build like a stair. Then the teacher brings down the smallest rod and counts "1". She next brings down the two rod and counts it by placing two fingers on each of the segments and counts aloud while doing so. When she reaches number 10 she invites Carl to count with her. When they finish counting together, the teacher brings down the first three rods and proceeds to reinforce the first three numbers. Carl is losing interest, stating "I want to put it away". Starting with the 10 rod he carries the first four separately.

10:44

After putting four rods back on the shelf Carl goes outside for a few minutes. He comes back inside but does not return to the mat. The teacher reminds him to put the rest of the rods away, which he proceeds to do so.

When children are able to understand the concept of numbers, especially the one to nine and zero, it is a simple extension to expand their learning to the decimal system. The concept of operations, such as addition, subtraction, multiplication and division, are carried out with concrete materials - 1 to 9 of units, 1 to 9 of tens, 1 to 9 of hundreds, and so on. Children are able to easily make exchanges, for instance, ten ones are the same as one ten.

The math materials that were designed by Montessori have not been adapted or modified in this centre. Other materials had been added to this curriculum area that are non-Montessori, and this is now common practice for most Montessori centres.

Cultural Area

The cultural materials are integrated within the five curriculum areas. This includes people and their cultures and beliefs, music, art, science, history, cooking, botany and geography. In New Zealand centres need to represent Māori and other cultures within their centre. For instance, within the centre there were puzzles based on Maori themes, te reo Māori nomenclature activities language activities and they had a parent who was a fluent Māori speaker who came into the class once a week to teach the children. The parent was doing her Montessori training by correspondence so she had a good understanding of the Montessori philosophy [Interviewee #3]. In mainstream centres there is an increased expectation on teachers to use both English and Māori in their interactions and work with children, parents and whānau. It was noticeable that the staff did not use te reo Māori but they did sing some Māori songs.

Recognised Montessori cultural materials such as the sandpaper globe and the puzzle maps of the world were in the classroom. Agents for Montessori equipment now make puzzle maps of New Zealand but there is still a big emphasis on Montessori teachers that the children's culture is evident in the learning environment.

Discussion

There is congruence between Montessori's writings and the curriculum and materials observed the case study centre. As previously noted, teacher education programmes now divide the curriculum into five areas. Materials

that are not present in her books are now part of the Montessori learning environments. Many were developed after her death. Nonetheless, much of what Montessori describes in her books can be seen in the centre. The 'root' materials including the Sandpaper Letters, the Pink Tower, and the Moveable Alphabet are still present. In relation to Montessori's didactic materials, however, there has been some adapting and modification, which has occurred due to cultural, historical and social contexts. The extensive exploration of the sensorial materials is something that was not present in the 1980s in New Zealand and it certainly was not evident in Montessori's writings. I found, too, that some of the materials such as the Metal Insets and the Moveable Alphabet were not frequently used. I only noted on a couple of occasions where the children made use of these.

In the previous chapter I reported that one of the surveyed teachers had replaced the Sandpaper Letters [*Respondent #23*]. According to Chatten-McNichols (1992a, p. 21), an former A.M.I. trainer, the "best Montessori schools and teacher education programs remain true to Montessori's empirical traditions; they are constantly making small changes and adjustments and carefully observing children's reactions". As previously argued, though, these are related to the sequence or further development of the materials, not a reexamination of her fundamental pedagogical premises [see Chapter 2]. The observations undertaken indicated that these changes occurred with the introduction and use of the materials, reflecting the training the teachers undertook. One of the teachers had obtained her Montessori qualification from Goldsbrough's Aperfield distance course, which was written for New Zealand teachers. However, they were in accordance with and an understanding of the teachers' understanding of Montessori's philosophy [*Interviewee #21, 22*].

Current research suggests that children's interests alone are not sufficient for either extending their learning or for teachers' planning (Ministry of Education, 2003). It might be time, therefore, to reconsider some of the teaching practices

that Montessori emphasised such as the observational approach to her work (1912/1964). As Neubert (1992) notes, it might be more natural for Montessori teachers to take a more active role rather than standing back and observing.

Chapter Summary

The observations showed that cultural adaptation of the curricular content did occur, such as the encouragement of exploration with the sensorial materials. The teaching of Montessori's ideas in a New Zealand cultural setting has resulted in a modification to Montessori's dogmatic presentation of materials in a cultural-free manner.

The national early childhood curriculum, *Te Whāriki*, has allowed for different programme perspectives including Montessori. From August 1998 Montessori teachers have been required to demonstrate that they are running their programmes according to the Principles, Strands and Goals outlined in *Te Whāriki*. The ERO (2002, p. 4) reported that 38 percent of Montessori teachers do not have a good understanding of the curriculum document and "methods of planning to achieve the learning outcomes". In order for the teachers to gain a more in depth understanding on-going professional develop will be necessary. This is important as the *Best Evidence Synthesis* found that the most effective programmes are characterised by a high level of teacher input into the planning process as well as initiating and being involved in children's activities (Ministry of Education, 2003).

Chapter 8

Montessori in Change: Towards a Theory of Cultural Adaptation

Introduction

In this thesis I examined the historical evolution and contemporary status of Montessori schooling in New Zealand, as an example of the adaptation of an alternative educational ideal to a particular national context. The research questions in Chapter 1 structured three strands to this investigation. Firstly, Montessori's life and the initial Montessori movement, and her method were discussed. The circumstances that supported the rapid interest in and the dissemination of her ideas were presented along with the reasons for the rapid decline of the Montessori movement. Secondly, the initial introduction of Montessori's method and the subsequent re-emergence of Montessori education in New Zealand was explored. When it was first implemented in this country Montessori's philosophies were modified and adopted mainly in the infant schools. The re-introduction of Montessori's ideas in the mid-1970s saw it embraced in the early childhood sector as an alternative to existing programmes. A third strand involved a case study of one Montessori early childhood centre, investigating how the policies and practices of the parent run committee supported the delivery of an educational programme in accordance with Montessori's philosophy. The perceptions of Montessori teachers, parents and former pupils were highlighted here. How original ideas of Montessori have been reworked to suit a different historical and social context were examined through the direct observation of teachers and children in the case study centre.

The history of Montessori's ideas demonstrate that the opportunity to apply her methods to 'normal' developing children emerged due to changing social

circumstances throughout Italy. An awareness of these circumstances highlighted not only the context of Montessori's achievement but illuminated the missionary zeal associated with the movement. Montessori stated that she was both a scientific educator and a missionary, two roles that have contradictory characteristics. Nonetheless I argue that the endurance of Montessori's method can be explained by such apparent contradictions. Montessori's messianic zeal and fervor, along with her conviction that her curriculum was complete as it was based on scientific results, helps explain the endurance of her model. How the original ideas of Montessori have been reworked to suit different historical and social contexts, including Australia and New Zealand was examined. I argued that Montessori is a global educator whose philosophy and pedagogy transcends national boundaries. Nonetheless, the integration of Montessori education within any country does result in a culturally specific Montessori education.

Globalising Montessori: The First Phase

According to Rambusch (1992c) when ideas, such as Montessori, are moved from one culture to another the process of being reworked follows a predictable path. Rambusch based this on an analysis of the United States experience of Montessori. A similar sequence was also evident in Australia and New Zealand. Firstly, ideas are transported from the host to the receiving culture. In regard to Montessori's educational ideas, enthusiastic individuals such as American writer Dorothy Canfield Fisher and the influential journalist, S. S. McClure, accomplished this during its first phase. The rise of the printed media of communications during the early 1900s further assisted in the rapid spread of Montessori's educational ideas on a global scale (Cunningham, 2000). Fisher wrote *A Montessori Mother* in 1912, for an American audience, explaining Montessori's work in Rome and set down her "own Americanized meditations on Dr. Montessori's Italian text", situating it within the context of middle-class American family life (1920, p. ix). The most influential publication, however, in the United States, which also had an impact on New Zealand, was a series of

articles in *McClure's Magazine*. The history of the American Montessori movement began with Josephine Tozier's article on Montessori as an educational wonder-worker in May 1911 and was followed by a set of articles called 'The Montessori Movement in America'. These articles assisted Americans to implement Montessori's method (Rambusch, 1992c).

The New Zealand and Australian public also had access to the popular *McClure Magazine*. Martha Simpson read Tozier's favourable review of Montessori as well as Montessori's *Pedagogia Scientifica*. The first copies of *The Montessori Method* contained directions for making materials and the Tozier article was heavily illustrated. As in America, this assisted Simpson to implement Montessori's ideas.

Rambusch (1992c) states that once an idea is transported, it then requires translation. She argues that those who are receiving the ideas are more effective at doing this than those who are sending it. When Fisher, McClure and the well-known and influential Alexander Graham Bell and his wife Mabel became interested in Montessori, they immediately started to situate her method in an American context. Fisher, for example, provided suggestions on how middle-class American mothers could adapt the Montessori principles and practices to assist in raising their own children. In Australia, Simpson was aware very early on that it was highly unlikely Montessori's method could be introduced in its complete and original form. Instead, aspects of the method were implemented in the classroom she set up for five and six-year-olds at Blackfriars Practice School in Sydney. Her favourable report was published in New Zealand in September 1912. In Auckland Margaret Newman, who had observed Montessori's method in Rome, cautioned that:

The extent to which her methods could be adopted in existing school (many are already adopted and were, indeed, in existence before Dr. Montessori acquired her present reputation) is...a matter for local determination after consideration of the cost, facilities offered by school buildings, etc. (Manuka, 1914, p. 41).

Finally, Rambusch (1992c, p. 9) states that when the “received idea is translated into a new culture, it reshapes the culture, even as it is reshaped by the culture”. When this process has occurred, then the particular idea can be described as “naturalized”. During the first introduction of the Montessori method in America, Montessori ideas only got as far as the translation or interpretations phase. One reason put forward for this was that Montessori’s work was treated as a commercial business rather than an educational theory and practice. Another factor was that Montessori insisted that only she could train teachers how to use her method and materials properly, and she maintained total control over the manufacture and distribution of the materials. With Montessori as head of the enterprise, the business soon took on the characteristics of a church, with Montessori’s role one of priestess to her ardent, longtime followers. Such factors reveal the interplay between personalities of individuals and their models of curriculum.

Montessori’s method was accepted as an alternative method education worldwide in the early 1900s, particularly in England and the United States, as it offered a programme of reform during a reform-minded age. Montessori’s approach to education seemed to have proved, in a very short period of time, that it could lead to an improvement in society. It appeared to be possible to mold a new generation of children who would be independent, productive members of society and at the same time solve problems such as social inequities of the social classes and gender. However, Montessori’s method was not embraced with enthusiasm within the early childhood profession.

There were several aspects of the Montessori method that initially appealed to educationists who were adopting her philosophy. In Britain, for instance, Montessori’s ideas arrived at the same time as other progressive thinkers. There was dissatisfaction with the methods of education that were current, involving large passive classes, severe discipline, rote learning and rigid teaching methods. The progressive vision, in direct contrast, had common themes that included such things as growth, freedom, play, activity, self-

activity, development, individuality, spontaneity, with the notion of freedom leading to individuality and inner growth, development or self-realisation. The Montessori method appeared to offer an answer, especially in the Infant schools, where much of the criticism had been directed.

Progressive education also thrived during this period, due to the belief that “through educational reconstruction, war could be eliminated, a ‘new man’ created, and a brave new world ushered in” (Cohen, 1974, p. 57). In particular, progressives found the Montessori system entirely suited to do this.

Another attraction of Montessori’s method, deriving from its scientific basis, was her requirement that the teachers were properly trained. Montessori used the term ‘directress’ instead of teachers, which indicated a different relationship between the adult and child, reinforcing the scientific basis of the system. There were concerns in Britain about the quality of elementary trained teachers and an emphasis on teachers being trained appropriately was welcomed.

Montessori travelled widely during her lifetime to train her disciples in her method of education but she never visited New Zealand. The dissemination of her method in this country during the first phase was largely due to the work and influence of Martha Simpson in Sydney. Simpson claimed to be Montessori’s disciple but she did not embrace the total adoption of Montessori’s philosophy. Instead she selected Montessori didactic material and teaching techniques and adapted them to best suit the educational and cultural environment of Australia.

Montessori’s ideas spread to New Zealand at the same time as in the United States and Britain. In Chapter 3, I outlined how the Montessori system was extensively tried in the Wanganui Education Board. There was some evidence that other centres had adopted the Montessori method in the infant classes, particularly in Auckland (Manuka Jubilee Edition, 1906-1956). The main interest

came from teachers who taught in the early years of formal schooling. As May (1997) puts it, this was most likely due to Montessori's claims of successfully teaching children to read and write quickly and easily. Simpson's experiment at Blackfriars was further proof that Montessori's system could be adopted and successfully applied to English-speaking children.

The failure of Montessori to have a lasting impact in New Zealand after its initial introduction, had overseas parallels in the United States, Britain and Australia over a broadly similar time-span, with teaching methods at first enthusiastically received by educators, then virtually forgotten. As occurred in the United States, I am arguing here that Montessori's ideas only got as far as the translation stage. The effects of selective borrowing, untrained staff and a top-down approach were identified as the major reasons for the "adoptive failure" in Chapter 3. Furthermore, while Montessori inspired programmes were harnessed to what educators believed to be desirable social and economic goals, they were discarded, as more attractive options became available, such as the Dalton Plan.

Another reason Montessori's ideas failed to have a lasting effect in a different educational and cultural environment, was that Braik, the Chief Inspector of the Wanganui district, made it very clear in New Zealand that, like Simpson, he was only interested in adapting aspects of Montessori's method that would support the existing aims of education. As Miltch-Conway and Openshaw (1988, p. 189) stated, Montessori's "philosophies and techniques were modified and adapted in accordance with educational and cultural expectations very different from those which she envisaged".

The Second Phase: Montessori Revived

According to Rambusch (1992c) it took 50 years before Montessori's ideas could become transformed and 'naturalized'. It helped that the historical, social and cultural contexts were radically different when Rambusch reintroduced

Montessori's ideas in the United States in 1958. In 1960 Rambusch and a number of educators who admired Montessori's educational methods but not her restrictive personal control established the American Montessori Society.

As Rambusch (1992c) puts it when ideas such as Montessori are transformed in reciprocal contact with a particular culture, then its original definition frequently is displaced. Schon (1963) refers to this as 'displacement of concept'. Rambusch (1992c) argues that the American Montessori education is a valid illustration of this. When Montessori education moved into "American culture the result is an *American culture and an American Montessori education*" (Rambusch & Stoop, 1992, p. 3) [italics in original].

According to Schon (1963) the displacement of concept is central to the development of new theories and concepts. When displacement occurs the familiar ideas are brought to bear on unfamiliar one so that new concepts are generated but at the same time still retaining as much as possible of the former.

Rambusch (1992c) argues that this is exactly what happened during the second documented revival of Montessori in the mid-1960s. Montessori's ideas were "subject to translation from the side of the culture and to transformation within the culture" (Rambusch & Stoop, 1992, p. 3). The early organisers wanted to do more than simply transpose Montessori's method from Europe to America. They wanted it to become an American phenomenon, and they supported a range of settings that Montessori's ideas would find a place.

The steps involved in this process of displacement include the following. In the first instance aspects of Montessori's ideas are transposed to the new situation. Secondly, well-known aspects of Montessori's ideas are interpreted within the new situation. Finally, common areas and differences between Montessori's ideas and the transposed theory are noted. "Asked to find the old theory in the

new situation, one come to see the old theory in a different way" (Rambusch, 1992c, p. 12).

According to Rambusch (1992c, p. 12) a North American updated version of Montessori's method occurred as part of this process.

The term *Montessori* was rich in the connotations of the historical personage, the social movement, and the pedagogical practices. *American* was redolent of size, plurality, complexity, and ambiguity. But intentionally linking the two notions as equivalent terms, as the American Montessori Society did, one could not have easily said which context was central [italics in original].

The boundaries and the internal structure of the American Montessori Society started to change and were indistinct (Rambusch, 1992c; Schon, 1963).

The displacement concept consists of four stages. The first stage of transposition is continual. As Montessori's ideas continue to shift the new concept "fills out" (Rambusch, 1992c). The second stage, interpretation is closely aligned with transposition and there is usually resistance to new ideas. Once changes take place the result is displacement. When Montessori was re-established in America in the early 1960s Association Montessori Internationale (A.M.I.) European trained teachers came to the United States to train Montessori teachers. Not unsurprising the A.M.I. resisted the idea that the American situation was unique, maintaining that every national group was special due to its geography. According to Rambusch (1992c, p. 13) those "within the AMS innocent of cultural complexity also resisted the view of cultural change assuming that the old theory could be placed like a stencil over the new situation". The end result was mutual adaptation where aspects of Montessori's ideas, both old and new, were modified to suit the new situation.

The third stage of the displacement concept is correction. The term 'American Montessori' became identified with a plurality of possibilities, not as a single orthodox repetition of Montessori's thought (Rambusch, 1992b). Finally, the

'spelling out' stage results from the "culture in which the old idea is now newly embedded" (Rambusch, 1992c, p. 13). As Rambusch and Stoop (1992, p. 4) put it:

The most orthodox practice emanates from Montessori's circle of European disciples, while the "reformed" practice, although proceeding from Europe, is indigenous in origin and assimilationist in intention. Some American Montessorians see the original San Lorenzo Children's House of 1906 as their model; others see Montessori's insights as more critical than the full panoply of her didactic materials. Montessori practices reframe by time, circumstances and culture are the *foci* of such Montessorians [italics in original].

In the mid-1970s, this updated version of Montessori's method was reintroduced to New Zealand, as an alternative approach to early childhood education. When Montessori's ideas moved from the North American situation and to a lesser extent Europe, this had resulted in a specific New Zealand Montessori education.

New Zealand Montessori Experience

The re-introduction and adaptation of Montessori's ideas in New Zealand, illustrates several main themes common to such processes of the international transplanting of educational philosophies. Firstly, key individuals played a pivotal role in the establishment and development of Montessori centres. Secondly, there was the impact of Government policies. Montessori centres received limited financial support, but there was the need to adhere to Government's requirements for the early childhood sector in relation to licencing and funding purposes, as well as the hiring of Montessori teachers. Thirdly, there has been the development of teacher training programmes to supply the schools with qualified staff. Finally, the perceived value of the programme is an integral part of Montessori's success. A strong emphasis on community publicity was a necessary aspect to attract parental support and student enrolments to the centre from its beginnings.

The Role of Key Individuals

Key individuals were responsible for spreading and establishment of the Montessori method in New Zealand, particularly in the early stages. During the first phase of the Montessori movement Australian Martha Simpson played a key role in the implementation of Montessori education in this country, which was mainly adapted in the state school system (see Chapter 3). During the second phase of development Goldsbrough's work further exemplifies the crucial role played by key individuals in establishing alternative educational philosophies (see Chapter 4). Goldsbrough played a pivotal role in the re-establishment of the Montessori method, particularly in regard to the training of Montessori teachers. The establishment and development of the case study centre was also due to a small group of enthusiastic parents (see Chapter 5). Goldsbrough's story epitomises the intensely personal aspects of spreading educational innovations like Montessori within a specific historical and social context. The success of the Montessori method of education appears to depend heavily on passionate believers like Goldsbrough, particularly at the initial stages of the revival (Goffin & Wilson, 2001). The valuing of the early years and parents' desires for services that met different aims and goals further influenced the development of Montessori in the mid-1970s. This was led by a small group of enthusiastic parents. The founding parents had a strong commitment and belief in the Montessori philosophy that underpinned their reasons for sending their children to the centre.

Montessori centres established during the mid-1970s were local 'do-it-yourself' ventures, which was not unusual for new early childhood endeavors. This reflected a strong community 'do-it-yourself' base evident in other New Zealand early childhood services such as the Playcentre movement (Cullen, 1996).

Government Policies

Government policies have impacted upon the Montessori movement at particular historical points. When the case study centre was established the community-run committee were dependent on fees, grants and fundraising. Some assistance was available from the government but this was minimal. The introduction of bulk funding has had a huge impact on the growth of Montessori early childhood centres. The change of teacher training to three years, and the constant up grading of early childhood teachers' qualifications also impacted on the centre. The lack of trained Montessori teachers is an on-going critical problem for the Montessori movement.

The National Montessori Association (MANZ) was established in the mid-1980s to provide a cohesive national voice that could assist and advise existing Montessori schools, particularly the teachers. The focus, however, soon shifted to Government liaison. Early on Goldsbrough was aware of the necessity to take into account the concerns of the wider early childhood sector and the Government preferred to work with a single national body. MANZ's work has continued to be government liaison and Montessori teacher training.

