ABSTRACT
        In this paper the affective domain entails provision
for the growth of attitudes and behaviors that deal with feelings,
emotions, values, and in general the personal concerns of students.
Its place in curriculum can emerge from an exploration of the
following questions: To what extent can we identify and describe a
distinct affective curriculum? Should it be encouraged and
disseminated? Can it succeed as an established movement? Interviews
with three educators, a university staff member, a director of an
alternative school, and an elementary school curriculum specialist,
all advocating and working within an affective approach in education,
were the means for discovering the actual role of affective education
in curriculum. The interviewees responded to inquiries about the
sources in literature for their programs, their goals for students,
their view of affect as an end or as a means in curriculum, the state
of being of their curriculum, their preparation of teachers, and
evaluation or observations of their programs. With the exception of
the curriculum specialist, who had well thought-out-curriculum
materials, the interviewees had little to contribute toward defining
the role of the affective domain in curriculum, casting doubt on the
success of the affective movement. (JH)

Curriculum Significance of the Affective Domain[*]

Morton Alpren, Temple University

Three questions run through this paper about the affective curriculum:

(1) To what extent can we identify and describe a distinct affective

curriculum? (2) Should it be encouraged and disseminated? (3) Can it

succeed as an established movement?

Let's begin the inquiry with definitions and differentiations of

meanings.

I. Definitions and Components of Affective Education

The taxonomy handbook dealing with affective domain refers to it as

follows: "Objectives which emphasize a feeling tone, an emotion, or a degree

of acceptance or rejection."[1] A review of the more recent literature, and

discussions with those who deal with affect in practice, leads to the

definition for this paper as provisions for the growth of attitudes and

behaviors that deal with feelings, emotions, values and, in general, the

personal concerns of students. Whereas the definition does not provide for

social or group settings, neither does it deny that social concerns may

legitimately be the substance of affective encounters. It does, however,

---

separate self-knowledge from other kinds of knowledge.

Curriculum, as used in this writing, will be Goodlad's set of intended
(or planned) learnings. It is neutral in the sense that it does not reveal
who does the intending. Furthermore, it implies a product rather than a
process and is distinct from curriculum development and instruction, both of
which are processes related to both the curriculum and the proposed learner.

Curriculum development is defined as a concentrated effort to construct
or re-construct a curriculum. While this paper does not focus upon develop-
ment, it is significant that both the taxonomy and those in the behavioral
objectives movement are either implicit or explicit about adults being the
curriculum developers. This also applies to those in the subjects-from-the-
disciplines camp. Many, if not most, in the affective camp oppose this
rationale and procedure and it is from their standpoints that this paper
directs its attention. Those that are least prescriptive, and most open-ended
tend to opt for maximizing students and/or teacher with students developing a
curriculum.

I began to explore the components of affective education last year
through a brief article.[2] The three elements or components were those of

curriculum, instruction, and conditions for learning. A fourth component,
                                    one aspect or dimension of the
viz., classroom climate, was considered to be A combination of instruction

and conditions for learning. One of the problems noted for those desiring

affective education was that of confusing the components so that we could

never "see" a curriculum, the instruction, curriculum developers, or other

societal agency personnel (police, doctors, etc.). We could never know whose

functions or tasks were being addressed to whom.

For example, the concern about gangs, while an important entity as a

condition for learning, is essentially a control problem for the police.

Only in a secondary sense can parents and school personnel assist in controlling

the problem so that students are freer from the fears of gangs. If we were

to believe the affective people, much of the problem was to be attended to

through curriculum and instruction. Or, students are frequently deprived of

sufficient sleep. Another condition for learning in a classroom. But how is

this a matter for the curriculum? The need for teachers to be humane to

sleepy children does not call for changing the curriculum nor even for a

new set of instructional strategies.

The article did not attempt to condemn those in the affective camp but suggested that, if the movement was to succeed, its proponents should think out and express the differences in the components so that they could then begin to address themselves better to the curriculum. In effect, if education was to direct itself more to gangs, drugs, race relations, and any student concerns, it would help to see what was on paper for our scrutiny. Gang study, student values, et. al., may be highly worthy of study but we need to see the goals, the justifications, and the curriculum to see if it all makes sense. Otherwise, how do we know what we are asked to buy?

This was all another way of providing two criteria to a curriculum proposal, viz., what a curriculum should provide (the function question), and what a curriculum can accomplish (the attainability question). The function question helps us examine what our tasks should be, what our values are, or, in this instance, our affective way of looking at affect. The attainability question helps us see if it's feasible to reach goals we consider worthy.

By intentionally ignoring the extremes of the efficiency and specificity

of a taxonomy, on one hand, and the vague generalities that have been stated

for affective education, on the other, we do run a risk. We fail to cope

with the huge range of goals and directions that affect affords. To some,

affective education reaches into the province of psychoanalysis, where many

critics question the tools of teachers and the chances of any changes of

deep-seated problems that lie within students. Worse still, wounds are

opened that teachers cannot help close and harm is done to these students.