From the beginning of MANZ, Goldsbrough stressed that everyone was in it for the "same overall purpose" regardless of his or her training (Goldsbrough, 1998). By not aligning themselves with one of the major Montessori international organisations, MANZ has been able to develop strong relationships with all of them (Chisnall, 2002). MANZ has also developed a teacher teaching programme in conjunction with Auckland University of Technology (AUT). As a consequence New Zealand has one national body that speaks on behalf of Montessori education.

Government's constant change to teacher qualifications (see Chapter 4) has had an impact on the Montessori movement in relation to attracting suitably qualified teachers. The benchmark qualification is a Diploma of Teaching (ECE)

for licensing in early childhood centres by 2005. Montessori teachers who have made the decision to continue teaching have or are currently upgrading to the Diploma or a Degree. Montessori teachers are now being trained to both generic and Montessori standards. What effect this will have on their implementation of Montessori's method within its established parameters remains to be seen.

Another challenge for Montessori trained teachers is implementing the early childhood curriculum document, *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996). The *whāriki* concept recognises the diversity of early childhood programmes in New Zealand, including Montessori. In 2002 the Ministry of Education signalled its intentions to make *Te Whāriki* a statutory requirement in all licensed and chartered early childhood centres (Ministry of Education, 2002). There has been no administrative sanctions for early childhood centres to implement *Te Whāriki* directly, centres which meet the requirements of DOPs 4 and 5 needed to be consistent with *Te Whāriki*, as discussed in Chapter 7. Montessori early childhood centres therefore were expected to identify the links between *Te Whāriki* and their curriculum and to illustrate that their curriculum is consistent with *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1998b, p. 40). Montessori educators will require on-going professional development to ensure that they are able to plan effectively with the curriculum document.

Programme Success/Appeal

The perceptions of the parents and teachers regarding the nature and value of Montessori education in general appeared to broadly coincide and were overall positive about Montessori. There were multiple factors for parents choosing to send their children to Montessori. Mentioned was school preparation, a quality safe learning environment, the fostering of independence, the opportunity for individualised attention, and so on. Teachers and parents believed that the Montessori method prepared children well for primary school. To receive the full benefit of the Montessori programme, teachers highlighted the necessity of

children completing the three-year cycle in order to obtain the full benefits of this alternative education.

Due to the perceived success of the Montessori education their children received, parents recommended the centre by word-of-mouth. From its early beginnings the centre relied on this type of publicity. Parent education was also an important part of being part of the Montessori community (see Chapter 5).

Montessori Teachers

Teachers were drawn to Montessori education for a variety of reasons. Information about Montessori was gained from books written on her ideas, television documentation, their studies while at University, working in a Montessori pre-school and from friends. The main reason that people became Montessori teachers was that they were attracted to Montessori's philosophy and how it was implemented in practice.

When Montessori was reintroduced to New Zealand in the mid-1970s many of the centres, including the case study, had to recruiting trained Montessori teachers from overseas due to the lack of available teachers in New Zealand. Many Montessori trained teachers were imported from Europe and Asia. One difficulty was that they were unfamiliar with New Zealand culture and through their training and experience were thoroughly imbued with the European Montessori view. This led to modification in their implementation of the Montessori method. Many of those who were trained were also required to train their assistants, which was another modification forced on teachers. For A.M.I. trained teachers this was particularly problematic as it was stressed during their training that only Montessori qualified trainers could train other Montessori teachers (Ball, 1983). Further, due to the expense of the Montessori equipment, many of the teachers had to make their own, similar to what occurred during the first phase of Montessori in New Zealand.

Limitation of the Study and Future Directions for Research

The limitations of examining programme effects in isolation from other, simultaneous aspects of children's lives was a factor in this research. I did not extend my investigation to include the impact of a Montessori early childhood education in conjunction with other significant contributors such as parenting to children's educational and developmental outcomes. Further I did not try to disentangle the various elements of the Montessori programme, and how, individually and in association with each other, these elements interact with and effect children who bring different characteristics and family circumstances to the programme.

Primary and Secondary Montessori Education

Longitudinal research looking at preparing children successfully for educational attainment is an area for future investigation. Until recently children attending a Montessori early childhood programme were unable to go on to a Montessori primary school. As mentioned in Chapter 4 the first primary Montessori School opened in Wellington in 1988. During the 1990s other cities started to establish Montessori primary schools, many of which were located within existing primary schools, with parents taking advantage of the class of special character (see Chapter 4). Children could be followed through the primary Montessori system and a comparison group of children who attended a Montessori early childhood centre but went on to a New Zealand primary school could be studied for comparison.

The rapid expansion experienced by the Montessori movement in the early childhood sector has shifted to primary education. In 2002 the first secondary school opened in Wellington. As the Montessori method moves into the primary sector and further into Secondary education, the constraints would be greater due to the achievement orientation of the education sector as outlined

in the *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (1993b). The principles underpinning the curriculum introduce the seven essential learning areas (subject areas) and list the eight groupings of essential skills that need to be developed by all students. The early childhood sector, although accountable to the education reforms of the 1980s and 1990s, has more flexibility.

Impact of Situating Montessori in a Generic Degree Programme

Students who enrolled in the Auckland University of Technology (AUT) three year Montessori early childhood degree B. Ed (ECT Montessori) in 2002 will graduate in December 2004. This qualification will allow graduates to become registered to teach in Montessori and mainstream early childhood centres. Other Montessori teachers who have made the decision to stay in the profession have or are currently upgrading their qualifications in recognised early childhood training institutions. What impact an understanding of the wider field of early childhood education will have on their delivery of the Montessori method of education would be worth investigating. As discussed in Chapter 4 in 2002 the Government's Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education Centres has established the Diploma of Teaching (ECE) as the benchmark qualification for licensing in early childhood centres by 2005. I highlighted that until recently Montessori teachers have been isolated from mainstream developments in the early childhood sector. Due to government policy this is changing.

General Conclusion

Despite the initial dismissal by the international early childhood sector during the first phase of its development Montessori's ideas has endured. There are three explanations for this. Firstly, there is the ability of Montessori's method to be packaged, and reproduced by using a specific set of materials. Although the integration of Montessori education within any country results in a culturally specific Montessori education, the paradigm is culture sensitive and highly adaptable. Secondly, over time Montessori centres have received more

financial support from the Government. The acceptance of diverse philosophical approaches, including Montessori, was endorsed in official Ministry documents. Finally, the spreading and establishment of the Montessori movement is due to the enthusiasm and commitment of parents and teachers. Two key individuals, Martha Simpson and Binda Goldsbrough exemplify the critical role played by key individuals in establishing alternative educational philosophies.

The Montessori Association of New Zealand has build a national network of Montessori schools, including the case study school, and a teacher training programme. In the early beginnings of the Montessori movement there were few resources but since then the Montessori movement has inserted Montessori's ideas into a New Zealand culture to produce a culturally specific Montessori education.

Reference List

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 377-392). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Alexander, M. D. (1914). Montessori at Training College, Sydney, *Leaflet*, Vols 1-4, July. Education Department File re Montessori, New Zealand National Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21.
- Albanesi, F. (1990). *Montessori class management*. Chicago: Adams Press.
- Alcorn, B. (1996, June). Tribute to Margaret Homfray. *Montessori Education*, 7 (5), 18.
- Alcorn, B. (1999, September). Montessori education has historical links in Christchurch. *Montessori Newz*, 15, 1-2.
- Alcorn, N. (1999). *"To the fullest extent of his powers:" C. E. Beeby's life in education*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American psychological association*. (5th ed.). Washington, DC.: American Psychological Association.
- Armstrong, D. (1999, Fall). *Integration of computers into the Montessori curriculum*. Retrieved 23 March 2003, from <http://www.cs.berkeley.edu>
- Ball, M. J. (1983). Notes taken at the 1982-83 Association Montessori Internationale Training Course, Toronto, Canada.
- Banta, T. (1972). Montessori: Myth or reality. In R. Parker (Ed.), *The preschool in action: Exploring early childhood programs* (pp. 210-242). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barney, D. (1975). *Who gets to pre-school?* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Barron, M. (1992). Montessori and the twenty-first century. In M. H. Loeffler, (Ed.), *Montessori in contemporary American culture* (267-279). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings*. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Batty, L. (1997). *The life history of Binda Goldsbrough*. Unpublished Sociology 340 Life History Project, Canterbury University.
- Bell, B. W. (1986). *Preschoolers' attitudes toward their respective early childhood programs*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 619).

- Bell, C. (1991, February 24). Small fingers on great works. Children learn how to appreciate art. *The Dominion Sunday Times*, p. 14.
- Bennett, N., Wood, L., & Rogers, S. (1997). *Teaching through play. Teachers' thinking and classroom practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bentley, R. (1964). *Publisher's foreword to the 1964 edition. The Montessori method* (xvii-xxii). Cambridge, MA: Robert Bentley, Inc.
- Bentzen, W. R. (1993). *Seeing young children: A guide to observing and recording behavior* (2nd ed.). New York: Delmar Publishers Inc.
- Berg, B. L. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berger, B. (1969). An investigation of Montessori versus conventional pre-kindergarten training with inner city children: An assessment of learning outcomes. Cited in E. Evans (Ed.). (1975). *Contemporary influences in early childhood education*. New York: Holt.
- Berk, L. E. (1976). How well do classroom practices reflect teacher goals? *Young Children*, 32 (1), 64-81.
- Blenkin, G. M., & Kelly, A. V. (Eds.). (1992). *Assessment in early childhood education*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Blenkin, G. M., & Kelly, A. V. (Eds.). (1996). *Early childhood education. A developmental curriculum* (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Blennerhassett, E. (1914). Montessori at Training College, Sydney, *Leaflet*, Vols 1-4, July. Education Department File re Montessori, New Zealand National Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21.
- Boehnlein, M. M. (1988). Montessori research: Analysis in retrospect. *The NAMTA Journal*, 13 (3), (whole issue).
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education. An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bonnet, A. (1999). The Montessori revolution. *Education Horizons*, 5 (2), 4-6.
- Bowman, B. (1990). Play in teacher education: The United States perspective. In E. Klugman & S. Smilansky (Eds.), *Children's play and learning* (pp. 97-111). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Braik, G. D. (1913, July). *Notes on education in Australia and New Zealand with some recommendations*, Wanganui. Education Department File re Montessori, New Zealand National Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21.
- Brehony, K. J. (1994). *"Individual work": Montessori and English education policy 1909-1939*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational

- Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 4-8. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 385 483).
- Brehony, K. J. (2000). Montessori, individual work and individuality in the elementary school classroom. *History of Education*, 29 (2), 115-128.
- Britton, L. (1992). *Montessori play and learn. A parents' guide to purposeful play from two to six*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979a). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979b, August). *Who cares for the children?* Opening Address to the Second Early Childhood Care and Development Convention, Christchurch, August.
- Brooks, J. (1992). *Choosing for children. Is the curriculum of importance to parents when they choose an early childhood facility?* A Dissertation Submitted to Massey University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Certificate in Early Childhood Education.
- Brown, A., & Dowling, P. (1998). *Doing research/reading research: A mode of interrogation for education*. London & Washington, D.C: The Falmer Press.
- Bruce, T. (1984). A Froebelian looks at Montessori's work. *Early Child Development and Care*, 14, 75-84.
- Bruner, J. (1966). *Towards a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Buchanan, K. (1995). Aims, beliefs, practices and training of early childhood practitioners from three different backgrounds: Montessori, traditional and the preschool playgroups association. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 27 (2), 1-9.
- Burgess, R. G. (Ed.). (1985). *Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Butchers, A. G. (1930). *Education in New Zealand*. Dunedin: Coulls Somerville Wilkie Ltd.
- Caldwell, C. A., Yussen, S. R., & Peterson, P. (1981). Beliefs about teaching in Montessori and non-Montessori preschool teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32 (2), 41-44.
- Calvert, P. (1986). *Responses to guidelines for developmentally appropriate practice for young children and Montessori*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, DC, November 13-16. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 558).
- Cannella, G. S. (1997). *Deconstructing early childhood education. Social justice and*

revolution. New York: Peter Lang.

- Carlson, S. M. (1986). *Implementation of activities for the development of affective skills with primary and preschool children*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 293).
- Carlson, S. M. (1988). *Implementing a teacher training program to develop skills to individualize preschool, primary, and intermediate classrooms*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 582).
- Carmichael, A. C. (1912). Quoted in *Harold*, New Zealand National Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21.
- Carr, M. (1997). Persistence when it's difficult. A disposition to learn for early childhood. *Early Childhood Folio 3. A Collection of Recent Research* (pp. 9-12). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Carr, M. (1998). *Assessing children's experiences in early childhood*. Final Report to the Ministry of Education. Part One, February. Wellington: Research Division.
- Carr, M. (2001). *Assessment in early childhood settings. Learning stories*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Carr, M., Hatherly, A., Lee, W., & Ramsey, K. (2003). *Te Whāriki and Assessment: A case study of teacher change*. In J. Nuttall (Ed.), *Weaving Te Whāriki: Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum. Document in theory and practice* (pp. 187-214). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Carr, M., & May, H. (1993). Choosing a model: Reflections on the development process of *Te Whāriki*, national early childhood curriculum guidelines in Aotearoa-New Zealand. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 1 (3), 7-22.
- Carr, M., & May, H. (1994). Weaving patterns: Developing national early childhood curriculum guidelines in Aoteroa – New Zealand. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 19 (1), pp. 25-33.
- Carr, M., & May, H. (1996). *Te Whāriki*, making a difference for the under-fives? The new national early childhood curriculum. *Delta*, 48 (1), 101-112.
- Carr, M., & May, H. (2000). *Te Whāriki: curriculum voices*. In H. Penn (Eds.), *Early childhood services. Theory, policy and practice* (pp. 53-73). Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Carr, M., May, H., & Podmore, V. (1998). *Learning and teaching stories: New approaches to assessment and evaluation in relation to Te Whāriki*. Wellington: Institute for Early Childhood Studies.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1994). *Becoming critical. Education, knowledge and action research* (Rev. ed.). Geelong: Deakin University.
- Cassidy, D. J., & Lawrence, J. M. (2000). Teachers' beliefs: The "whys" behind the

- “how tos” in child care classrooms. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 14 (2), 193-204.
- Chattin-McNichols, J. P. (1981, July). The effects of Montessori school experience. *Young Children*, 36 (5), 49-66.
- Chattin-McNichols, J. P. (1991, November). *Montessori teachers' intervention: Preliminary findings from an international study*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Denver. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 341 499).
- Chattin-McNichols, J. P. (1992a). *The Montessori controversy*. Albany: Delmar Publishers Inc.
- Chattin-McNichols, J. P. (1992b). What does research say about Montessori? In M. H. Loeffler (Ed.), *Montessori in contemporary American culture* (pp. 69-100). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Child care demand rockets. (1985, May 7). *Evening Standard*, p. 5.
- Childs, C. (1991). *Coordinating Montessori and traditional education through the use of units focused on a skill based competency and training staff to be goal directed*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 438).
- Child's personality chief focus of Montessori method. (1996, p. 21). *The Press*, p. 27.
- Chisholm M. (1946, November 2). The woman who made school fun. *Picture Post*, pp. 16-18.
- Chisnall, N. (2002). *On spinning, weaving and darning: Changing perspectives on Montessori in Aotearoa-New Zealand 1975-2000*. Unpublished thesis submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.
- Chisnall, N. (2003a, September). *Changing perspectives on Montessori in early childhood education*. Paper presented at the 8th Early Childhood Convention, Palmerston North.
- Chisnall, N. (2003b). *Weaving the Montessori Whāriki*. Occasional Paper No. 14. Wellington: Institute for Early Childhood Studies.
- Chisnall, N. (2004). Changing perspectives on Montessori early childhood education. *Early Education*, 34, Autumn, 15-21.
- Christians, C. G. (2000). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 133-155). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Click, P. M. (2000). *Administration of schools for young children* (5th ed.). Albany: Delmar Thomson Learning.

- Coe, E. J. (1991, October). *Montessori education and its relevance to educational reform*. Paper presented at the Conference on the Future of Public Montessori Programs, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 462).
- Cohen, S. (1972, Winter). Montessori comes to America, 1911-1917. *Notre Dame Journal of Education*, 2 (4), 359-372.
- Cohen, S. (1974). The Montessori movement in England, 1911-1952. *History of Education*, 3 (1), 51-67.
- Cole, J., Clark, S., Hirschheimer, S., Martyn, T., & Morrall, J. (2001). *Helping young children learn through activities in the early years*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Cole, L. (1950). *A history of education. Socrates to Montessori*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Comenius, J. A. (1896). *The great didactic of John Amos Comenius*. (Translated and edited by M. W. Keatinge.) London: A. and C. Black.
- Cook, H. M. (1985). *Mind that child: Childcare as a social and political issue in New Zealand*. Upper Hutt, N.Z.: Blackberry Press.
- Cotton, C. (1996). A bold experiment in teaching values. *Educational Leadership*, 53 (8), 54-58.
- Cox, L. (1980a, March 16). Children learn at their own pace. *Evening Standard*, pp. 1, 3.
- Cox, L. (1980b, March 16). Rachel Ryan: Montessori her career. *Evening Standard*, p. 1.
- Cox, T. (Ed.). (1996). *The national curriculum and the early years: Challenges and opportunities*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Cubey, P., & Dalli, C. (1996). *Quality evaluation of early childhood education programmes: A literature review*. Wellington: Institute for Early Childhood Studies. Occasional Paper No. 1, November.
- Cullen, J. (1992). Young children's perceptions of their learning: A metacognitive perspective. In J. Cullen & J. Williamson (Eds.), *The early years: Policy, research, and practice* (pp. 110-122). Perth: Merrilinga Young Children's Foundation, Inc.
- Cullen, J. (1996). The challenge of *Te Whāriki* for future developments in early childhood education. *Delta: Policy and Practice in Education*, 48 (1), 113-125.
- Cullen, J. (2001, June). Literacy learning in early childhood centres: Challenges to early childhood educators, *Pitopito Korero*, 25, 6-10.

- Cullen, J. (2003). The challenge of *Te Whāriki*: Catalyst for change? In J. Nuttall (Ed.), *Weaving Te Whāriki. Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum. Document in theory and practice* (pp. 269-296). Wellington: NZCER.
- Culverwell, E. P. (1913). *The Montessori principles and practices*. London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd.
- Cumming, I., & Cumming, A. (1978). *History of state education in New Zealand 1840-1975*. Wellington: Pitman Publishing New Zealand Ltd.
- Cunningham, P. (2000). The Montessori phenomenon: Gender and internationalism in early twentieth-century innovation. In M. Hilton & P. Hirsch (Eds.), *Practical visionaries: Women, education and social progress 1790-1930* (pp. 203-220). Harlow, England: Longman.
- Cunningham, P. (2001). Innovators, networks and structures: Towards a prosopography of progressivism. *History of Education*, 30 (5), 433-451.
- Curtis, A. M. (1986). *A curriculum for the pre-school child. Learning to learn*. London: Routledge.
- Dalli, C. (1993). Is Cinderella back among the cinders? A review of early childhood education in the early 1990s. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 3, 223-252.
- Davidson, C., & Tolich, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Social science research in New Zealand. Many paths to understanding*. Auckland: Longman.
- Delamont, S. (2002). *Fieldwork in educational settings. Methods, pitfalls and perspectives* (2nd ed.). London & New York: Routledge.
- De Leon, S. (1970). Montessori for adolescents. In K. Edelson & R. C. Orem (Eds.), *The children's house parent-teacher guide to Montessori* (pp. 49-55). New York: Capricorn Books.
- D'Emidio-Caston, M., & Crocker, E. (1987). *Montessori education: A humanistic approach for the 1990s*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 212).
- den Elt, M. E., van Kuyk, J. J., & Meijnen, G. W. (1996). Culture and the kindergarten curriculum in the Netherlands. *Early Child Development and Care*, 123, 15-30.
- Denscombe, M. (1998). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989a). *Interpretive interactionism*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989b). *The research act. A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- DeVries, R., & Goncu, A. (1990). Interpersonal relations in four-year-old dyads from constructivist and Montessori programs. In A.S. Honig (Ed.), *Optimizing early child care and education* (pp. 11-27). New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.
- DeVries, R., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). *Constructivist early education: Overview and comparison with other programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Dowling, M. (1992). *Education 3 - 5*. (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Drummond, M. J. (1996). Play, learning and the national curriculum: Some possibilities. In T. Cox (Ed.), *The national curriculum and the early years: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 129-139). London: The Falmer Press.
- Dryden, G., & Vos, J. (1993). *The learning revolution. A lifelong learning programme for the world's finest computer: Your amazing brain*. Auckland: Profile Books.
- DuCharme, C. C. (1992, November). *Margaret McMillian and Maria Montessori: Champions of the poor*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 463).
- Dyne, J. (2001). *The place of blocks in the early childhood curriculum: Do we need a new set of free blocks?* Occasional Publication Series No. 9. Wellington: Institute for Early Childhood Studies.
- Early Childhood Education Project (2000, March). *The workload of volunteers in early childhood services*. Wellington: NZEI Te Riu Roa.
- Edelson, K., & Orem, R. C. (Eds.). (1970). *The children's house parent-teacher guide to Montessori*. New York: Capricorn Books.
- Edmonson, B. (1963, November). Let's do more than look - Let's research Montessori. *The Journal of Nursery Education*, 66-77.
- Edson, C .H. (1988). Our past and present: Historical inquiry in education. In R. R. Sherman & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods* (pp. 44-57). London: The Falmer Press.