At an opposite point in this range, those interested in mathematics

often refer to an aim of helping students "appreciate mathematics." This

leads to an objective dealing with "appreciating the beauty of geometric

forms." One could argue that this is within the affective domain, but for

purposes of this paper, it is too far removed from the goals of affective

advocates to consider here.

I'm suggesting that we examine the curriculum significance of the

affective domain neither from the shoes of those with disciplinary-subject

interests nor through those with behavioral objective interests. I'm trying

to put myself in the affective advocate's shoes, except as I return to my

own to raise questions.

Two examples may suffice as to why the behavioral objectives and

systems approaches should not be considered in this inquiry. At a conference

in 1971, Popham delivered a paper[3] on the outmoded, non-technological curri-

culum professor. His points were fairly well received until he was questioned

about using behavioral objectives to meet affective goals. From this point

on, his difficulties increased as one was left with the impression that it's

hard to be all things to all people.

During the 1970-71 winter, I was engaged in the evaluation of an AIR

individualized instructional system.[4] It proved to be a carefully developed

diagnostic and prescriptive system resulting in learning packets with some

use of computer-management. Its cognitive objectives were praised. However,

in following up the affective objectives,

it became obvious that teacher developers of cognitive objectives

really couldn't care less about implementing them   except as they

related specifically to their subjects (as opposed to their students).

This is no condemnation of the work of Popham nor of the staff of

the school being evaluated. It merely calls attention to the fact that few

of us excell at the development and implementation of both cognitive and

affective goals and objectives. What may be "good business" for some, who

are pushed to be all things to all people, should not be allowed to detract

from this inquiry.

At this point in time, Popham is refining affective instruments on the

basis of field test results.[5] The effort should be applauded. However, many

continue to question the efficiency-technology movement as a basis for dealing

with affect.

In summary to this point, by defining terms, explaining components, and

delimiting the scope of the inquiry, the intention is to then get at the

advocations and consistency of those advocations by dialogue with some

affective practitioners. What are they saying and doing in practice? Do they

have clear ideas of where they are going and why? Do their practices reflect

the literature? Such questions can help us get at the more central theme of

the curriculum significance of the affective domain.

II. Affective Models in Action

My desire to discover affective curriculum in practice was too large

a task to undertake without sufficient time and money. Ideally, a researcher

would seek out numerous examples for case studies and spend much time and

effort on them. I did what seemed to be the next best thing. The Philadelphia

area afforded a few fairly discrete examples that could lend themselves to

study.

The Philadelphia District, in its central office, has been sponsoring

affective education for the past five years under such titles as Affective

Education Research Project and Affective Curriculum Development Project.[6]

The best known of these ideas in action was determined from various sources

as one at the Bartram School for Human Services, an Annex of Bartram High

School, for students who are often identified as potential dropouts. The

school unit staff prides itself on having an affective educational program.

Since most every school that purports to be dealing with an affective curri-

culum derives its support (including in-service for teachers) from the

Affective Office, this example was used as a Philadelphia sample.

To find something different from this, I discovered that Abington, a suburb of Philadelphia, was moving in this direction and its primary focus was in the elementary schools. The Human Development Program was 1½ years old, was supported by the school district central office, and has a model quite different from Philadelphia's.

Finally, to round out these brief case studies, I turned to a member of a university staff whose field is affective education, who writes on the subject, and who conducts graduate classes in schools with teachers and school student populations.

What follows is a result of taped dialogues in each of three local situations. Each was asked to focus upon four or five questions:

1. From what models in the literature does your program derive?

2. What are your goals for students in this program? (When goals were not clearly stated, the means-ends question was explored, i.e., affect as an end or as a means toward helping students toward more customary cognitive ends?)

3. Do you have a curriculum on paper? (If not, how and who decides what will be learned or pursued in a classroom? Or, if not, what on paper

has emerged from open-ended, non-prescriptive beginnings in classes?)

4. How were teachers prepared or in-serviced to conduct this program?

(What was their curriculum?)

Whereas these four questions were commonly used for each interview, a

fifth question varied. Each was asked to explore what he (she) wished or

to move into an evaluative response. (Do you have any basis for stating that

this program is meeting its goals?)

While the need for such limited research may seem obvious to many, let

me state the value of conducting it for me. It helped me divorce myself from

some biases. (How many of us feel even moderately neutral about this

movement?) It also helped me to examine responses to questions that relate

the first to the last section of this paper.

Prior to each interview, each was informed about the nature of the paper

and the definitions being used for affect and curriculum.

A. Interview with Dr. X, Assistant Professor of Curriculum Theory & Development

at a University.