- Education Review Office. (2000a, Winter). *Early literacy and numeracy: The use of assessment to improve programmes for four to six year olds*. Number 3. Wellington: Author.
- Education Review Office. (2000b, Winter). *What counts as quality in early childhood centres*. Number 4. Wellington: Author.
- Education Review Office. (2002, May). *Provision of early childhood education in Montessori preschools*, pp. 1-8. Retrieved 8 March 2003, from <http://www.ero.govt.nz/Publications/pubs2002/Montessori.htm>
- Education Review Office. (2004, June). *Early childhood readiness to implement the 2005 qualification requirements*, pp. 1-8. Wellington: Author.
- Edwards, A., & Knight, P. (1994). *Effective early years education. Teaching young children*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Edwards, C. P. (2002, Spring). Three approaches from Europe: Waldorf, Montessori, and Reggio Emilia. *Early Childhood Research & Practice*, 4 (1), 1-7. Retrieved 21 November 2002, from <http://ecrp.unuc.edu/v4n1/edwards.html>
- Elkind, D. (1967). Piaget and Montessori. *Harvard Educational Review*, 37, 535-545.
- Elkind, D. (1983). Montessori education: Abiding contributions and contemporary challenges. *Young Children*, 38, 3-10.
- Elkind, D. (1990). Academic pressure - too much, too soon: The demise of play. In E. Klugman & S. Smilansky (Eds.), *Children's play and learning* (pp. 3-17). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Ellicott, B. A. (1989). *Maria Montessori--A biography*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 305 352).
- Ellis, H. C., Derwent, L., & Hillman, R. (1970). Schooling: Views of three rich experiences from preschool to multi-age to post-Montessori. In K. Edelson & R. C. Orem (Eds.), *The children's house parent-teacher guide to Montessori* (pp. 162-172). New York: Capricorn Books.
- Ely, M. with Anzul, M., Friedman, T., Garner, D., & McCormack Steinmetz, A. (1991). *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Epstein, A. S., Schweinhart, L. F., & McAdoo, L. (1996). *Models of early childhood education*. Ypsilanti, Michigan: High/Scope Press.
- Evans, E. D. (1975). *Contemporary influences in early childhood education* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Farquhar, S. (1990). Defining quality in the evaluation of early childhood programmes. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 15 (4), 16-23.

- Faust, R. A. G. (1984). *Defining and examining areas of criticism concerning the pedagogical ideas of Maria Montessori with emphasis on the critics and their criticism from 1910-1925*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 048).
- Feagin, J. R., Orum, A. M., & Sjoberg, G. (1991). *A case for the case study*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Findlay, J. J., & Steel, K. (1914). *Educative toys. Being an account of investigations with Montessori and other apparatus, conducted at the Fielden school*. London: Blackie & Sons Limited.
- Fisher, D. C. (1914). *The Montessori manual: In which Dr. Montessori's teachings and educational occupations are arranged in practical exercises or lessons for the mother or the teacher*. London: Constable & Company, Ltd.
- Fisher, D. C. (1920). *A Montessori mother* (6th impression). London: Constable and Company Limited. (Original work published 1913).
- Fleege, U. H. (1979). Montessori system of education. In E. Ignas & R. J. Corsini (Eds.), *Alternative educational systems* (pp. 151-199). Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Fleet, A., & Clyde, M. (1995). *What's in a day? Working in early childhood*. Wentworth Falls: Social Science Press.
- Fleer, M. (2003). The many voices of *Te Whāriki*: Kaupapa maori, socio-cultural, developmental, constructivist, and...? Australians listen carefully. In J. Nuttall (Ed.), *Weaving Te Whāriki. Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum. Document in theory and practice* (pp. 243-268). Wellington: NZCER.
- Flynn, T. M. (1990). *Development of social, personal and cognitive skills of preschool children in Montessori and traditional preschool programs*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 337 297).
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361-376). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Fromberg, D. P. (2002). *Play and meaning in early childhood education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Frost, J. L. (Ed.). (1968). *Early childhood rediscovered. Readings*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Fyee, A. (1998, July). There are other ways. *NZ Education Review*, 7-8.

- Gaffney, M., & Smith, A. (1997, February). *An evaluation of pilot early childhood professional development programs to support curriculum implementation*. A Report to the Ministry of Education. University of Otago, Dunedin: Children's Issues Centre.
- Gall, M. E., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research. A introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, New York: Longman Publishers USA.
- Gardner, R. W. (1968). A psychologist looks at Montessori. In J. L. Frost (Ed.), *Early childhood education rediscovered. Readings* (pp. 78-91). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Genishi, C. (1982). Observation research methods for early childhood education. In B. Spodek (Ed.), *Handbook of research in early childhood education* (pp. 564-591). New York: The Free Press.
- Genishi, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Ways of assessing children and curriculum. Stories of early childhood practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gettman, D. (1987). *Basic Montessori. Learning activities for under-fives*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Glenn, C. M. (1993). *The longitudinal assessment study (LAS): Cycle 3 (seven year follow-up)*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 679).
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.
- Goffin, S. G., & Wilson, C. S. (2001). *Curriculum models and early childhood education. Appraising the relationship* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merrill Prentice-Hall.
- Goldsbrough, B. (1990-1994). *The Aperfield Montessori course*. Christchurch: Aperfield Trust.
- Goldsbrough, B. (1998). Interview with B. Goldsbrough.
- Goodwin, W. L., & Goodwin, L. D. (1996). *Understanding quantitative and qualitative research in early childhood education*. New York & London: Teachers College Press.
- Gordon, A. M., & Williams-Brown, K. (2000). *Beginnings and beyond* (5th ed.). Albany, New York: Delmar Publishers.
- Grant, C., with an introduction by Saleeby, C. W. (1913). *English education and Dr. Montessori*. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., Ltd.
- Grant, C. E. (n.d.). *The teachers book of individual occupations. With occupations*

- based on the Montessori ideal of individual work* (4th ed.). The Kingsway Series. London: Evans Bros.
- Griggs, G. E. (1991). *Wellington community Montessori pre-school 1991*. Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc. Newsletter, Issue One
- Gross, M. J. (1986). *Montessori's concept of personality*. Lanham & London: University Press of America, Inc. (Original work published 1978).
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.
- Haggerty, M. (2003). Reconceptualising notions of curriculum: The case of Te Whaariki. *NZ Research in Early Childhood Education*, 6, 35-49.
- Hainstock, E. G. (1968). *Teaching Montessori in the home. The pre-school years*. New York: First Plume Printing.
- Hainstock, E. C. (1971). *Teaching Montessori in the home: The school years*. New York: Random House.
- Hainstock, E. G. (1997a). *Teaching Montessori in the home: The pre-school years* (Updated ed.). New York: Plume.
- Hainstock, E. G. (1997b). *The essential Montessori. An introduction to the woman, the writings, the method, and the movement* (Revised and updated ed.). New York: Plume.
- Hamer, C. (1999). *Observation. A tool for learning*. Lower Hutt: The Open Polytechnic of New Zealand.
- Hamilton, V. J., & Gordon, D. A. (1978, Summer). Teacher-child interactions in preschool and task persistence. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15 (3), 459-466.
- Hammersley, M. (1990). *Reading ethnographic research: A critical guide*. New York: Longman.
- Hammersley, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Educational research: Current issues*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Harris Helm, J., Beneke, S., & Steinheimer, K. (1998). *Windows on learning. Documenting young children's work*. New York & London: Teachers College Press.
- Hatch, J. A. (Ed.). (1995). *Qualitative research in early childhood settings*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Hay, M. (1975, February). Montessori teaching for under-fives. *Mother & Baby*, 11-13.

- Hayes, L. (1979, January 18). Montessori methods of education a bit way-out for NZ. *The Evening Post*. (Page number unknown).
- Hendricks, A., & Meade, A. in Conjunction with Wylie, C. (1993, July). *Competent children. Influences of early childhood experiences. Pilot study report*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Education Research and Faculty of Education, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Hessessy, M. (n.d.). Our lady star of the sea school. *Shoreline 21*.
- Hittleman, D. R., & Simon, A. J. (2002). *Interpreting educational research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice-Hall.
- Holmes, E. G. A. (1912). *The Montessori system of education*, Board of Education (UK), Educational Pamphlets, No. 24 (London, HM Stationery Office) M2/93, James Allen Papers, New Zealand National Archives, Wellington.
- Holmes, E. G. A. (1920). Introduction. In D. C. Fisher, *A Montessori mother* (pp. v-xiviii) (6th impression). London: Constable and Company Limited. (Original work published 1913).
- Holmes, H. W. (1912). Introduction. In M. Montessori, *The Montessori method. Scientific pedagogy as applied to child education in "the children's houses" with additions and revisions by the author* (pp. xvii - xlii). New York: Schocken Books.
- Humphryes, J. (1998, July). The developmental appropriateness of high- quality Montessori programs. *Young Children*, 53 (4), 4-16.
- Hunt, J. McV. (1964). Introduction: Revisiting Montessori. In M. Montessori, *The Montessori method* (pp.xi-xxxix). New York: Schocken Books.
- Hurst, V. (1997). *Planning for early learning. Educating young children* (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Ignas, G., & Corsini, R. J. (1979). *Alternative educational systems*. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Jensen, D. (1988). *Erroneous assumption correction*. Letter written to Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc., Newsletter 14, November.
- Jerums, G. (1999). Different learning curves. *Education Horizons*, 5 (2), 7-10.
- Jordan, B. J. (1999). Dialogues and projects: Extending young children's thinking. *Early Childhood Folio, 4: A Collection of Recent Research*, 4, 3-7.
- Jordan, B. J. (2003). *Professional development making a difference for children: Co-constructing understandings in early childhood centres*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). *Participant observation. A methodology for human studies*.

Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Josselson, R. (Ed.). (1996). *Ethics and process in the narrative study of lives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Kahn, D. (1993). *Montessori in the public schools. Implementation basics*. Montessori Public School Consortium in cooperation with the Montessori Resource Center.

Karnes, M., Shwedel, A., & Williams, M. (1983). A comparison of five approaches for educating young children from low-income homes. In The Consortium for Longitudinal Studies (Ed.), *As the twig is bent...Lasting effects of preschool programs* (pp. 133-170). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Publishers.

Katz, L. G. (1990, April). *Questions about Montessori education today*. Paper presented at a Symposium of the American Montessori Society, Arlington, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321 845).

Kenward, S. (1988, April). Montessori method develops potential. *Evening Standard*, pp. 1, 4.

Kessler, S. (2001). Critical perspectives on social studies in early childhood education. In J. A. Jipson & R. T. Johnson (Eds.), *Resistance and representation. Rethinking childhood education* (pp. 127-147). New York: Peter Lang.

Kimmel, A. J. (1988). *Ethics and values in applied social research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Kierstead, J. (1980). *Montessori and Dewey: A comparison of their theory and practice*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Claremont Reading Conference, 48th, Claremont, CA, January 16-17, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198 506).

Klugman, E., & Smilansky, S. (Eds.). (1990). *Children's play and learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Knudsen Lindauer, S. L. (1987). Montessori education for young children. In J. L. Roopnarine & J. E. Johnson (Eds.), *Approaches to early childhood education* (pp. 109-126). Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.

Kornegay, W. (1981). *The American odyssey of Maria Montessori*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 272).

Kottler, S. B. (1977, April 11-15). *The Montessori approach to the education of the exceptional child--early childhood through high school*. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children, 55th, Atlanta, Georgia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 139 220).

Krafft, K. C., & Berk, L. E. (1998). Private speech in two preschools: Significance of open-ended activities and make-believe play for verbal self-regulation. *Early*

Childhood Research Quarterly, 13 (4), 673-658.

- Kramer, R. (1988). *Maria Montessori. A biography*. Reading, Massachusetts: Perseus Books. (Originally published in 1976).
- Krogh, S. L. (1979). *Moral development in Montessori and traditional preschool children: Does school type make a difference?* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 190 217).
- Krogh, S. L. (1982, November). *Preschool democracy: Ideas from Montessori*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224 610).
- Lambert, M. D., & Lambert, L. G. (1989). Parent choice works for us. *Educational Leadership*, 47 (2), 58-60.
- Lange, D. (1988). *Before five: Early childhood care and education in New Zealand*. Wellington: Department of Education.
- Lascarides, V. C., & Hinitz, B. F. (2000). *History of early childhood education*. New York & London: Falmer Press.
- Lawrence, L. (1998). *Montessori read and write. A parents' guide to literacy for children*. London: Ebury Press.
- Lay-Dopyera, M., & Dopyera, J. E. (1992). Strategies for teaching. In C. Seefeldt (Ed.), *The early childhood curriculum. A review of current research* (2nd ed., pp. 16-41). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lee, R. M. (2000). *Unobtrusive methods in social research*. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Lees, A. (1977, August 6). Teaching a new way -- City move. *Evening Standard*. (Page Number Unknown).
- Lidington, T. (2000). *'Mat-weaving': Factors influencing the implementation of Te Whāriki*. Unpublished MEd thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Lillard, P. P. (1973). *Montessori, a modern approach*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Lillard, P. P. (1976). A Montessori classroom. In M. M. Montessori, Jr., *Education for human development. Understanding Montessori* (pp. 107-116). (P. P. Lillard, Ed.). New York: Schocken Books.
- Lillard, P. P. (1996). *Montessori today. A comprehensive approach to education from birth to adulthood*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Loeffler, M. H. (Ed.). (1992). *Montessori in contemporary American culture*.

Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Lohmann, R. T. (1988). *A re-vision of Montessori: Connections with Dewey, Piaget, and Vygotsky*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 210).
- Lucas, C. J. (1972). *Our western educational heritage*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Lucas, C. J. (1984). *Foundations of education. Schooling and the social order*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- MacNaughton, G., Rolfe, S. A., & Siraj-Blatchford, I. (Eds.). (2001). *Doing early childhood research. International perspectives on theory and practice*. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- McAuley, H., & Jackson, P. (1992). *Educating young children. A structural approach*. London: David Fulton Publishers. Published in association with the Roehampton Institute.
- Makin, L. (1997). "Would you like to pack away now?" Improving the quality of talk in early childhood programs. *Early Childhood Folio 3. A Collection of Research Research* (pp. 3-8). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Mallory, B. L., & New, R. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Diversity & developmentally appropriate practices. Challenges for early childhood education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Malloy, T. (1974). *Montessori and your child. A primer for parents*. New York: Schocken Books Inc.
- Manuka Jubilee Edition. (1906-56). *Women in the life of the college* (pp. 30-31). Auckland: Auckland Training College.
- Manuka. (1914). *The "Montessori" method* (pp. 33-41). Auckland: Auckland Training College.
- Manuka. (1923). *Miss Newman* (p. 7). Auckland: Auckland Training College.
- Manuka. (1954). *Obituary* (p. 57). Auckland: Auckland Training College.
- Margetts, K. (1997). Factors impacting on children's adjustment to the first year of primary school. *Early Childhood Folio 3. A Collection of Recent Research* (pp. 53-56). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *The schoolhome. Rethinking schools for changing families*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- May, H. (1992). Learning through play: Women, progressivism and early childhood education, 1920s-1950s. In S. Middleton & A. Jones (Eds.), *Women and education in Aotearoa 2* (pp. 83-101). Wellington: Bridget Williams Book Limited.

- May, H. (1997). *The discovery of early childhood*. Auckland: Auckland University Press/Bridget Williams Books with New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- May, H. (2001). *Politics in the playground. The world of early childhood in postwar New Zealand*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books with the New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- May, H., & Carr, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Implementing Te Whāriki. Te Whāriki Papers Two*. Institute for Early Childhood Studies, Victoria University of Wellington/ Department of Early Childhood Studies, University of Waikato.
- May, H., & Carr, M. (2000). Empowering children to learn and grow: *Te Whāriki*, the New Zealand early childhood national curriculum. In J. Hayden (Ed.), *Landscapes in early childhood education: Cross-national perspectives on empowerment: A guide for the new millennium* (pp. 153-169). New York: Peter Lang.
- May, H. (2004). *Margaret Slingsby Newman 1872-1954*. (Helen May's personal Margaret Newman archive).
- Mayer, F. (1963). *Foundations of education*. Columbus: Charles E Merrill Books, Inc.
- Mayer, S. E. (2002). *Raising children in New Zealand: The influence of parental income on children's outcomes*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.
- Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research. A philosophic and practical guide*. London: The Falmer Press.
- McCallum, J., & Sullivan, G. (1990). *Kelburn normal school 75th jubilee 1914-1989*. Wellington: Kelburn Normal School.
- McClune, H. F., & Lord, G. H. (1917). *Democracy in the schoolroom: A guide to primary school work with special reference to sole charge schools*. Auckland: Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd.
- McCulloch, G. (1988, June). *Education in the forming of New Zealand society: Needs and opportunities for study*. New Zealand Association for Research in Education. Monograph No. 1.
- McCulloch, G. & Richardson, W. (2000). *Historical research in educational settings*. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- McDermott, J. J. (1965). Introduction. In M. Montessori, *The advanced Montessori method: Spontaneous activity in education* (pp. xi - xxviii). New York: Schocken Books.
- McGee-Brown, M. J. (1995). Multiple voices, contexts, and methods: Making choices in qualitative evaluation in early childhood education settings. In J. A. Hatch (Ed.), *Qualitative research in early childhood settings* (pp. 191-211). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

- McGrath, H. (1980). The Montessori method of education: An overview of research. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 5 (4), 20-24.
- McKinnon, J., Flieger, S., & Patterson, M. (1982). *A comparative study of the effects of preschool education on middle class children*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 220 179).
- McLachan-Smith, C. J., & St. George, A. (1997). Emergent literacy in kindergartens. *Early Childhood Folio 3. A Collection of Recent Research* (pp. 13-18). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Meade, A. (1988). *Education to be more: Report of the early childhood care and education working group*. Wellington: Government Print.
- Meade, A. (1997). Good practice to best practice: Extending policies and children's minds. *Early Childhood Folio 3. A Collection of Recent Research* (pp. 33-40). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Meade, A. (2000). If you say it three times, it is true? Critical use of research in early childhood education. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 8 (1), 15-26.
- Meade, A., with Cubey, P. (1995). *Thinking children. Learning about schemas*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research and Institute for Early Childhood Studies, Wellington College of Education/Victoria University of Wellington.
- Meade, A., & Cubey, P. in association with Hendricks, A., & Wylie, C. (1995). *Competent children and their teachers. Learning about trajectories and other schemas*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research and Faculty of Education, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Measor, L. (1985). Interviewing: A strategy in qualitative research. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), *Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods* (pp. 55-78). London: The Falmer Press.
- Mellor, E. J. (1990). *Stepping stones. The development of early childhood services in Australia*. Sydney: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education. A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study. Applications in education. Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Miezitis, S. (1971). The Montessori method: Some recent research. *Interchange*, 2 (2), 41-59.
- Middleton, S., & Jones, A. (Eds.). (1992) *Women and education in Aotearoa 2*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

- Middleton, S., & May, H. *Teachers talk teaching 1915-1995. Early childhood, schools and teachers' colleges*. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Miller, L. B., & Bizzell, R. P. (1983a). Long-term effects of four preschool programs: sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. *Child Development*, 54, 727-741.
- Miller, L. B., & Bizzell, R. P. (1983b). The Louisville experiment: A comparison of four programs. In The Consortium for Longitudinal Studies (Ed.), *As the twig is bent...Lasting effects of preschool programs* (pp. 171-200). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Publishers.
- Miller, L. B., & Dyer, J. L. (1975, October). Four preschool programs: Their dimensions and effects. *Monographs of the society for research in child development*, Serial No. 162, 40 (5-6).
- Miltich-Conway, B., & Openshaw, R. (1988). The Montessori method in the Wanganui education board district, 1911-1924. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 23 (2), 189-200.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (1993a). *Te Whāriki: Draft guidelines for developmentally appropriate programmes in early childhood services*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (1993b). *The New Zealand curriculum framework*. Wellington: Learning Media Ltd.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (1996). *Te Whāriki: He whariki matauranga mo ngā mokopuna o Aotearoa: Early childhood curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media Ltd.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (1998a). *Providing positive guidance: Guidelines for early childhood education services*. Wellington: Author.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (1998b). *Quality in action. Te mahi whai hua. Implementing the revised statement of desirable objectives and practices in New Zealand early childhood services*. Wellington: Learning Media Ltd.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (1999). *The quality journey: He haerenga whai hua*. Wellington: Learning Media Ltd.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (2000a). *Education statistics: July 1999 early childhood statistics 10, (1)*. Wellington: Data Management and Analysis Division.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (2000b). *Letter "To the early childhood sector"* 9 May. Parliament Buildings, Wellington.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (2001). *Education statistics: July 2001. Number of*

- education and care centres by special character and form of ownership*, p. 30. Wellington: Data Management and Analysis Division.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (2002). *Pathways to the future: Nga huarahi arataki. A 10-year strategic plan for early childhood education*. Wellington: Learning Media Ltd.
- Ministry of Education (N.Z.). (2003). *Quality teaching early foundations: Best evidence synthesis*. Wellington: Learning Media Ltd.
- Mitchell, L. (2002/2). *Differences between community owned and privately owned early childhood education and care centres: A review of evidence*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research Occasional Paper. Retrieved 8 February 2004 <http://www.nzcer.org.nz/pdfs/11743.pdf>
- Monighan-Nourot, P. (1990). The legacy of play in American early childhood education. In E. Klugman & S. Smilansky (Eds.), *Children's play and learning* (pp. 59-85). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Montessori Association of New Zealand. (1986, April). *Montessori schools and associations in New Zealand. The results of a survey in October 1985*. Report 1.
- Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc. (1988). Newsletter 14, November.
- Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc. (1991). Newsletter, Issue 3, p. 2.
- Montessori classes offer alternative. (1996, May 31). *The Dominion*, p. 17.
- Montessori considers doubling its roll. (1986, March 6). *Evening Standard*. (Page number unknown).
- Montessori Education. (1996, June). *Take over launches Montessori education into the next century*. 17 (5), 5-6.
- Montessori, M. (1912). *The Montessori method. Scientific pedagogy as applied to child education in "the children's houses" with additions and revisions by the author* (A. E. George, Trans.). London: William Heinemann.
- Montessori, M. (1914). *Dr. Montessori's own handbook*. London: Heinemann.
- Montessori, M. (1929). *The child in the church. Essays on the religious education of children and the training of character*. (E. M. Standing, Ed., with a chapter on the Montessori method.) London: Sands & Co.
- Montessori, M. (1964). *The Montessori method* (A. E. George, Trans.). New York: Schocken Books. (Original work published in English in 1912).
- Montessori, M. (1965a). *The advanced Montessori method: Spontaneous activity in education* (F. Simmonds, Trans.). New York: Schocken Books Inc. (Original work published in English in 1917).

- Montessori, M. (1965b). *Dr. Montessori's own handbook*. New York: Schocken Books Inc. (Original work published 1914).
- Montessori, M. (1966). *The secret of childhood* (M. J. Costelloe, Trans.). Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides Publishers. (Original work published 1937).
- Montessori, M. (1969). *Education for a new world*. Madras: Kalakshetra Publications.
- Montessori, M. (1970). *The child in the family* (N. R. Cirillo, Trans.). Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. (Original work published 1936).
- Montessori, M. (1971a). *The child*. Madras, India: The Theosophical Publishing House. (Reprinted from *The Theosophist*, December 1941).
- Montessori, M. (1971b). *The advanced Montessori method: The Montessori elementary material* (A. Livingston, Trans.). Cambridge: Robert Bently, Inc. (Original work published in English in 1917).
- Montessori, M. (1973). *From childhood to adolescence*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Montessori, M. (1974). *Childhood education* (A. M. Joosten, Trans.). Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. (First published under the title *The formation of man* in India, 1949).
- Montessori, M. (1980). *The absorbent mind* (C. A. Claremont, Trans.). New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc. (Original work published 1949).
- Montessori, M. (1988). *The discovery of the child* (M. J. Costelloe, Trans.). Oxford: Clio Press. (First published in 1948. Note that this book is a new translation of Montessori's original book *The method of scientific pedagogy as applied to infants in the children's houses*, which was changed to *The Montessori method* for English publication in 1912. This book provides a rephrasing of Montessori's original work.)
- Montessori, M. (1992). *Education and peace* (H. R. Lane, Trans.). Oxford: Clio Press. (Original work first published in Italy as *Educazione e pace* in 1949).
- Montessori, M. (1997). *Basic ideas of Montessori's educational theory: Extracts from Maria Montessori's writings and teachings* (L. Salmon, Trans.). Oxford: Clio Press. (Original work first published in Germany in 1967 and was originally compiled from Montessori's writings and teachings by P. Oswald and G. Schulz-Benesch).
- Montessori method of teaching. (1977, July). *The Evening Post*. (Page number unknown).
- Montessori, M. M., Jr. (1970). Fantasy and reality in children's games. In K. Edelson & R. C. Orem (Eds.), *The children's house parent-teacher guide to Montessori* (pp. 132-136). New York: Capricorn Books.
- Montessori, M. M., Jr. (1976). *Education for human development: Understanding*

- Montessori* (P. P. Lillard, Ed.). New York: Schocken Books.
- Montessori Newz. (2003, March). *Challenges ahead. MANZ tackles 'big issues' in 2003*, Issue 29, p. 1.
- Montessori pre-school group, (1977, January 30). *Evening Standard*. (Page number unknown).
- Montessori pre-school may start up soon. (1978, February 15). *The Sentinel*, 3 (4), p. 1.
- Montessori primary plan. (1987, April 23). *The Dominion*. (Page number unknown).
- Montessori, R. (1982). Personal Communication.
- Montessori, R. (1988). *An interview with Renilde Montessori by Terry Lane*. ABC Radio Station 3, 20 July. Printed in Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc., Newsletter No. 19, April 1990, 4-7.
- Montessori teacher finds concept eagerly accepted. (1988, March 8). *The Evening Post*, p. 12.
- Morrison, G. F. (1991). *Early childhood education today*. (5th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Morrison, G. F. (1997). *Fundamentals of early childhood education*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Morton-Williams, J. (1993). *Interviewer approaches*. Hants: Dartmouth Publishing Company Limited.
- Murphy, M. J., & Goldner, R. P. (1976). Effects of teaching orientation on social interaction in nursery school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68 (6), 725-728.
- Murrow, K. (1995). *Early childhood workers' opinions on the draft document Te Whāriki*. Research Section Report No. 5. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Newby, D. (1991). *Margaret Homfray. The spirit of Montessori*. Avila Beach, CA: Multi-Task Business Services.
- New Zealand Gazette. (1996, July 1) *Curriculum development. A report on early childhood curriculum development*. 75 (11), 1-4.
- New Zealand Gazette. (2002, May 6). *Athena settles in*, 11.
- Nisbet, F., & Watt, F. (1984). Case study. In J. Bell, T. Bush, A. Fox, J. Goodey & S. Goudling (Eds.), *Conducting small-scale investigations in educational management* (pp. 72-92). London: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Norris, C. J. (1976, October 20-23). *Renewed interest in Piaget and Montessori: Implications for the teaching of beginning reading*. Paper presented at the Annual

Meeting of the College Reading Association, 20th, Miami. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 130 253).

Nuttall, J. (Ed.). (2003a). *Weaving Te Whāriki. Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum. Document in theory and practice* (pp. 161-186). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Nuttall, J. (2003b). Exploring the role of the teacher within *Te Whāriki*: Some possibilities and constraints. In J. Nuttall (Ed.), *Weaving Te Whāriki. Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum. Document in theory and practice* (pp. 161-186). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

O'Donnell, D. (1996). *Montessori education in Australia and New Zealand*. Glebe: Wild & Woolley Pty Ltd.

Official opening. (1988, April 18). *Evening Standard*. (Page number unknown).

Openshaw, R. (1993). *Challenging the myths: Rethinking New Zealand's educational history*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Orem R. C. (Ed.). (1965). *A Montessori handbook. "Dr. Montessori's own handbook" with additional new material on current Montessori theory and practice*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Our new teacher. (1983, October 1). *Evening Standard*, p. 1.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.

Pellegrini, A. D. (1996). *Observing children in their natural worlds: A methodological primer*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Petersen, R. C. (1983). The Montessorians -- M. M. Simpson and L. de Lissa. In C. Turney (Ed.), *Pioneers of Australian education. Volume 3. Studies of the development of education in Australia 1900-50* (pp. 231-271). Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Phillips, D. A., & Howes, C. (1987). Indicators of quality child care: Review of research. In D. A. Phillips (Eds.), *Quality in child care: What does research tell us?* Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Phillips, N. (1994). *Choosing schools and child care options: Answering parents questions*. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Pitcher, E. G. (1968). An evaluation of the Montessori method in schools for young children. In J. L. Frost (Ed.), *Early childhood education rediscovered. Readings* (pp. 92-96). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Plank, E. (1966). *Reflections on the revival of the Montessori method. Montessori in perspective*. Washington: NAEYC.

- Podmore, V. N., & May, H. with Mara, D. (1998, 27 February). *Evaluating early childhood programmes using Te Whāriki. Final report on phases one and two to the Ministry of Education.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Podmore, V. N., & Meade, A. with Hendrick, A. K. (2000). *Aspects of quality in early childhood education.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Pollard, A., with Filer, A. (1996). *The social world of children's learning. Case studies of pupils from four to seven.* London: Cassell.
- Powell, D. R. (1989). *Families and early childhood programs.* Washington: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Powell, L. E. (1989). *Active learning: Positive impact for schools and democratic society.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 702).
- Preschool building nears completion. (1987, September). *Evening Standard.* (Page number unknown).
- Pre-school story time. (1986, June 7). *The Guardian*, 14 (35), pp. 1-2.
- Price, J. (1996). Snakes in the swamp: Ethical issues in qualitative research. In R. Josselson (Ed.), *Ethics and process in the narrative study of lives* (pp. 207-215). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Primary schools extend options. (1996, June 21). *The Press*, p. 27.
- Prochner, L. (2001). "The proof of the home is the nursery": An American proverb revisited. In J. A. Jipson & R. T. Johnson (Eds.), *Resistance and representation. Rethinking childhood education* (pp. 205-221). New York: Peter Lang.
- Punch, M. (1986). *The politics and ethics of fieldwork.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Punch, M. (1994). Politics and ethics in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 83-97). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Radice, S. (1920). *The new children. Talks with Dr. Maria Montessori.* London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited.
- Rafter, P. (1972). *Never let go! The remarkable story of Mother Aubert.* Wellington: A. H. & A. W. Reed.
- Ragin, C. C., & Becker, H.S. (Eds.). (1992). *What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rambusch, N. M. (1962). *Learning how to learn. An American approach to Montessori.* Dublin: Helicon Baltimore.

- Rambusch, N. M. (1965). Introduction. In M. Montessori, *Dr. Montessori's own handbook* (pp. 9-24). New York: Schocken Books Inc.
- Rambusch, N. M. (1992a). *An American Montessori elementary teacher: Indigenous American Montessori models*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 353 066).
- Rambusch, N. M. (1992b). *Montessori's flawed diffusion model: An American Montessori diffusion philosophy*. Occasional Paper, Series One. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 204).
- Rambusch, N. M. (1992c). Montessori in America: A history. In M. H. Loeffler (Ed.), *Montessori in contemporary American culture* (pp. 7-16). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rambusch, N. M., & Stoops, J. (1992). *The authentic American Montessori school: A guide to the self-study, evaluation, and accreditation of American schools committed to Montessori education*. New York: Commission on Elementary Schools of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools & The American Montessori Society.
- Rankin, J. (1983, November 28). Natural curiosity the spur behind Montessori. *Evening Standard*, p. 16.
- Ratner, H. (1971). The infant as a human being. *La Leche League International Inc.*, Information Sheet No. 53, May, 1-5. (Paper Presented at the American Montessori Society National Seminar, Chicago, Illinois, June 14-16, 1963.)
- Readdick, C. A., & Douglas, K. (2000). More than line leader and door holder: Engaging young children in real work. *Young Children*, 55 (6), 63-70.
- Ross, L. (1997, June). Moments of madness in the method. *The International Montessori Journal*, 8 (3), 8.
- Rouse, J. (1998). *Quality in early childhood education*. Wellington: Early Childhood Development.
- Rusk, R. (1979). *Doctrines of the great educators* (5th ed., Revised by J. Scotland). New York: MacMillan Press.
- Ruxton, I. M. (1938). *The pathway plan: Individual methods in the infant room*. London: University of London Press.
- Ryan, S., & Oshsner, M. (1999). Traditional practices, new possibilities: Transforming dominant images of early childhood teachers. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 24 (4), 14-20.
- Saran, R. (1985). The use of archives and interviews in research on educational policy. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), *Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods* (pp. 207-244). London: The Falmer Press.

- Schechter, M. D. (1970). Montessori and the child's natural development. In K. Edelson & R. C. Orem (Eds.), *The children's house parent-teacher guide to Montessori* (pp. 72-83). New York: Capricorn Books.
- Schmid, J. (1978) *Montessori for everyone? Adapting Montessori for the regular classroom*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 157 638).
- Schofield, J. W. (1993). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Educational research: Current issues* (pp. 91-113). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Schon, D. A. (1963). *The displacement of concepts*. London: Tavistock Press.
- Schweinhart, L. J., & Epstein, A. S. (1997). Curriculum and evaluation in early childhood programs. In B. Spodek & O. N. Saracho (Eds.), *Issues in early childhood educational assessment and evaluation. Yearbook in early childhood education* (Vol. 7, pp. 48-68). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Scott, E., compiled by McDonald, G. (1975). *An early Wellington kindergarten as described by Ted Scott*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Scott, D., & Usher, R. (1999). *Researching education. Data, methods and theory in educational enquiry*. London & New York: Cassell.
- Seefeldt, C. (1977, April). *Montessori and responsive environment models: A longitudinal study of two preschool programs, phase two*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 139 520).
- Seefeldt, C. (1981). Social and emotional adjustment of first grade children with and without Montessori preschool experience. *Child Study Journal*, 11 (4), 231-246.
- Seefeldt, C. (Ed.). (1992). *The early childhood curriculum. A review of current research* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Selleck, R. J. W. (1972). *English primary education and the progressives, 1914-1939*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research. A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research. A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (2nd ed.). New York & London: Teachers College Press.
- Seldin, T. (2000). Montessori 101: Some basic information that every Montessori parent should know. *Tomorrow's Child Magazine*, 8 (5). A publication of the Montessori Foundation.

- Sherman, R. R., & Webb, R. B. (Eds.). (1988). *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Shiple, G. L., & Oborn, C. S. (1996, October). *A review of four preschool programs: A preschool model that works*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 401 034).
- Shuker, M. J. (1988). *Children and classroom tasks: From Montessori pre-school to state primary school*. Unpublished Special Topic submitted to Massey University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Diploma in Education with Endorsement in Early Childhood Education.
- Shuker, R. (1987). *The one best system? A revisionist history of state schooling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data. Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Silverman, D. (1997). *Qualitative research. Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Simpson, M. M. (1912). Cited in *Harold*, NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21.
- Simpson, M. M. (1913). Simpson to Allen, Frankfurt, 3 March 1912, *James Allen Papers*, New Zealand National Archives, M2/93.
- Simpson, M. M. (1914). *Report on the Montessori method of education*, New Zealand National Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21.
- Simons, J. A. (1980). *Preschools and Montessori preschools: A discussion*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202 573).
- Simons, J. A., & Simons, F. A. (1986). Montessori and regular preschools: A comparison. In L. Katz (Ed.), *Current topics in early childhood education* (Vol. 6, pp. 195-223). New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Simons, M. (1988). Montessori, superman, and catwoman. *Educational Theory*, 38 (3), 341-349.
- Smith, A. B. (1995, December) *Incorporating children's perspectives into research: Challenge and opportunity*. New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Annual Conference, Palmerston North.
- Smith, A. B. (1997, March 12). *Defining and choosing quality: Messages from research*. Talk to Seminar Quality Contexts for Children's Development. University of Otago: Dunedin, Children's Issues Centre, Invercargill.
- Smith, A. B. (1998). *Understanding children's development. A New Zealand Perspective* (4th ed.). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

- Smith, A. B., & Barraclough, S. I. (1997). Quality childcare: Do parents choose it? *Early Childhood Folio 3. A Collection of Recent Research* (pp. 19-22). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Smith, A. B., & Farquhar, S. E. (1994). The New Zealand experience of charter development in early childhood services. In P. Moss & A. Pence (Eds.), *Valuing quality in early childhood services. New approaches to defining quality* (pp. 123-141). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Smith, A. B., & Taylor, N. J. (Eds.). (1996). *Assessing and improving quality in early childhood centres*. University of Otago, Dunedin: Children's Issues Centre.
- Smith, T. L. (1912). *The Montessori system in theory and practice. An introduction to the pedagogic methods of Dr. Maria Montessori*. New York & London: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Snook, I. (1999). The ethics and politics of social research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand* (pp. 69-81). Auckland: Longman.
- Spock, B., & Hathaway, M. L. (1968). Montessori and traditional American nursery schools - How they are different, how they are alike. In J. L. Frost (Ed.), *Early childhood education rediscovered. Readings* (pp. 72-78). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Spodek, B. (Ed.). (1982). *Handbook of research in early childhood education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Spodek, B., & Saracho, O. N. (1990). Early childhood curriculum construction and classroom practice. *Early Child Development and Care*, 61, 1-9.
- Spodek, B., & Saracho, O. N. (1996). Culture and the early childhood curriculum. *Early Child Development and Care*, 123, 1-13.
- Sri Lanka's newest export - Montessori teachers. (1977, April 22-28). *Honey*, p. 14.
- Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Standing, E. M. (1962). *Maria Montessori. Her life and work*. Scarborough: The New American Library Of Canada Limited. (Original work published 1957).
- Standing, E. M. (1966). *The Montessori revolution in education*. New York:

- Schocken Books. (Original work published 1962).
- Standing, E. M. (1970). The proof of the pudding. In K. Edelson & R. C. Orem (Eds.), *The children's house parent-teacher guide to Montessori* (pp. 173-181). New York: Capricorn Books.
- Stephens, M. W., & Delys, P. (1973). External control expectancies among disadvantaged children at preschool age. *Child Development*, 44 (3), 670-674.
- Stoops, J. A. (1987, October). *Maria Montessori: An intellectual portrait*. Paper presented at the Convention of the American Montessori Society, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 289 600).
- Stott, D. (2002, April). *The Nineteenth Annual General Meeting of the Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc.*, Auckland.
- Stover, S. (1997, October). Fellow travellers – adult education amongst children: Educating parents in the Playcentre movement, 1941-1997. *New Zealand Journal of Adult Learning*, 25 (2), 53-81.
- Stover, S. (1998, October). Fellow travellers – adult education amongst children. Part two: Playcentre as a social movement. *New Zealand Journal of Adult Learning*, 26 (2), 34-46.
- Suransky, V. P. (1982). *The erosion of childhood*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor-Hershel, D., & Webster, R. (1983). Mainstreaming: A case in point. *Childhood Education*, 175-180.
- Te One, S. (2003). The context for *Te Whāriki*: Contemporary issues of influence. In J. Nutall (ed.), *Weaving Te Whāriki. Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum. Document in theory and practice* (17-49). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Thielke, R. (1970). Montessori in the home. In K. Edelson & R. C. Orem (Eds.), *The children's house parent-teacher guide to Montessori* (pp. 97-104). New York: Capricorn Books.
- The Diamond Jubilee of the Sisters of Our Lady of the Missions in New Zealand*. (1928). Sacred Heart Girls' College, Christchurch.
- The Montessori System IV Recent Developments in England. (1912). Reported in *Times Educational Supplement*, James Allen Paper, New Zealand National Archives, 5, M2/93.
- Tierney, W., G. (2000). Undaunted courage: Life history and the postmodern challenge. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 537-553). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Times Educational Supplement* (1912). James Allen Papers, New Zealand National Archives, Wellington, 5, M2/93, 3 December.
- Tittle, B., & Ohlhaber, D. (1977). The truth about Montessori. *Day Care and Early Education*, January/February, 12-13, 42.
- Torrence, M. (2001). Montessori and play: Theory vs. practice. *Montessori Life*, 13 (3), 8-11.
- Travers, R. (1968). Analysis of the characteristics of children implicit in the Montessori methods. In J. L. Frost (Ed.), *Early childhood education rediscovered. Readings* (pp. 96-101). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Turner, J. S. (1992). Montessori's writings versus Montessori's practices. In M. H. Loeffler (Ed.), *Montessori in contemporary American culture* (pp. 17-47). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Turney, C. (Ed.). (1983). *Pioneers of Australian education. Volume 3. Studies of the development of education in Australia 1900-50*. Adelaide: Griffin Press Limited.
- Walford, G. (2001). *Doing qualitative educational research. A personal guide to the research process*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Weber, E. (1969). *The kindergarten: Its encounter with educational thought in America*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Welch, D. (1999, February 6). That learning feeling. *Listener*, 30-32.
- Wentworth, R. A. L. (1999). *Montessori for the new millennium: Practical guidance on the teaching and education of children of all ages, based on a rediscovery of the true principles and vision of Maria Montessori*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research methods in education. An introduction* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wiley, K., & Langford, P. (1981). A comparison of Montessori with traditional pre-school education in Melbourne. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 6 (1), 24-25.
- Wheatley, H. (1996). Children were her intimates. *Montessori Education. The International Montessori Journal*, 17 (5), 16-18.
- White, S. H., & Buka, S. L. (1987). Early education: Programs, traditions, and policies. In E. Z. Rothkopf (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education* (Vol. 14, pp. 43-91). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data. Description, analysis, and*

interpretation. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Wolf, A. D. (1980). *A parents' guide to the Montessori classroom*. Altoona: Parent Child Press.

Wolfe, J. (2000). *Learning from the past. Historical voices in early childhood education*. Mayerthorpe, Alberta: Piney Branch Press.

Wood, L., & Attfield, J. (1996). *Play, learning and the early childhood curriculum*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Wortham, S. C. (1995). *Measurement and evaluation in early childhood education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Wylie, C. (1996). *Five years old & competent. A summary of the main findings of the first stage of the competent children project*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Wylie, C., Thompson, J., & Kerslake-Hendricks, A. K. (1996). *Competent children at 5. Families and early education*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Wylie, C., & Thompson, J. (1998). *Competent children at 6: Families, early education, and schools*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Wylie, C., Thompson, J., & Lythe, C. (1999). *Competent children at 8: Families, early childhood and schools*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Yin, R. K. (1993). *Applications of case study research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research. Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yussen, S. R., Mathews, S., & Knight, J. W. (1980). Performance of Montessori and traditionally schooled nursery children on social cognitive tasks and memory problems. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 5, 124-137.

New Zealand National Archives

Education Department File re Montessori, New Zealand National Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21.

Report on Apiti Public School. (1917). Inspector's Reports on Schools. Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 68, 1917-1919, 29 August.

- Report on Ashhurst Public School. (1917). Inspector's Reports on Schools. Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 68, 1917-1919, 30- 31 July.
- Report on Awahuri School. (1920). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Board Archives, ABCV W3571 – Box 62, 1920-23, 30 September.
- Report on Central Infants' Public School (1917). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 68, 1917-1919, 11-12 October.
- Report on Central Infants' Public School (1921). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABCV W3571 – Box 62, 1920-23, 10 June.
- Report on Central Infants' Public School (1922). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABCV W3571 – Box 62, 1920-23, 10 November.
- Report on Hawera District High School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools. Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-1916, 19 -20 June.
- Report on Katatahi Public School. (1917). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 68, 1917-1919, 31 October.
- Report on Lytton Street School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools. Unnotified Visits. Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-1916, 16 June.
- Report on Makino School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools. Unnotified Visits. Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-16, 7 March.
- Report on Manutahi School. (1922). Inspector's Reports on Schools. Wanganui Education Archives, ABCV W3571 – Box 62, 1920-1922, 20 March.
- Report on Marton District High School. (1922). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABCV W3571 – Box 62, 1920-1922, 7 August.
- Report on Maxwell School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-1916, 18 April.
- Report on Nugutuwera School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-1916, 19 April.
- Report on Ohingaiti School. (1917). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 68, 1917-1919, 20 August.
- Report on Ohingaiti School. (1922). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABCV W3571 – Box 62, 1922 O-W, 14 March.
- Report on Okoia School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-16, 13 June.

Report on Okoia School. (1922). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABCV W3571 – Box 62, 1922 O-W, 17 August.

Report on Opaku School. (1917). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 68, 1917-1919, 25 July.

Report on Parewanui School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Board Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-16, 29 February.

Report on Pohongina School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Board Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-16, 26 September.

Report on Umutoi School. (1917). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Board Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 68, 1917-1919, 7 August.

Report on Waitohi School. (1916). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Board Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 67, 1912-16, 8 September.

Report on Waverley School. (1920). Inspector's Reports on Schools, Wanganui Education Board Archives, ABDV W3571 – Box 62, 1920-22, 15/18 November.

Wanganui Education Board Minute Books. (1912-19). Wanganui Education Board, New Zealand National Archives, ABCV W3571, Box 100, 26 June.

The [] Montessori Association Archives

The Massey University Human Ethics Committee requested that the name of the early childhood centre was not identified. The name has been replaced with [] to meet ethic protocol.

Association Newsletters. (1977). [] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Association Newsletters. (1982-1989). [] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Association Newsletters. (1990-2000). [] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Charter of the [] Montessori Association. 1991. [] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Financial Statements. (1977). [] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Financial Statements. (1978). [] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minute Book of Case Study Montessori Association. (8 March 1980 - 4 December 1985). [] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minute Book of Case Study Montessori Association. (5 February 1986 – 12 February 1991). [] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minute Book of Case Study Montessori Association. (26 February 1991 - 13 October 1992). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minute Book of Case Study Montessori Association. (10 November 1992 – 20 February 1996). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minutes of Case Study Montessori Association. (1997). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minutes of Executive Committee of the Case Study Montessori Association. (1997). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minutes of Case Study Montessori Association. (1998). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minutes of Executive Committee of the Case Study Montessori Association. (1998). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minutes of Executive Committee of the Case Study Montessori Association. (1999). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Minutes of Executive Committee of the Case Study Montessori Association. (2000). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Montessori Association of New Zealand. (no date). Memorandum from MANZ charter development group. [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Smith, T. (1995). Why people choose Montessori as their preschool option. [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.*

Written Communications

Ball, M. J. (1983a). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*, July 5.

Ball, M. J. (1983b). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*, July 29.

Hallifax, C. (1982a). Letter outlining proposed national Montessori meeting 1982.

Hallifax, C. (1982b). Letter confirming the organisation of a National Montessori meeting, 14 September.

Hallifax, C. (1982c). Agenda for the National Montessori meeting held in Palmerston North, October.

Jones, C. (1983a). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.* Correspondence with M. J. Ball, 14 July.

Jones, C. (1983b). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.* Correspondence with M. J. Ball, August 15.

- Jones, C. (1983c). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with M. J. Ball, September 9.
- Lindsay, Sister A. (1984). Correspondence to B. Goldsbrough, 14 April.
- Mountsier, C. (1991). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence to G. Wilson, 8 March.
- O'Neil, S. (1978). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with R. Ryan, 3 November.
- Reilly, E. M. (1997, June). *Report on [_____] Montessori preschool*. [_____] Montessori Association, Inc. Archives.
- Ryan, R. (1978). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with R. Hay, 26 September.
- Ryan, R. (1979a). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with R. Hay, 6 March.
- Ryan, R. (1979b). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with S. O'Neil, 20 April.
- Ryan, R. (1979c). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with S. O'Neil, May.
- Ryan, R. (1979d). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with S. O'Neil, 3 September.
- Ryan, R. (1979e). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with M. Sedcole, 18 December.
- Ryan, R. (1980). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with M. Sedcole, 16 January.
- Ryan, R. (1983). Correspondence to M. J. Ball, 10 August.
- Russell, D. (1982). Questions posed at the National Montessori Meeting held in Palmerston North, October.
- Russell, D. (1983). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with B. Clothier, 17 March 1983.
- Sedcole, M. (1979). *Case Study Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence with R. Ryan, 30 November.
- Sedcole, M. (1980). *Case Study Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence to R. Ryan, 4 January.
- Sedcole, M. (1993). Correspondence to A. Grant, 6 February.

Slee, A. (1989a). [_____] *Montessori Association, Inc. Archives*. Correspondence to M. J. Shuker, 14 January.

Slee, A. (1989b). Correspondence to M. J. Shuker, 16 April.

Slee, A. (1989c). Correspondence to M. J. Shuker, 5 May.

Stott, D. (2000). Correspondence to M. J. Shuker, 19 March.

Unpublished Sources

Goldsbrough, B. (1963). *Movement in relation to learning processes*. Talk given to the Canterbury Branch of the New Zealand Society of Physiotherapists, 2 November.

Goldsbrough, B. (1982a). Why a national Montessori body?

Goldsbrough, B. (1982b). Comments from the Montessori Association of Christchurch on questions posed by David Russell at the National Montessori Meeting, Palmerston North, November.

Goldsbrough, B. (1988a, July). Letter to the members of the Montessori Association of Christchurch Inc.

Goldsbrough, B. (1988b, October). Report from the Training Panel to the Annual General Meeting of the Montessori Association of New Zealand Inc.

Goldsbrough, B. (1996). *Some reminiscences of Binda Goldsbrough from 1951 to 1996*.

Hennessey, B. (1989). Letter to Binda Goldsbrough.

Web based References

<http://www.amshq.org>

<http://www.ero.govt.nz/Publications/pubs2002/Montessori.htm>

<http://www.montessori.ac.uk/history.html>

<http://www.montessori-ami.org/ami.htm>

<http://www.montessori-namta.org>

<http://www.montessori-ncme.org>

http://www.montessori.org.nz/employment_opportunities.htm

Appendix A

Information Sheet, Consent Form and Interview Schedules (Former Montessori Teachers, Parents and Pupils)

[Massey University Letterhead]

INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Mary Jane Shuker and I am a student at Massey University College of Education, working towards a PhD on Montessori education in New Zealand. This research is supervised by Dr. Joy Cullen (PH: 351 3355) and Dr. Roger Openshaw (PH: 351 3373). I am a Montessori teacher, and for six years I was the Head Teacher of a Montessori Pre-school, teaching children aged 2 1/2 to 5 years.

The purpose of this research project is to examine the historical rise and fall and resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand. In the early 1900s, the Montessori system was being extensively tried throughout New Zealand, both in training colleges and schools. However, the Montessori method failed to maintain and consolidate its presence in this country. More recently, Montessori schooling has experienced a world-wide resurgence, and there are currently seventy-nine Montessori schools in New Zealand.

Part of this research is concerned with Montessori teachers, parents, and former pupils perceptions of the nature and value of Montessori education, and their understanding of the Montessori philosophy. In particular, this research will provide information on how well Montessori education is working in New Zealand and if it has been successful in preparing children for the mainstream primary school system.

I would like to invite you to take part in this study. Participation will involve an interview, which would last approximately an hour. I assure you that any information gathered will remain anonymous. The transcripts of the taped interview will be shown to you to verify that it is a correct record, and you will be given the opportunity to change it. The interviews will be retained for archival purposes.

Only my supervisors and I will have direct access to the interview tapes, which I will transcribe. All information given will be confidential to the research and any publications resulting from it. This research is not an evaluation of the school.

Participation in this research will be voluntary. You have the right to refuse to answer any particular questions. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time. During the interview you are encouraged to ask any questions about the study at any time. If you agree to provide information, it is on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher.

A summary of the results will be made available on completion of the research project.

If you have any questions concerning the Information Sheet or the Consent Form please feel free to contact me (PH: 356 3687 - home) for further information.

Thank you for your time.

Mary Jane Shuker

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

CONSENT FORM (FORMER MONTESSORI TEACHERS AND PARENTS)

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the research project explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that I have the right to decline to answer any particular questions.

I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my name will not be used without my permission. *(The information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project).*

I agree/do not agree to the interview being audio taped.

I also understand that I have the right to ask for the audio tape to be turned off at any time during the interview.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signed:

.....

Name:

.....

Date:

.....

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

CONSENT FORM (FORMER PUPILS)

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand I have the right to withdraw my child from the study at any time. My child has the right to decline to answer any particular questions.

I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my child's name will not be used without my permission. *(The information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project).*

I agree/do not agree to my child's interview being audio taped.

I also understand that I have the right to ask for the audio tape to be turned off at any time during my child's interview.

I agree for my child to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signed:

.....

.....

Name:

.....

Date:

.....

Former Montessori Teachers' Interview Schedule

1. How did you first become interested in the Montessori method of education?
2. Why did you decide to become a Montessori teacher?
3. Where did you do your training?
4. How did you learn about the training programme that you undertook?
5. Did you feel that your training course adequately prepared you for teaching in a Montessori classroom?
6. How many years have you taught in a Montessori school?
7. Are you currently teaching? If yes, how did you find out about your current teaching position? (Advert, word of mouth, etc.)?
8. What is your teaching position?
9. How is the organisation of your school managed? (Parent-run committee, principal, privately owned and/or operated, etc.)
10. How long has your school been operating?
11. How well do you think the Montessori programme is for preparing children for primary school?
12. How receptive were the local [] primary schools to Montessori education?
13. How did the [] Montessori pre-school liaise with the local schools in an effort to make the transition from pre-school to school an easy one for your pupils?
14. Which of the curriculum areas (Practical Life, Sensorial, Language, Math, Cultural Subjects, and Art) do you feel are most important for preparing children for primary school? Why?
15. Which of the curriculum areas do you feel are least important? Why?
16. In what way did DOPS (Statement of Desirable Principles and Practices) affected your programme?
17. In what way did *Te Whāriki* affected your programme?
18. Since your training have you made any changes to the way you teach the Montessori method? If you answered yes, please explain.
19. What kind of feedback do you get from former parents? Their children?

20. How informed were your clientele on the Montessori philosophy?
21. What are your feelings as to the direction Montessori education is taking in New Zealand?
22. Do you think an Early Childhood Education curriculum is a positive step?
23. How do you think this will affect individual Montessori programmes?
24. Does your pre-school receive bulk funding?
25. How has this affected your programme?
26. Do you have any comments regarding the National Montessori Association?
27. Do you think Montessori education has a high profile today?
28. Any other comments or concerns about Montessori education/Montessori in New Zealand?

Former Parents' Interview Schedule

1. How did you (parents) learn about the Montessori method of education?
 - educational literature?
 - friends/associates?
 - television document?
 - acquaintances who had children who went to Montessori?
 - open day/pamphlets/advertising?
 - from personal investigation/visit/inquiry?
2. How important was:
 - the location of the Pre-school relative to one's home or work?
 - the teacher-child ratios?
 - the number of children per class, ie class size?
 - the Montessori philosophy?
 - the structured environment and specialised materials?
 - guiding or directing children through the learning process rather than teaching them?
 - yours, or your child's friends attending the Pre-school?
 - children learning at their own level or pace?
 - the half-day sessional programme?
3. Do you think your child gained from going to Montessori? If so, what?
4. Did you see any disadvantages sending your child to Montessori?
5. At what age did your child start Montessori?
6. Did your child complete the full programme? If no, why not?
7. How did your child adjust to the transition from pre-school to school?
8. How receptive was your child's primary teacher to the Montessori way of education?
9. Have you been able to see the effects of the Montessori education reflected in your child's education, particularly in the primary school system?
10. Any other comments or concerns?

Former Pupils' Interview Schedule

1. Do you remember your Montessori teacher's name?
2. What do you remember about the other children who were at Montessori with you?
3. Did any children from Montessori go to your primary school? If yes, were any in your class?
4. What was different about going to primary school?
5. What do you remember about your time at Montessori?
6. Do you think that attending Montessori helped you at primary school?
7. Can you describe any of the materials that were in the classroom?
8. Which materials did you like working with best of all?
9. Were there any materials that you did not like working with? If yes, why not?
10. Did you enjoy your time at Montessori?
11. What do you consider the advantages of attending the Montessori pre-school?
12. What is your favourite subject at school?
13. Any other comments you would like to make?

Appendix B

Survey of Current Montessori Teachers

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Mary Jane Shuker and I am a student at Massey University College of Education, working towards a PhD on Montessori Education in New Zealand. This research is supervised by Dr. Joy Cullen (PH: (06) 351 3355) and Dr. Roger Openshaw (PH: (06) 351 3373). I hold a post-graduate teaching diploma in Montessori education, and for six years I was the Head Teacher of a Montessori Pre-school, teaching children aged 2 1/2 to 5 years.

The purpose of this research project is to examine the historical rise and fall and resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand. In the early 1900s, the Montessori system was being extensively tried throughout New Zealand, both in training colleges and schools. However, the Montessori method failed to maintain and consolidate its presence in this country. More recently, Montessori schooling has experienced a world-wide resurgence, and there are currently 79 Montessori schools in New Zealand.

Part of this research is concerned with Montessori teachers' perceptions of the nature and value of Montessori education. In particular, this research will provide information on how well Montessori education is working in New Zealand, and if it has been successful in preparing children for the mainstream primary school system. I am also interested in why people choose to become Montessori teachers.

I would like to invite you to take part in this study by filling in the attached questionnaire. If you take part in this survey I assure you that any information gathered will remain anonymous. However, due to the specific survey group, total anonymity may not be guaranteed. All information given will be confidential to the research and any publications resulting from it.

It is assumed that filling in the questionnaire implies consent. You have the right to decline to answer any particular questions. If you decide to complete the questionnaire then a stamped self-addressed envelope has been provided.

A summary of the results will be made available on completion of the research project.

If you have any questions concerning the questionnaire please feel free to contact me (PH: (06) 356 3687 - Home) for further information.

Thank you for your time.

Mary Jane Shuker

Survey of Current Montessori Teachers

1. Where did you do your training? (Please state the name of the organisation affiliation of your training programme, such as AMI, AMS, Aperfield Montessori, St. Nicholas, London Montessori Centre, etc.)

2. How did you learn about Montessori?

3. Why did you decide to become a Montessori Directress?

4. Where did you learn about the training programme that you undertook?

5. How long have you been teaching in a Montessori school since your training?

6. What is your position? (For example, Head Directress, Directress, Assistant Directress, etc.)

7. How did you find out about your current teaching position? (Advert, word of mouth, etc.)

8. When was your school established?

9. How is the organisation of your school managed? (Parent-run committee, principal, privately owned and/or operated, etc.)

10. How many children are enrolled in your Montessori programme?

11. List the 3 major goals of your school in order of importance:

12. Summarise briefly how these goals are implemented:

13. How many teachers do you have at the school?

14. How many teachers are qualified in Montessori, early childhood education (specify), other?

15. How successful do you think the Montessori programme is for preparing children for primary school?

16. Which of the curriculum areas (Practical Life, Sensorial, Language, Math, Cultural Subjects, and Art) do you feel are most important for preparing children for primary school? Why?

17. Which of the curriculum areas do you feel are of the least importance? Why?

18. In what way has DOPS (Statement of Desirable Principles and Practice) affected your programme?

19. In what way has *Te Whāriki* affected your programme?

20. Since your training have you made any changes to the way you teach the Montessori method? If you answered yes, please explain.

21. What kind of feedback do you get from former pupils? Their parents?

22. Other comments or concerns?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Mary Jane Shuker

Appendix C

Information Letter for Experienced Montessori Teachers

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

My name is Mary Jane Shuker and I am a student at Massey University College of Education, working towards a PhD on Montessori Education in New Zealand. This research is supervised by Dr. Joy Cullen (Ph: (06) 356 9099 Ext. 8955) and Dr. Roger Openshaw (Ph: (06) 356 9099 Ext. 8847). Currently I lecturer in early years education at Massey University College of Education. I am also a trained Montessori teacher and for seven years I was the Head Teacher of a Montessori Pre-school, teaching children aged 2 1/2 to 5 years.

The purpose of this research project is to examine the historical rise and fall and resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand. In the early 1900s, the Montessori system was being extensively tried throughout New Zealand, both in training colleges and schools. However, the Montessori method failed to maintain and consolidate its presence in this country. More recently, Montessori schooling has experienced a worldwide resurgence, and there are currently 100 Montessori schools in New Zealand.

Part of this research is concerned with Montessori teachers' perceptions of the nature and value of Montessori education. A postal survey was undertaken to gauge this as well as provide information on how well Montessori education is working in New Zealand and if it has been successful in preparing children for the mainstream primary school system. The questionnaire also provided information on why people choose to become Montessori teachers. A summary of the main findings to date has been collated.

I would like to invite you to take part in this study by commenting on the findings to date. At this phase of the doctoral research it is important to ascertain the viewpoint of experienced Montessori educators. It is anticipated that this will take up to two hours of your time. I assure you that any information gathered will remain anonymous. However, due to the specific survey group, total anonymity may not be guaranteed. All information given will be confidential to the research and any publications resulting from it.

As a participant you have the right:

- to decline to participate;
- to refuse to answer any particular questions;
- to withdraw from the study at any time;
- to ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- to provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
- to be given access to a summary of the findings of the study when it is concluded.

It is assumed that filling in the questionnaire implies consent. You have the right to decline to answer any particular questions. If you decide to complete the questionnaire then a stamped self-addressed envelope has been provided.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, PN Protocol 02/49. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Professor Sylvia V. Rumball, Chair, Massey University Regional Human Ethics Committee: Palmerston North, telephone 06 350 5249, email S.V.

HYPERLINK <mailto:Rumball@massey.ac.nz>.

Rumball@massey.ac.nz.

If you have any questions concerning the questionnaire please feel free to contact me (Ph: (06) 356 9099 Ext. 8826) for further information. I would really appreciate you finding the time to complete this questionnaire by _____. Your response will make a valuable contribution to my research.

Thank you for your time.

Mary Jane Shuker

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

CONSENT FORM FOR EXPERT GROUP

The researcher would like to request permission to have your name published in the research report so that the information and opinions given in the questionnaire may be attributed to you unless requested otherwise.

I agree/do not agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my name will be used.

Signed:

Name:

Date:

Appendix D

Permission Forms for School Administrators

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Mary Jane Shuker and I am a student at Massey University College of Education, working towards a PhD on Montessori education in New Zealand. This research is supervised by Dr. Joy Cullen (PH: 351 3355) and Dr. Roger Openshaw (PH: 351 3373). I hold a post-graduate teaching diploma in Montessori education, and for six years I was the Head Teacher of a Montessori Pre-school, teaching children aged 2 1/2 to 5 years.

The purpose of this research project is to examine the historical rise and fall and resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand. In the early 1900s, the Montessori system was being extensively tried throughout New Zealand, both in training colleges and schools. However, the Montessori method failed to maintain and consolidate its presence in this country. More recently, Montessori schooling has experienced a world-wide resurgence, and there are currently seventy-nine Montessori schools in New Zealand.

Part of this research is concerned with how Government policies influence Montessori. In particular, I am interested in how the policies and practices of the Association support the delivery of high quality care and education in accordance with the Montessori philosophy.

I would like to invite you to take part in this study. Participation will involve examination of the current administration of the pre-school. As you are an elected member of the school's administration, I would like permission to attend executive committee meetings, be a participating member, and to view documentation that is relevant.

While undertaking this research, I will take a leave of absence from my duties on behalf of the Association. Furthermore, this research is not an evaluation of the school.

Only my supervisors and I will have direct access to any information gathered. All information given will be confidential to the research and any publications resulting from it.

Participation in this research will be voluntary. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time. You have the right to ask any questions about the study at any time during participation. If you agree to provide information, it is on the

understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher.

A summary of the results will be made available on completion of the research project.

If you have any questions concerning the Information Sheet or the Consent Form, please feel free to contact me (PH: 356 3687 - Home) for further information.

Thank you for your time.

Mary Jane Shuker

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

CONSENT FORM

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that I have the right to decline to answer any particular questions.

I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my name will not be used without my permission. *(The information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project).*

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signed:.....

Name:

Date:

Appendix E

Permission Forms To Observe Children

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Mary Jane Shuker and I am a student at Massey University College of Education, working towards a PhD on Montessori education in New Zealand. This research is supervised by Dr. Joy Cullen (PH: 351 3355) and Dr. Roger Openshaw (PH: 351 3373). I hold a post-graduate teaching diploma in Montessori education, and for six years I was the Head Teacher of a Montessori Pre-school, teaching children aged 2 1/2 to 5 years. In April 1998 I was rehired as Head Teacher and taught till the end of the year.

The purpose of this research project is to examine the historical rise and fall and resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand. In the early 1900s, the Montessori system was being extensively tried throughout New Zealand, both in training colleges and schools. However, the Montessori method failed to maintain and consolidate its presence in this country. More recently, Montessori schooling has experienced a world-wide resurgence, and there are currently seventy-nine Montessori schools in New Zealand.

Part of this research is concerned with the way in which the original ideas of Dr. Maria Montessori have been reworked to suit a different historical and social context. Direct observation of the children in the classroom will be part of this study.

I invite your child to take part in this research. Participation will involve observing children working with the Montessori materials, interacting with the teachers and with their peers. I would like permission to observe your child twice during the morning session for a three week period, in the first and second terms of 1999.

The name of your child will remain anonymous. The information gathered will be confidential to the research and any publication resulting from it.

Your child's participation in this research will be voluntary. You have the right to withdraw your child from the research at any time.

This research is not an evaluation of the school.

A summary of the results will be made available on completion of the research project.

If you have any questions concerning the Information Sheet or the Consent Form please feel free to contact me (PH: 356 3687 - Home) for further information.

Thank you for your time.

Mary Jane Shuker

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

CONSENT FORM

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand I have the right to withdraw my child from the study at any time.

I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my child's name will not be used without my permission. *(The information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project.)*

I agree for my child to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signed:

.....

.....

Name:

.....

Date:

.....

Appendix F

Permission Forms To Observe Teachers

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Mary Jane Shuker and I am a student at Massey University College of Education, working towards a PhD on Montessori education in New Zealand. This research is supervised by Dr. Joy Cullen (PH: 351 3355) and Dr. Roger Openshaw (PH: 351 3373). I hold a post-graduate teaching diploma in Montessori education, and for six years I was the Head teacher of a Montessori Pre-school, teaching children aged 2 1/2 to 5 years. In April I was rehired as Head Teacher.

The purpose of this research project is to examine the historical rise and fall and resurgence of Montessori education in New Zealand. In the early 1900s, the Montessori system was being extensively tried throughout New Zealand, both in training colleges and schools. However, the Montessori method failed to maintain and consolidate its presence in this country. More recently, Montessori schooling has experienced a world-wide resurgence, and there are currently seventy nine Montessori schools in New Zealand.

Part of this research is concerned with the way in which the original ideas of Dr. Maria Montessori have been reworked to suit a different historical and social context. Direct observation of the teachers and children in the classroom will be part of this study.

I would like to invite you to take part in this research. Participation will involve observing your morning preparation for the day's teaching, and inquiring what reasoning lay behind your selection of activities. I would like permission to observe what actually happens in the classroom for a three week period, two times in the 1999 school year. The observation in the classroom will be non participant, i.e. I will not be contributing to the class.

Participation in this research will be voluntary. You have the right to decline to participate. You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. You have the right to ask any questions about the study at any time during participation.

If you agree to provide information, it is on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher. The information given will be confidential to the research and any publication resulting from it.

The research is not an evaluation of the school.

A summary of the results will be made available on completion of the research project.

If you have any questions concerning the Information Sheet or the Consent Form please feel free to contact me (PH: 356 3687 - home) for further information.

Thank you for your time.

Mary Jane Shuker

[Massey University Letterhead]

The Historical Evolution and Contemporary Status of Montessori Schooling in New Zealand, as an Example of the Adaptation of an Alternative Educational Ideal to a Particular National Context.

CONSENT FORM

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that I have the right to decline to answer any particular questions.

I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my name will not be used without my permission. *(The information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project).*

I agree/do not agree to provide written permission to the researcher to view my contract.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signed:

Name:

Date:

Appendix G

Some Highlights in the Life of Dr. Maria Montessori

1896 First woman to receive her doctorate in medicine, University of Rome

- Represented Italian women in Feminist Congress in Berlin
- Practiced medicine in clinics, hospitals and privately... positions varied: ten years of medical practice, special interest in the 'nervous diseases of children' ... went to Bicetre and Salpetriere in Paris to study the subject. Her publications at this time were various, such as *The Cephalo-Tachitic liquid in Paralytic Insanity*, *The Case of a Solitary Tubercle in the Middle Brain*, *The influence of Culture on Reactions to Psychological Tests*, *The Psychic and Anthropological Characteristics of Women of Latium*, *The Influence of Social Conditions on the Mental Development of Children in Schools*, *Anthropological Characteristics of Children Who are Judged As Either the Best or Worse in Public Schools*, and *Sexual Education Among Children*

1886 - 1906

- Chairman of Hygiene (Health) at Magistero Femminile of Roma of the two universities for women in Italy
- Director of the Orthophrenic Institute, Rome
- Attended feminist Congress in London: spoke against child labour
- Gave up position at Orthophrenic School to study psychology and philosophy at University of Rome (in addition to her ongoing medical career)
- Lecturer in Anthropology, University of Rome – taught anthropology to medical students and students in natural science and pedagogy, wrote (1904) first major publication entitled *Pedagogical Anthropology*, lecturer until 1916

1907 Opening of the first Casa dei Bambini

- Publication of *The Montessori Method*, written in Italian. Montessori gave up her medical practice and her two chairs at the University of Rome, became supported by her teacher training activity and eventually royalties from her books

1911 Articles in *McClure's Magazine*, United States

- First school opens in the US

1912 Translation of *The Method of Scientific Pedagogy as Applied to Infant*

Education in the Children's Houses into English by an American who had taken Montessori training, Anne George – title change and book translated into fourteen languages including French, German, Russian and Japanese

- 1913 Model Montessori classroom set up in London
 - Montessori's first trip to United States
 - First Montessori school established in Spain
- 1914 Publication of *Dr. Montessori's Own Handbook*
 - Second International Montessori Congress, Rome
 - Opening of first Casa dei Bambini, Holland
- 1915 Third International Training Course, San Francisco
 - Second trip to the United States
 - Model classroom at San Francisco Exposition
- 1916 Publication of *The Advanced Montessori Method*
- 1917 Lecture to Pedagogical Society of Amsterdam
- 1919 First International Training course, London
- 1920 Lectures at the University of Amsterdam
- 1922 Lecture in Berlin
- 1924 International Training Course, Amsterdam
- 1926 Speaker at League of Nations, Geneva
 - Lectures in Berlin
 - Formation of Montessori Society, India
 - Private audience with Mussolini
 - Made honorary member of the Fascist Women's Organization
- 1927 Montessori Society of Argentine
 - Establishment of Training School, Rome
 - Travels to England
- 1929 Formation of Association Montessori Internationale (A.M.I.)
 - First International Congress, Denmark
- 1930 Formation of A.M.I. branch, England
- 1932 Second International Montessori Congress, Nice
 - Publication of *Peace in Education*
- 1933 International course, Barcelona
- 1934 Montessori Congress, Ireland

- Formation of Montessori Society, Ireland
 - Publication of *The Child in the Family* and *The Secret of Childhood*
- 1936 Amsterdam became A.M.I. Headquarters
- Montessori established her home in Laren, Holland
 - Fifth Montessori Congress, Oxford
- 1937 Left Spain
- Sixth International Montessori Congress, Copenhagen
- 1938 Seventh International Montessori Congress, Edinburgh
- 1939 Speech to World Fellowship of Faith
- Montessori goes to India
- 1945 First All-India Montessori Congress, Jaipur
- 1946 Returns to Holland from India
- Courses in London and Scotland
 - Publication for *Education for a New World*
- 1947 Celebrates 40th anniversary of Casa dei Bambini
- Establishment of Montessori Centre, London
 - Returns to India
- 1948 Publication of *Discovery of the Child, To Educate the Human Potential, and What You Should Know About Your Child*
- 1949 Receives Cross of the Legion of Honor, France
- Eighth International Congress, San Remo
 - To Pakistan to found a Montessori Association
 - Publication of *The Absorbent Mind*
- 1950 Nominated for Nobel Peace Prize
- Delegate to UNESCO Conference, Florence
 - Publication of *The Formation of Man*
- 1951 Ninth International Montessori Congress, London
- 1952 Maria Montessori dies, May 6, 1952.
(Faust, 1984; Kramer, 1988; Hainstock, 1997)

Appendix H

Rules and Regulations of the “Children’s Houses”

The Roman Association of Good Building hereby establishes within its tenement house number _____, a “Children’s House,” in which may be gathered together all children under common school age, belonging to the families of the tenants.

The chief aim of the “Children’s House” is to offer, free of charge, to the children of those parents who are obliged to absent themselves for their work, the personal care which the parents are not able to give.

In the “Children’s House” attention is given to the education, the health, the physical and moral development of the children. This work is carried on in a way suited to the age of the children.

There shall be connected with the “Children’s House” a Directress, a Physician, and a Caretaker.

The programme and hours of the “Children’s House” shall be fixed by the Directress.

There may be admitted to the “Children’s House” all the children in the tenement between the ages of three and seven.

The parents who wish to avail themselves of the advantages of the “Children’s House” pay nothing. They must, however, assume these bindings obligations:

- (a) To send their children to the “Children’s House” at the appointed time, clean in body and clothing, and provided with a suitable apron.
- (b) To show the greatest respect and deference toward the Directress and toward all persons connected with the “Children’s House,” and to co-operate with the Directress herself in the education of the children. Once a week, at least, the mothers may talk with the Directress, giving her information concerning the home life of the child, and receiving helpful advice from her.

There shall be expelled from the “Children’s House”:

- (a) Those children who present themselves unwashed, or in soiled clothing.
- (b) Those who show themselves to be incorrigible.
- (c) Those whose parents fail in respect to the persons connected with the “Children’s House,” or who destroy through bad conduct the educational work of the institution.

(Montessori, 1912/1964, pp. 70-71)

Appendix I

Montessori's Critics and Advocates

The strongest criticisms against her approach included the Scottish educational philosopher, William Boyd; the Dublin educator, R. J. Fynee; the well known American child psychologists, Arnold and Beatrice Gesell; William Kilpatrick, professor at Columbia Teacher's College; and the representatives of progressive educators and other child movement leaders, such as Michael O'Shea and Elizabeth Rose Shaw.

The critics appeared to be removed from direct contact with students, "more theorist than practical applicator, notably those teaching teachers" (Faust, 1984, p. 14). Exceptions were Edward P. Culverwell, a professor at Dublin University; Martha MaClear, who wrote about application of Montessori principles for Froebelian kindergartens; and Florence Elizabeth Ward, a professor of education at Iowa State Teachers College who travelled to Rome to study Montessori so that she would be able to lead curriculum seminars for her students. Montessori's advocates, on the other hand, were mainly teachers interested in exploring the value of applying Montessori's method within their own classrooms.

There were a number of important books and chapters written about Montessori after the publication of *The Montessori Method*. Among her critics, Beatrice and Arnold Gesell wrote a chapter on 'Montessori Kindergarten' in their book *The Normal Child and Primary Education* in 1912; *The Montessori Method: An Exposition and Criticism* was also published by S. A. Morgan that year. In 1914 William Boyd wrote *From Locke to Montessori – A Critical Account of the Montessori Point of View* and William Heard Kilpatrick published his influential book *The Montessori System Examined* in 1914 as well as a number of articles.

Among those offering mainly positive assessments of Montessori's method in the United States were Theodate L. Smith's *The Montessori System in Theory and Practice* (1912) and Ellen Yale Stevens, who wrote *Guide to the Montessori Method* in 1913 as well as a number of articles. That same year Florence Elizabeth Ward published *The Montessori Method and the American School* and Jessie White wrote *Montessori Schools as Seen in the Early Summer of 1913*. Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher (1913)

authored *A Montessori Mother*, followed up by *The Montessori Manual: In Which Dr. Montessori's Teachings and Educational Occupations are Arranged in Practical Exercises or Lessons for the Mother or the Teacher* (1914). During 1915 Carolyn Bailey published *Montessori Children*.

In the United Kingdom Professor E. P. Culverwell (1913), of Dublin University, wrote *The Montessori Principles and Practice*; Professor J. J. Findlay of Manchester University, sponsored Montessori research at the University's Fielden School, (Educative Toys, n.d.c.1913). Sheila Radice wrote *The New Children: Talks with Dr. Maria Montessori* (1920). Mary Blackburn in 1920 recorded *Montessori Experiments, with four classes in a large Infants' School in Leeds*. In 1921 Beatrice Ensor began a column in the journal of the New Education Fellowship, *New Era*, which was devoted to the Montessori approach and *The Time Educational Supplement* ran regular updates on Montessori's progress (Chisnal, 2002; Cunningham, 2000).

Appendix J

Montessori Didactic Material

The didactic material for the *education of the senses* consists of:

- (a) Three sets of solid insets.
- (b) Three sets of solids in graduated sizes, comprising:
 - (1) Pink cubes.
 - (2) Brown prisms.
 - (3) Rods: (a) colored green; (b) colored alternately red and blue.
- (c) Various geometric solids (prism, pyramid, sphere, cylinder, cone, etc.).
- (d) Rectangular tablets with rough and smooth surfaces.
- (e) A collection of various stuffs.
- (f) Small wooden tablets of different weights.
- (g) Two boxes, each containing sixty-four colored tablets.
- (h) A chest of drawers containing plane insets.
- (i) Three series of cards on which are pasted geometrical forms in paper
- (k) A collection of cylindrical closed boxes (sounds).
- (l) A double series of musical bells, wooden boards on which are painted the lines used in music, small wooden discs for the notes.

Didactic Material for the Preparation for Writing and Arithmetic

- (m) Two sloping desks and various iron insets.
- (n) Cards on which are pasted sandpaper letters.
- (o) Two alphabets of colored cardboard and of different sizes.
- (p) A series of cards on which are pasted sandpaper figures (1, 2, 3, etc.).
- (q) A series of large cards bearing the same figures in smooth paper for the enumeration of numbers above ten.
- (r) Two boxes with small sticks for counting.
- (s) The volume of drawings belonging specially to the method, and colored pencils.
- (t) The frames for lacing, buttoning, etc., which are used for motor education of the hand.

(Montessori, 1914, pp. 18-21/1964, pp.50-52)[italics in original]

Appendix K

Winter Schedule

Proposed Winter Schedule of Hours in the “Children’s Houses”

Opening at nine O’clock – Closing at Four O’clock

9-10. Entrance. Greeting. Inspection as to personal cleanliness. Exercises practical life; helping one another to take off and put on the aprons. Going over the room to see that everything is dusted and in order. Language: Conversation period: Children give an account of the events of the day before. Religious exercise.

10-11. Intellectual exercises. Objective lessons interrupted by short rest periods. Nomenclature, Sense exercises.

11-11:30. Simple gymnastics: Ordinary movements done gracefully, normal position of the body, walking, marching in line, salutations, movements for attention, placing of objects gracefully.

11:30-12. Luncheon: Short prayer.

12-1. Free games.

1-2. Directed games, if possible, in the open air. During this period the older children in turn go through with the exercises of practical life, cleaning the room, dusting, putting the material in order. General inspection for cleanliness: Conversation.

2-3. Manual work. Clay modeling, design, etc.

3-4. Collective gymnastics and songs, if possible in the open air. Exercises to develop forethought: Visiting, and caring for, the plants and animals.

(Montessori, 1912/1964, pp. 119-120).

Appendix L

Montessori Training Institutes – Historical Perspective and Current Status

When Montessori's method of education became known throughout the world, institutional support and certification of teachers became a critical issue of the Montessori movement. Despite the need for trained teachers Montessori acted with extreme caution in allowing her name to be used by others in the training and certification of teachers. Lack of effective communication, physical distance and disruption of two World Wars exacerbated personality conflicts concerning the issue of training, hindering Montessori's efforts during her lifetime to expand her new method of education. The North American revival of Montessori's ideas in the late 1950s, following her death, has led to a demand for trained Montessori teachers, which continues to be a critical issue world-wide.

Association Montessori Internationale (AMI)

In August 1929 Montessori and her son, Mario, founded the Association Montessori Internationale (AMI) to oversee the activities of schools and societies worldwide and supervise the training of teachers. This enabled Montessori to protect and promote the name of Montessori. The AMI consisted essentially of Montessori's personal communication and relationships established and maintained through her various travels and teacher training activities mainly in Italy, England, Spain, Holland and India. This international body provided certification of teachers, copyright control of Montessori's published writings and the co-ordination of the activities of various Montessori organisations. Montessori gave the authority and control of this organisation to her son, Mario Montessori, who continued in this role till his death in 1982. Since then AMI has remained active as a support organisation by receiving royalties for Montessori's published writings, collecting fees for AMI certification and training of teachers along with providing school recognition and services for its membership.

AMI accredited courses are offered in 35 centres around the world, training students to work with children at three levels: Assistants to Infancy (0-3), Casa dei Bambini (3-6) and Elementary (6-12) (<http://www.montessori-ami.org/ami.htm>).

American Montessori Society (AMS)

Nancy McCormick Rambusch, Ph.D., is credited with the reintroduction of Montessori education into the United States, which began in Whitby, Connecticut in 1958. Rambusch, an AMI trained teacher, sought to represent the interests of AMI in the United States. However, when certain personality and cultural disputes arose with Mario Montessori, AMI moved to reassert its control through appointing another representative, Margaret Stephen, who established an AMI teacher education training centre in Washington, DC. These disputes led to the founding of the separate American Montessori Society (AMS) in 1960. Rambusch led the AMS to organise its own form of certification of teachers and provide separate support for its own membership and accreditation of schools. This nonprofit education organisation also encourages research, organises seminars and symposia, and all other areas which relate to the dissemination of Montessori philosophy (Hainstock, 1997; Rambusch, 1992c; <http://www.amshq.org/>)

Montessori in the Public Domain

In the 1960s AMI sought to restrict the use of the name Montessori by AMS or any other association without its specific approval. This resulted in a legal decision in 1967 by the United States Patent Office that the use of the name 'Montessori' was now in the public domain as a generic term and could not be registered for exclusive use by any one organisation. The consequence of the legal resolution of the name/control issue is that many non-AMI Montessori teacher training programmes have emerged due to the diverse interests and needs of various personalities in the Montessori movement throughout the world, including New Zealand (Hainstock, 1997)

St. Nicholas Training Centre

In January 1947 a Montessori Centre was founded by Margaret Homfray and Phoebe Child during Montessori's last visit to London, which later became known as the St. Nicholas Training Centre (Wheatley, 1996). Homfray and Child were co-principals

while Montessori's input was signing the graduating students' diplomas up until the year before she died (Newby, 1991). They developed a steadily growing network of teacher education in Britain and Europe, using travel as the only means of training teachers. In 1952 Homfray and Child offered the first Montessori correspondence course. They continued to travel to run workshops for their correspondence courses, to the United States, New Zealand, Australia and Ireland.

In 1954 St. Nicholas Training Centre became an educational trust for the promotion of the Montessori method of education. The trust ran a Montessori teacher-training college, providing on campus and correspondence courses, and a Montessori nursery school until 1998.

Montessori World Educational Institute (MWEI)

After she retired in 1978, Margaret Homfray spent four years in California during which time she helped to set up the Montessori World Educational Institute (MWEI) organisation, along with Dr. Plodget and wife. Based in California, the organisation provides correspondence courses and teacher education world-wide.

During the years between 1977 and 1986 Homfray helped establish Montessori schools and teacher training in Australia and New Zealand. As a consequence of her work in the Southern Hemisphere, Homfray assisted in setting up the Montessori World Educational Institute (Australia). Beth Alcorn has been the Australasian co-ordinator for this organisation since 1983 (Alcorn, 1996; Newby, 1991).

London Montessori Centre (LMC)

Leslie Briton, the founder of London Montessori Centre, trained at St. Nicholas under Margaret Homfray and Phoebe Child in the late 1960s and opened an early childhood centre at St. Mark's Chapel in 1970. The centre was successful but Briton felt that she had to do more.

So few people were aware of Montessori: I wanted to clear up misinterpretations and misconceptions and bring it out into the educational arena and make it more widely understood. I wanted to see more research and better training which would include a wider view of education so students could make their own judgements. The approach as it was then was somewhat blinkered (Briton cited in Montessori Education, 1996, p. 6).

She expanded the centre, putting in extra floors and rooms, which enabled the London Montessori Centre to become a training college in 1979. The organisation provided correspondence courses and workshops in association with its local affiliates based around the world. Prior to selling London Montessori Centre to Asquith Schools in 1996, Britton sold many franchises, creating 35 London Montessori Centres in several countries including South Africa, Singapore and the Philippines (Montessori International, 1996).

The Institute for Montessori Education (TIME) and Endicott College (Boston, USA)

TIME is an outgrowth of The Institute for Educational Studies (TIES), instituted in 1987 to advance Montessori and integrative education. TIME is a year-long 6-12 teacher formation course of study in Christchurch, New Zealand (www.montessoriprimary.org).

TIES, in conjunction with Endicott College in Massachusetts (USA), offers the graduate degree, Masters of Education in Montessori Integrative Learning. The entire course of study is completed online and designed for collaborative learning. Students can receive their 6-12 qualifications as part of the programme; or they can enroll in a “Montessori emphasis area” option. Phil Gang, PhD and Marsha Snow Morgan, direct the programme (www.ties-edu.org).

Aperfield Montessori Trust

Binda Goldsbrough wrote the Aperfield Montessori early childhood education course, which began in 1990. The course can either be done through correspondence or taken face-to-face, as an Advanced Studies for Teachers (AST) course through Christchurch College of Education. It is also offered face-to-face in Dunedin (Goldsbrough, 1990).

Montessori Centre International (MCI)

In 1998 St. Nicholas Training Centre and London Montessori Centre were combined under the name Montessori Centre International. This organisation offers full-time teacher training in London along with correspondence courses in 90 countries worldwide.

This new organisation includes the Montessori St. Nicholas Charity, which promotes Montessori education in the United Kingdom and overseas by means of grants, publicity and research programmes (Montessori International, 1996; <http://www.montessori.ac.uk/history.html>).

National Centre for Montessori Education (NCME)

In the United States the National Centre for Montessori Education (NCME) was developed as an independent study course in 1977. This non-political association's goals were to promote unity among Montessorians and provide creditable teacher education programmes. In 1981 an Advisory Board was selected to assist in the development of minimum standards for all NCME teacher education programmes. During 1983 NCME was established as an independent non-profit corporation. Today NCME provides affiliated teacher education programmes internationally, an annual conference and publishes a quarterly journal, *The National Montessori Reporter* (<http://www.montessori-ncme.org>).

International Montessori Society (IMC)

Lee Havis founded the International Montessori Society in 1979 to support the effective application of Montessori principles worldwide. The Society is a non-profit corporation directed by Lee Havis in the United States, providing a broad range of teacher education programmes, services and support for Montessori education.

Unification of the Various Teacher Education Programmes

Efforts to unify the diverse teacher education programmes in the international Montessori movement have revolved around such issues as government recognition of these programmes. In the United States AMS and AMI, the two largest Montessori organisations, have both pushed for their own exclusive recognition by the US federal government. Smaller organisations such as the International Montessori Society have fought against this type of exclusionary recognition as being “diverse and contrary to constructive co-operation, progress and creative vitality in Montessori education” (<http://turst.wdn.com/ims/COMM.HTM>). Instead, the International Montessori Society argued for the recognition of a fully inclusive umbrella accrediting body for the entire Montessori movement.

Montessori Accreditation

In 1992 a Montessori accrediting body known as 'Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education' (MACTE) was organised to join Montessori organisations in the United States such as AMS, MIA and NCME under a single umbrella agency.

The International Montessori Accreditation Council (IMAC) was organised in 1994 as an inclusive umbrella accrediting agency, providing accreditation for teacher education programmes throughout the entire Montessori community. This agency evolved over many years of interest in the field to have some consistent basis for measuring quality and assuring public accountability and standards in Montessori teacher education (Hainstock, 1997).

Appendix M

Binda Goldsbrough – A Life in Montessori

Binda Goldsbrough was born in Biggin Hill, Kent, England in 1912, the same year the English edition of *The Montessori Method* was published. Goldsbrough's father, Giles Herbert Goldsbrough, and her mother, Victoria Patience, were from large middle-class Victorian families living in London. Her father was one of five children while her mother was one of thirteen. Goldsbrough recalled that both families had inquiring minds and the women were well educated. She believes this was a contributing factor to the alternative upbringing she and her two brothers received (Batty, 1997).

When Goldsbrough's parents got "married they felt that they wanted their children to be brought up in the country" so they purchased a small bungalow in Biggin Hill, with nearly an acre of land, located twenty-six miles out of London (Goldsbrough, 1998). Their house was named Northfield due to its location in the north field of the ancient manor of Aperfield. After she retired Goldsbrough wrote a correspondence teacher training course, which she called the Aperfield Montessori Course (Goldsbrough, 1990; Batty, 1997).

Goldsbrough's parents were given a copy of *The Montessori Method* the year she was born. Both of her parents "got very interested...and tried to bring their children up in a Montessori way"(Goldsbrough, 1998). Goldsbrough recalled that she and her brothers "always did a lot of practical life activities which our neighbour's children didn't do...in some ways they envied us and wanted to come and clean silver and wash dishes and clean the windows and feed the animals" (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Goldsbrough's father was a merchant seaman who worked on cable ships laying and mending telegraph cables under the sea. During World War I he was away from home a great deal (Batty, 1997). For the first few years of Goldsbrough's life her mother brought up the three children primarily on her own. One thing that they used to do was go on long walks around the Kentish countryside. Goldsbrough's mother taught Goldsbrough and her brothers the names of all the wild flowers, trees and birds.

We did not realise that was unusual but other children that we knew didn't go for these walks and didn't learn these things... We didn't realise that

this was a thing that Dr. Montessori had said. Once a child can walk it wants to walk and walk and walk and can in fact walk, you know, one or two miles quite easily (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Reflecting on the many things in her early upbringing, which were Montessori, Goldsbrough thought:

It was amazing in those days that many people tried to bring their children up in that way or even started Montessori school just from a book translated from Italian. Nowadays people moan and groan and say...people can't start schools until they have so many years training and got so many points and degrees.... But many very creditable schools grew up early in those days (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Goldsbrough and her brothers did not attend the local school because their parents had read about Montessori teaching and “didn’t want us to go there”. They thought the school was “very old fashioned, years behind the times” with “a very strict headmaster who walked around with a cane in his hand all the time and the children learnt very, very basics” (Goldsbrough, 1998). There were no Montessori schools in the area so Goldsbrough and her two brothers were “set across the valley to Etheldean Preparatory School, which wasn’t at all Montessori but at least we got a lot of individual attention” (Goldsbrough, 1998). Later Goldsbrough’s older brother was sent to a Rudolf Steiner boarding school north of London. Goldsbrough recalled that the school “had previously been a Montessori school and, in fact, they used a lot of Montessori equipment” (Goldsbrough, 1998).

When Goldsbrough was 13 or 14 she went to James Ellen’s Girls School in London and boarded with her grandparents in Herne Hill. She attended the school for three years, returning home for the weekends and holidays. By this stage her father worked in London so he would pick her up on Friday afternoons and drop her off on Monday mornings. When Goldsbrough completed her secondary school education she needed to make a career choice. She knew that she did not want to be “a nurse like Aunty Marion because I didn’t like the ideas of blood and bits of people’s insides and things”. Nor did she want to be a teacher like her “Aunty Margarete” as “it’s very strict” (Goldsbrough, 1998). Eventually Goldsbrough decided that she want to teach young children. Her parents asked her if she “wanted to be the kind of teacher who stands at the blackboard and writes things out and tells the children to learn it. Or would you like to be the kind of teacher where all the children are busy learning things and you go round and help

them?” (Goldsbrough, 1998). This was Goldsbrough’s parents’ description of Montessori and the kind of teacher she wanted to be.

Goldsbrough and her parents discovered there was a Montessori teacher-training course at Studio House in Hampstead. Claude Claremont and his wife, Francesca Claremont, who were “friends and protégés of Dr. Maria Montessori”, ran the school (Goldsbrough, 1998). Claude Claremont attended Montessori’s first international course held in 1913 and was Montessori’s assistant and interpreter for the second international course held in 1914 in Rome. He was an active member of the London Montessori Society and helped established Montessori teacher-training colleges in London. The college offered a two-year course for young, inexperienced teachers including a four-month intensive course run by Montessori (Kramer, 1988). At the end of the course the students received “a Montessori certificate from the College and the Montessori diploma from Dr. Montessori” (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Goldsbrough began training to teach children from ages three to twelve in 1930 when she was seventeen. In regards to the curriculum “nought to three was not really mentioned. We were taught about stages of development [and] sensitive periods. Not too much on the absorbent mind at that point because she actually developed that later when she was in India” (Goldsbrough, 1998). Along with a “good grounding in the use of materials” the students were required several morning to “observe in a Montessori school in London” (Goldsbrough, 1998). Goldsbrough observed in:

A wide range of “Montessori” schools, state, private, preschool, primary school, boarding and day schools. Not one of them could be deemed a “model” Montessori school, and *I doubt if there is such a place*. We were exhorted to observe the children, not necessarily the teachers (Goldsbrough, 1990) [italics added]

Goldsbrough recalled that there were “dozens of preschools” and plenty of primary Montessori schools in the small London Borough of Acton (Goldsbrough, 1998). Acton was an exception among local education authorities in England. It was mainly individual schools, in particular those from the private sector, where Montessori’s method was implemented. However, in 1916 teachers who had trained under Montessori ran the public elementary schools in Acton on Montessori principles. Later, in 1923, when Dr. Ewart Smart was appointed as Secretary to the Acton Education Committee, he gave the local education authority his full support. Considering that he

was the chairman of the English Montessori Society for many years this was not unexpected (Kramer, 1988; Brehony, 1994).

Some of the Montessori schools where Goldsbrough observed were in the “heart of the slums of London” (Goldsbrough, 1998). She did a “long stint there at Hornsey” Road and in another working class area where the approach to the curriculum incorporated both care and education.

We spent a lot of time on the physical check/care of the children. On arrival their top clothes were taken off and we changed them into little cotton overalls and pants. Part of the job of the teachers, too, was to do this and also to comb the children’s hair to remove lice and nits. If the children had more than three live lice in their hair they then had to be carted down the road to the cleansing station where their heads were washed in disinfected shampoo. We had to keep records. These were the kind of records we were keeping, not whether we had observed them and what stage they were at in their child development (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Unsurprisingly the children were treated again and again for the same health problems due to overcrowded and unhygienic homes as well as school policy. Goldsbrough remembered one particular child, Albert, “who only ever had three lice in his hair. They were large and fat and pink like Albert. But Albert never had to go to the cleansing station because he never had more than three [lice] (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Goldsbrough found her teaching practice to be a “terrific experience” (Goldsbrough, 1998). Reflecting on the training provided by Montessori distance courses she noted, “this was something that our correspondence students miss out on entirely and it does need remedy at some point” (Goldsbrough, 1998).

A very special part of Goldsbrough’s two-year course was one term “under Dr. Maria Montessori” (Goldsbrough, 1998). During Montessori’s four – month course lectures were given three evenings a week. The students received fifty hours of lectures on her system as it applied to children from ages three to twelve. Montessori had extended both the method and materials into the elementary years, outlined in her two books *The Advanced Montessori Method*, which were published in English in 1917 (Kramer, 1988).

Looking back, Goldsbrough said that she was very fortunate to have had some training under Montessori.

But I was very young and immature and I regret greatly that I did not benefit more from it...much later in life when I came as it were back to pure Montessori it's come back to me with much greater meaning and I realise what...she was saying now. If only I could hear her now saying those same things they would mean so much more to me. But there we are. I say to everyone about training. "One course, one training is not the end it's only the beginning". Learning is cumulative. You can never say, "I have learnt that. I know it"...I will never in a hundred years (Goldsbrough, 1998).

The course also included fifty hours of practice teaching under the supervision of Montessori and her assistants (Kramer, 1988). During the morning Montessori's assistants would demonstrate the use of the materials and then the students would practice using them. Montessori "rarely demonstrated [but] she occasionally would show up [and] walk around at practice time" (Goldsbrough, 1998). The students were required to prepare books based on their experience working with the materials.

When Goldsbrough and her parents had first inquired about Montessori training at the college they asked:

If the course was recognised by the [Board] of Education...We were told no but it would be before I finished my training and it never was. In that sense I think possibly the Claremonts were a little short sighted in that they wanted to keep the College purely Montessori. If they had included other subjects and conformed to certain regulations it could have become a recognized College (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Upon graduation Goldsbrough was only able to "teach in private schools but at that time there were a great number of private Montessori schools, especially residential schools" scattered all over England (Goldsbrough, 1998). For the next ten years Goldsbrough taught in these schools. After teaching in three different schools Goldsbrough took up a teaching appointment at Pioneer Health Centre at Peckham in South London (Batty, 1997).

The centre was established by two doctors, who felt that medicine was too concerned with ill health and wanted to carry out research on how to retain good health established the Pioneer Health Centre in South London. A large recreation centre was built and membership was restricted to families as opposed to individuals. In order to join

members had to submit to either annual or bi-annual examinations so that the doctors could record the state of their health. Goldsbrough was hired to run the nursery school in association with the health centre. When war was declared in 1939, however, the health centre and nursery school were evacuated to Bromley Common in Kent. The health centre was re-established at the doctors' own country home, Oakley House and was registered as a Mothers Auxiliary Yeoman Service. The women were evacuated there and carried out the men's work while they were away at war (Batty, 1997).

The nursery school where Goldsbrough taught was in a cottage on the farm. Fathers of the children who attended had built on a room for the school to use. Goldsbrough's own parents were close by, living in the lodge at the farm gate. While they were there, sadly, her father had a heart attack and died (Batty, 1997).

Inevitably the bombing got nearer and the health centre had to evacuate once again. At this stage Goldsbrough resigned and was hired at another private Montessori school located in Devon. Her mother came with her and assisted with the cooking. Goldsbrough taught there a year before taking up a job running a wartime nursery in northern England (Batty, 1997; Goldsbrough, 1998).

These nurseries "sprung up like mushrooms" all over the country and were run in temporary buildings located in the grounds of primary schools (Goldsbrough, 1998). The administration was shared equally by the Health Department and the Education Department so there was a Head Teacher and a Head Nurse. Goldsbrough found the dual control and responsibility caused problems. Goldsbrough recalled that just as she was:

Giving a presentation or [the] children were just settled the Head nurse would come in and in a loud voice would say, "Billy, Tom and Mary come and have your hair washed". This sort of thing went on all the time. I found it exceedingly difficult (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Over time Goldsbrough was "increasingly feeling" that she wanted to teach in state schools due to the fact she thought private Montessori schools were "rather elitist" (Goldsbrough, 1998). She had to retrain, however, as her Montessori qualification did not allow her to teach in the English primary sector. She discovered that there was a private teacher training college, St. Gabrielle's College that had been evacuated from

London to Doncaster. Goldsbrough applied to do the training, was accepted and did a two-year primary course during the war.

Goldsbrough found many things during her training in tune with Montessori's ideas. Reflecting on this Goldsbrough stated:

It was a fairly liberal college in many ways. We were not taught, "You've got to do it like this"... We were given a very fair go on phonics, look and say sentence method... All sorts of methods and then [they] said, "Well you know different teachers [are] comfortable with different methods, certain children need certain methods. You use what works"... Also their attitude to things like concerts or productions done by the children was to my mind very much along Montessori lines. It wasn't that you prepared something for a show but it arose out of the work that you had been doing. One of my... school practice sections was a fortnight in a primary school and we did cave dwellers. On the very last day we enacted a [performance] which the children had put together on how cave dwellers lived... It wasn't something that they had learnt by heart or in isolation to their learning (Goldsbrough, 1998).

As her state training "fit in with my earlier Montessori training" Goldsbrough was pleased that she had undertaken that first (Goldsbrough, 1998). She said people regarded her as a "School Mum" and she wondered what type of teacher she would have been had it been the other way around.

During the 1920s and 1930s and up until the start of World War II Montessori continued to deliver her training courses every other year in England, that were organised by the Society. Goldsbrough's father had been made redundant during the "terrible slump... and then he took on a lot of voluntary work including being secretary for the British Montessori Society for many, many years. He was responsible for the arrangements... when Dr. Montessori came to London" (Goldsbrough, 1998).

In 1936 Goldsbrough's father organized the Fifth International Montessori Congress, the first to be held in England. Two hundred delegates from around Europe and as far away as India and South America attended. The conference was held in Oxford at Lady Margaret Hall, with the theme 'The Child's Place in Society'. Montessori told the gathering about her ideas for the education of adolescents, which were eventually published in *The Erdkinder* and other essays in 1939 (Kramer, 1988). This was reprinted as *From Childhood to Adolescence* (1973).

During the week of the Congress, Montessori's latest book, *The Secret of Childhood*, became available in print. Thirty years had passed since the establishment of the first Casa dei Bambini and Montessori retold how it all started. The book was criticised due to the fact that she did not have anything new to add to her early ideas (Kramer, 1988).

Along with listening to other speakers the delegates were given the opportunity of observing a small Montessori school, consisting of 15 to 20 children aged from two to eight years. The school was set up in the common room at Lady Margaret Hall with Goldsbrough and another teacher, Miss N. C. Nunnery, in charge (Goldsbrough, 1998).

At two of Dr. Montessori's International Courses in London, in 1939 and 1946, Goldsbrough considered herself fortunate to be appointed as Assistant demonstrator. The job "mainly entailed being present at the demonstrations which were held in the morning and then in the afternoons supervising the practice. Going around amongst the students, helping them on the mat or on the table...just as we do now in a workshop or...a training session"(Goldsbrough, 1998).

On 23 November 1938 the New Zealand Education Department received notice of Montessori's 24th training course to be held in London in 1939 from 14 March to 7 July. The letter written by Mario Montessori on behalf of the Association Montessori Internationale (A.M.I.) "stressed the importance of this Method for the moral and social preparation of the strong personality which is so much needed in these difficult times" (NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21). M. Montessori highlighted other advantages, stating:

In rural schools one teacher may have in the same class children whose culture may belong to three different school years. Also if the children enter the Montessori school at the right age and if the teacher be well trained and capable, they can save up to two years in the period of elementary school" (NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21).

Such advantages however could:

Only be reached by a teacher who was carefully trained in the Method and therefore we do not recognize as a "Montessori" teacher anyone who does not possess a diploma signed by Dr. Mari Montessori or by Mario M. Montessori as General Director of our Association (NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21).

No delegates from New Zealand were sent to that course nor is there any record of New Zealand teachers attending any of the earlier ones (NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21). Goldsbrough recalled that at the 1939 course “Mrs. Bangs and somebody else did demonstrations” (Goldsbrough, 1998). She added that Mrs. Bangs was “prominent in Montessori in New Zealand at that time” (Goldsbrough, 1998). I was unable to find any record of this.

There was a limited New Zealand connection. Interestingly, though, Mario Montessori wrote to the New Zealand Education Department, on 26 June 1939, stating:

Only those schools recognised by Dr. Maria Montessori, Mr. Mario M. Montessori and the official organization of the Montessori Movement: The Association Montessori International, as teaching according to the Montessori method are those schools whose classes are directed by teachers holding the Montessori Diploma. The only diplomas considered valid and rightfully bearing the name “Montessori” are those [who] hold either the signature of Dr. Maria Montessori, or of Mario M. Montessori with the seal of the Association Montessori International, or both signature and the seal (NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21).

He further noted that many countries had schools which had been founded and function using the Montessori name but the teachers have not been ‘properly trained’ in the Montessori system. Some schools, he said, had good results while others had bad results but the Association Montessori Internationale could not accept responsibility if these school were not associated with their official organisation. M. Montessori observed that there had been considerable movement amongst Montessori teachers who were qualified and asked the government to send a list of Montessori schools in New Zealand. The then Minister of Education, P. Fraser, replied on 18 August 1939 that those kindergartens under the New Zealand Free Kindergarten Association did not use Montessori’s name. He stated that there were a number of private kindergartens that were not officially recognised but the names were unknown to the Education Department (NZ Archives E-W, W1012, 29/21).

When she was an Assistant Demonstrator at the 1946 training course Goldsbrough was “directly in contact with Mario [Montessori]” (Goldsbrough, 1998). She was not allowed to deviate from her role and got into “great trouble” one day with Mario (Goldsbrough, 1998). He had demonstrated the full operation with the Golden Beads to the Saturday students in the morning and they got very confused. “When they came to

practice time in the afternoon they said to me, “Oh Binda, we haven’t followed it all”. They were all right up to the “addition and so on” but after that they got really confused with Mario’s demonstration. They asked Goldsbrough:

“Will you go over it again?” So I went over it again and Mario came in and he was very cross. He said, “That is not your job, Binda. I have demonstrated that. They now should be practicing it.” And I said, “Mario, they were confused about the demonstration”. “Well, that’s their problem. They should be practicing” [he said] very strict and sternly at me (Goldsbrough, 1998).

In addition Goldsbrough marked a lot of albums, taking an armful home every night. She had to be “very careful that they were strictly written up according to the demonstrations”(Goldsbrough, 1998).

The format of Montessori’s courses, the lectures, demonstrations, practice teaching and the preparation of the albums “remained the same throughout the years in which Montessori taught, although she never repeated her lectures verbatim, speaking extemporaneously and relying on different interpreters” (Kramer, 1988, p. 256). When she was an Assistant Demonstrator Goldsbrough made a point of going to “Dr. Montessori’s lectures. Each time I learnt something new or something in more depth. No original course, whether full-time, part-time or correspondence can be the all and end of all Montessori Training. It needs to be ongoing” (Goldsbrough, 1990).

When Montessori delivered her lectures at her training courses she stood beside her translator on a raised platform placed in one of the corners of the room. Later in her career she “usually sat to give the lecture...and she always lectured in Italian” (Goldsbrough, 1998). Speaking slowly and carefully Montessori would pause after each sentence for her interpreter to repeat what she had said in English, giving Goldsbrough and the other students “time to write down our notes” (Goldsbrough, 1998). Dorothy Cornish was Montessori’s interpreter for many years and the one most remembered vividly by her former students including Goldsbrough (Kramer, 1988). Goldsbrough recalled that Cornish “always dressed the same all the years I ever knew her”. A knitted suit with a long jacket and a long skirt to her ankles.... She had a brown suit and a maroon suit and I never saw her in anything else...She stood there impersonally and translated what she thought was said. Sometimes Dr. Montessori would say, “No, no Dorothy, no, no!” if she thought Cornish had not translated a sentence correctly

(Goldsbrough, 1998). Montessori's corrections showed that she did understand English even though officially she did not speak the language.

Reflecting on what occurred when Montessori gave her lectures Goldsbrough pointed out that there was:

Never anything personal...[No one] came in at the beginning of the course and said, "We wish to welcome Dr. Montessori or anything". She just came in and gave the first lecture and...[then] gave the next lecture and so on. On the course that I helped at just before the Second World War she gave her [final] lecture...and then went out. Nobody said, "Next week Dr. Montessori and Mario are going to India. Isn't that wonderful! We do wish them all the best." This sort of thing was never said. There were never any questions or any comments after the lectures. It wasn't the fashion. Lecturers gave a lecture and that was it (Goldsbrough, 1998).

During the 1946 course Goldsbrough "lived in the same house as Dr. Montessori", her son Mario and the other staff including Margaret Homfray and Phoebe Child (Goldsbrough, 1998). Homfray and Child had been asked by Montessori to make arrangements for the delivery of the training course.

Homfray and Child first met in 1929 when they both did the four – month Montessori course in London. Wanting to learn more about Montessori education they traveled to Italy in 1930 to attend another course. During that time they got to know Dr. Montessori a little, with Homfray assisting E. M. Standing with the English translations of Montessori's lectures (Newby, 1991). Upon completion of the course they returned to England and remained in close contact with each other and with Montessori activities in the London area.

Every two years Montessori came to London to run her training courses until the Spring of 1939. In October of that year Montessori traveled to India where she was detained with her son, Mario, for the duration of the War. Homfray stated that "there was no more training" and "there was no one to help the new teachers when they started. All the Montessorians knew that a permanent college was needed" (cited in Newby, 1991, p. 47). Humfray remembered:

...we all realized that Dr. Montessori was getting along in years (she was 69 when she left for India) and wouldn't be teaching, herself, very much longer and everybody wanted the Method to carry on. Thus any

of us who were keen on it were always discussing how we must get the training together after the war (cited in Newby, 1991, p. 47).

As former pupils and Members of the Board of the Montessori Society of England, Child and Homfray kept in touch with Montessori during her time in India. Child had enrolled in a Bachelor of Science degree in biology and in her spare time developed tactile materials for the biology curriculum, which she sent to Dr. Montessori for comments. These later became part of the science materials used in Montessori schools everywhere (Newby, 1991).

Upon Montessori's return to Holland, she asked Child and Homfray to make arrangements for her London teacher-training course. They also needed to find long term accommodation for Montessori and her son, Mario, which was difficult due to the number of houses that were damaged or destroyed during the War.

They rented a house in the west end of London, an empty house. [in Porchester Terrace in the Hyde Park area, which doubled as a residence and training centre]. They begged, borrowed and sold furniture, carpets, there were curtains from all their friends and relations and furnished this place for Dr. Montessori and Mario to live on one floor. Phoebe, Margaret and Pat Newbury and I, four sort of staff, lived upstairs, in a sort of attic floor and had a room up there where we had a lot of equipment and stuff. There was a big huge kitchen downstairs and the great friend of Dr. Montessori came over from California and did the cooking [Mrs. Andriano]. So we were living in the same house but we knew very little about the way Mario and Dr. Montessori lived (Goldsbrough, 1998).

Goldsbrough remembered that Montessori was always called "Mammolina" [meaning] little mother and we always...called her Mammolina too, which I think she really liked. [Montessori] was a...family person really" (Goldsbrough, 1998). Kramer (1988, p. 307) however, noted that:

It is one of the paradoxes of Montessori's personality that, given her dedication to fostering independence in children, she was so little able to tolerate independence in those around her. Her students began by being as children to her; they even called her "Mammolina." When they "grew up" and showed any indication of using what they learned from her to strike out on their own, she perceived it as a betrayal, although she eventually forgave them.

Before the course finished at the end of December 1946 there was opportunity to discuss the establishment of a permanent training centre in London. Dr. Montessori

agreed that this was needed but the Montessori Society of England by its constitution was unable to do the necessary work. Montessori gave permission for her training courses to be given but only if Homfray and Child ran them (Newby, 1991). In January 1947 the training centre was opened. Homfray and Child became the co-principals while Montessori's input was signing the graduating students' diplomas (Newby, 1991, p. 56). They developed a steadily growing network of teacher education in Britain and Europe, using travel as the only means of training teachers.

Eventually a disagreement about the training of teachers arose, and before Montessori's death a statement was issued by her to the effect that "this institution [which became the St. Nicholas Training Centre] is no longer authorized to issue Montessori diplomas or to use the name Montessori (Kramer, 1988, p. 352).

During this time Goldsbrough taught in State schools for seven years before she and her mother decided to visit family in New Zealand in 1951. Goldsbrough's youngest brother had married a New Zealander and was living in mid-Canterbury. "We were only going to stay for a year" with Goldsbrough on teacher exchange but by the end of twelve months Goldsbrough had a teaching job and her mother was happy living with her son and his family. They decided to stay in New Zealand, a decision made easier due to the fact that Goldsbrough's mother had sold the family home during the Second World War (Goldsbrough, 1998; 1996).

Goldsbrough taught for three years at Clarence Bridge, south of Marlborough and then moved several miles south to Mungamaunu Bay, which had a school house so that her mother could live with her. "That was a tremendous experience in a rural, coastal, small community in New Zealand. Very different from anything I [was] used to in England" (Goldsbrough, 1998).

At Mungamaunu Bay Goldsbrough noted that it was:

Hard work teaching some 10 subjects to 10 'standards' though there were sometimes only one or two children at the same level. The only help was that Form 1 and 2 pupils went to Kaikoura for woodwork or cooking (boys and girls respectively) once a week. If the teacher had been a man he would have been granted a sewing teacher once a week, but because I was a woman I had to teach sewing to the Standard girls once a week while also occupying the primers (Goldsbrough, 1996).

Drawing on her understanding of Montessori principles and practices Goldsbrough provided an individual learning environment for her students even though she had “little or no Montessori equipment”. Furthermore she believes that “rural schools today would benefit greatly from the Montessori Method” (Goldsbrough, 1996).

In 1958 Goldsbrough moved to Christchurch where she was appointed Principal to the Cerebral Palsy School (now called the Disabled Persons Centre). The school had a roll of 30 students who were either severely disabled physically or with special learning disabilities, but they had all been assessed as having educable potential. The school was multi-disciplinary with teachers, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and speech therapists. In addition the school was involved in training post-graduate students, with an interest in special needs education (Goldsbrough, 1996).

The students’ wide age and ability range made it necessary to use individual methods and Goldsbrough’s background in Montessori education was very applicable. However, Goldsbrough would not have claimed that:

It was a Montessori centre for various reasons, including a certain climate of unacceptance of Montessori at the time, staff untrained in Montessori, and a lack of Montessori materials, although I did bring back from England most of the Sensorial apparatus. We had special access to this and other sensorial and perceptual activities on Friday afternoon. We called this session Perceptual Training (Goldsbrough, 1996).

While at the school Goldsbrough extended her interest in education for the physically disabled, traveling through the United States to visit schools set up for the physically disabled and taking a course at the London Institute of Education for nine months. On her return she was asked to contribute an article to the *Speech Therapy Journal* in 1966. Goldsbrough commenting on current educational ideas she believed would be relevant to the area of speech therapy, made reference to Montessori’s ideas.

The critical or sensitive periods of learning are much under consideration now i.e., certain development or learning of skills can most easily take place at certain ages (much emphasized previously by Dr. Maria Montessori)...The years from birth to 5 years are very ‘critical’ for language development and if the handicapped have help early this might be much more fruitful than later” (Goldsbrough, 1966).

In her position as principal of the school Goldsbrough was invited to give many talks and she consistently highlighted Montessori's contribution to sensory education (see for example, Goldsbrough, 1963, 1970, 1972).

Goldsbrough taught at the school for seventeen years. During this period she was an active member of the Crippled Children's Society and assisted in the setting up of a holiday home at Brighton, and a residential home in Linwood. She was also a foundation member of the Christchurch Co-ordinating Council for the Handicapped (now superseded by the Disabled Persons Assembly) as well as the Toy Library for Special Needs. For her work with the disabled Goldsbrough was made a Member of the British Empire (M. B. E.) in the 1975 New Year's Honours List (Goldsbrough, 1996). When she retired in June 1975 Goldsbrough continued to keep busy. She helped establish the Specific Learning Difficulties Association (SPELD) and became a SPELD teacher, providing tutoring for individual children to learn to read and write in her own home

Appendix N

Agenda for National Montessori Meeting 1982

[Information added in italics by Binda Goldsbrough at the meeting.]

Saturday October 9th

9.00 Registration

9.30 Welcome and Introduction

CHAIR: David Russell

TOPIC: Montessori in New Zealand

SPEAKERS: Hugh Warburton
Jill Chivers

10.30 MORNING TEA

CHAIR: Margaret Galloway

TOPIC: Administration and Funding

SPEAKERS: David Russell
Brent Clothier

Topics for possible discussion:
problems facing expansion of Montessori in New Zealand
supply of trained teachers
supply of Montessori Apparatus
recognition by government
applications for State and other funding
transfer of places from 1 Mont. Sch. To another
National Newsletter

12.30 LUNCH

CHAIR: Binda Goldsbrough

TOPIC: The role of the assistant and aspects of classroom management

SPEAKERS: Marie Russell
Loes de Groot – Application of
Mont. in Primary School

Topics for possible discussion:
planning sessions each day
use of equipment other than Montessori
allocation of responsibility in the classroom
place of arts & craft
preparation of the environment
maintenance of the environment
must set high standards of excellence

AFTERNOON TEA

3.15 CHAIR: (to be decided) *Loes de Groot*

TOPIC: Curriculum

SPEAKERS: Rachel Ryan
Elizabeth Abbott
Paula MacInerney

There will be a short talk and demonstration of:

- The Montessori Bells
- Reading Schemes (with slides)
- Geography in the Montessori School
- Nature Study in the Montessori School

If time: Discussion and sharing of ideas on

- art and craft
- poetry and finger plays

4.30 CLOSE

6.30 p.m.

INFORMAL DINNER

(provided by the Palmerston North Committee at \$8.00 per head)

Slides will be shown of children in a Montessori School.

Sunday October 10th

9.00 CHAIR: (to be decided)

TOPIC: Keeping in touch in the future

Topics for possible discussion:

- a National resource centre for Montessori slides, films, books and information
- National newsletter (quarterly?)
- funds for bringing visiting speakers on from Australia
- National coordinator or a National Committee (may be situated in one locality for one or two years)
- World Montessori Institute

11.15 Summary and conclusion

11.30 Meeting closes

(There will be a short break for morning tea t 10.15)

If you feel able to contribute to any particular topic – or would like to speak on any other topic – relevant to Montessori – please let me know by phone or letter as soon as possible. The speakers mentioned on the agenda will not be speaking for the entire session, and I feel it is a good opportunity for everyone to voice their opinions.

(Hallifax, 1982c)

Appendix O

Montessori Schools established by 1982

1977 March	Hendersen Montessori Pre-School Ltd. 7 Don buck Rd, Massey, Auckland (Privately owned) [First licenced as a child-care centre in July 1971 and was re-licenced as a Montessori pre-school and child care centre on 14 March 1977 (Jensen, 1988)]
1977 September	Kapiti Montessori Society Inc. Reikorangi, Waikanae (Incorporated Society)
1978 February	New Plymouth Montessori Association Inc. Corner Breakwater and Bayly Road New Plymouth (Incorporated Society)
1978	Wellington Community Montessori Preschool St. Michael's Church Kelburn Wellington (Incorporated Society) [After six years moved to St. Annes Hall, Woburn Road, Northland, Wellington (Griggs, 1991)]
1978 June	Dunedin Montessori Pre-School Incorporated P.O. Box 5323 Dunedin (Incorporated Society)
1980 February	Palmerston North Montessori Association Inc. (Palmerston North Montessori Pre-School) Harrier Club Rooms, Totara Road, Palmerston North (Incorporated Society)
1980 September	Ellerton Montessori Pre-school 22 Ellerton Rd. Mt. Eden Auckland (Privately Owned – Elizabeth Abbott)
1980 November	Montessori Association of Christchurch Incorporated (The Courtyard Montessori-based Pre-School) Peterborough Centre

Cnr Monteval & Peterborough Street
Christchurch
(Incorporated Society)

1980 December Kapiti Children's Workshop
Paraparaumu
(Privately owned)

(Montessori Association of New Zealand, 1986; Jensen, 1988; Griggs, 1991;
O'Donnell, 1996).

Appendix P

Montessori Topics

Topic for meeting 21 April 8:15pm

“What is the Montessori Method” – Advantages and disadvantages

Montessori method can be based on twelve principles –

- A child, unlike an adult, is in a constant state of growth and changes and the ways in which he changes can be modified greatly by his environment.
- A young child wants to learn by himself. The Montessori materials awaken his curiosity into a learning experience the child enjoys.
- Mont. Materials help the child to understand what he learns by associating an abstract concept with a concrete sensorial experience.
- Special materials and only one of each kind means children get individual attention.
- A young child has a great capacity for absorbing a tremendous variety of experience even though he can't express it verbally.
- An environment must be prepared so he can choose freely the learning activities to meet his sensitive periods and individual needs.
“Children pass through definite periods in which they reveal psychological aptitudes and possibilities which afterwards disappear.”
- Sensory-motor activities play a great role in a child's learning and his developing intelligence.
- Children learn best in an atmosphere of freedom combined with self-discipline and in an environment prepared to help them learn.
- The teacher must not impose learning or his will on the child.
- A younger child works at his own rate. Children do not see themselves better or worse than others.
- A child develops a sense of worth by doing any task well. It could be scrubbing a table or pouring a drink without spilling any.
- When children's sensitive stages are met, he not only increases his intelligence but gains contentment, satisfaction, feelings of self-confidence and a desire for further learning.

(Association Newsletter, 1977, March).

Appendix Q

List of Montessori Equipment

“I can bring the following:

- 1) 4 cylinder blocks
- 2) Boxes 1 & 2 of the colour tablets
- 3) Geometric solids
- 4) Sandpaper Globe
- 5) Continents Globe
- 6) Puzzle map of the World (showing continents)
- 7) Binominal Cube
- 8) Metal Insets
- 9) Perhaps some Golden Bead material

Prices in Dutch Fl. ->Taken from current Nienhaus price list

Cylinder bl.'s. 4 @ 47.50 each	190.40
Colour Box 1	12.90
Colour Box 2	29.40
Geo. Solids	57.15
Binominal Cube	70.10
Puzz. Map of World	59.75
2 globes @ 25.35	50.70

Total 470.00 (Dutch Florines)

Equivalent to 114.42 English Pounds \$257.45 N.Z. dollars

I can make the following:

- 1) Sets of classified cards
- 2) Sandpaper letters and Numbers
- 3) Letters from the Moveable Alphabet
- 4) Sound boxes
- 5) Reading Scheme material
- 6) Counters and Cards
- 7) Cards for the Golden beads

You may be able to have the following made?: Pink Tower, Broad Stair, Red Rods, Number Rods, Dressing Frames

For an extremely well equipped classroom the following could be ordered depending on what can be afforded and none of which would be needed in the first 2 terms anyway.

- 1) Tactile Tablets and Rough & Smooth Boards 1 and 2
- 2) Trinomial Cube
- 3) Box III Colour Tablets
- 4) Square of Pythagoras
- 5) Construction Triangles
- 6) Spindle Boxes
- 7) Geometric Cabinet (very expensive)

8) Knobless Cylinders

9) Buckle frame (dressing frame)

The rest of the material - maths material - could be ordered later if you wished depending on how long parents intend leaving their children in the school” (Ryan, 1978e).