1. What model or models from the literature?

"My directions are toward non-verbal learnings and the

Open classroom." (Dr. X)

Primary model from literature is work of Simon, Howe and

Kirchenbaum.[7]

"Why is there nothing dealing with curriculum in chapter

headings or within the chapters?" (Alpren)

He sees curriculum as being restricted to the conventional

subjects. I define it for him a second time. He now says he didn't

realize that the definition allowed for such freedom. He appears to be

quite unclear about differentiating between goals, curriculum, and

instruction. He says he prefers not to differentiate the meanings. I

can't be sure (after a number of discussions with him over the past four

years) whether this is intentional for a reason that I cannot easily

fathom or if it is due to confusion.

2. What goals for students?

"We want to help them gain control over their lives." (Dr. X)

He then notes seven different criteria or ideas on valuing from

the literature model[8] such as prizing and publicly affirming beliefs.

He then notes that British examples of open classes are O.K. but

not conceptual in that children are in a process that they don't examine;

they don't get to see the consequences of their choices. The British

don't take advantage of opportunities to help children become aware of

valuing and the consequences of their decisions.

I find it difficult to get him to deal with my questions. Each

time I try to re-focus on goals, he returns to his own theme, i.e., why

the British and the open classroom fail to get at his valuing goals. At

one point I note that he said his point of reference was the open

classroom--but shouldn't it really be affective education. He says he

does not wish to be labelled. I get the feeling that each question on

my part represents a threat. When I note that he must label a class he

teaches, such as a new one on affective curriculum, he says he really is

both affective and cognitive. I proceed to re-define affective and state

that this appears to be consistent with his primary interest. He now

states that he likes George Brown's definition better. I ask what it is.

He says he can't recall it at the moment. I note that values are

included within my definition. He says this is now O.K. and rushes off

to another topic. (If this gives the impression of a frustrated inter-

viewer, it is intended to.)

I now forcefully interrupt to state (to get back to the topic)

that it appears that he's stating his goals for kids as feeling adequate

about themselves, initiating ideas in their educational programs, learning

to live with themselves and others, and becoming clear about their values

and beliefs. He agrees with this summary.

Dr. X returns to talking about the seven criteria on valuing.

I break in to note that these appear to be aims that stem from the goals

already discussed (know self and others, make decisions based on this

information, and to act appropriately on these decisions). He agrees

and this gives me the chance to ask him about affect as a means-ends

question.

Are these three goals primary in that they are ends for the

schooling of children or are they more like means toward other goals that

deal with customary subject skills and knowledges? He says the former.

(Affect and valuing are priority goals for students.) But then he backs

off and notes that the affect and conventional subjects should not be

separated in that they relate to each other. Self-concept ties up

with ability to read.

"It's not a tenable choice." (Dr. X)

3. Any curriculum on paper?

"What do you mean?" (Dr. X)

"Do either teachers have some materials for their use with

students or are there materials that have resulted from work with students

that indicate student activities?" (Alpren)

"We have case studies." (Dr. X)

"May I see some of these?" (Alpren)

"Yes, I'll get them to you." (Dr. X)

The materials received were as follows:

(a) an article from Science Teacher[9] that uses the success of a

moon shot to question societal values (in comparing priorities of tech-

nology to human habituation in slums). The writing proceeds to use

Newton's laws of motion as an example to indicate that it can be taught

at three levels, viz., facts, concepts, and values. Most of what follows

is a practical aid to dealing with values in this and other selected

science topics.

(b) Duplicated materials dealing with an open classroom in a
high school where Dr. X has been a consultant. The materials include
a diagram of an open class revealing student deployment, material loca-
tion, etc., an outline stressing sub-topics in English (noting that "the
basic concept for the class is combining basic skills in English, Reading,
Social Studies and Math with affective learning"); a sample student
contract to complete assignments with points awarded for each ("What is
right or wrong about where I live," "If I was the American Flag," etc.);
lists of readings; and a longer list of assignment questions.

(c) Pre and post test scores for the students in the 9th and 10th
grade classes noted above. The lists consist of student names, two
scores for each, and type of test. There are no numerical accumulations,
statistical comparisons, or explanations.

None of the above appear to be case studies.

4. How are teachers prepared to provide for affective education?

He notes that they are directed to the literature of Rogers,
Maslow, and the Simon, Howe, Kirschenbaum model.

In his classes and in-service with teachers in schools he tries
to be a human model with the group so that they, in turn, can be

models with their kids.

Brief reactions to this interview reveal the following obser-

vations. The most obvious, which were stated, is a defensive posture

on the questions and what appears to be a reluctance to submit (or a

lack of any) curriculum on paper. What does not come through is a

youthful, engaging personality in other settings. Dr. X has a boyish

charm not unlike others who are leading the movement. (Other observations

will follow as summary questions at the end of the three interviews.)

B. Interview with Paul Adorno, Director, Bartram School for Human Services

(Annex to Bartram High School), Philadelphia Public Schools. BSHS has 180

students and 8 teachers.

1. What models from the literature?

He cites Bruner's Process of Education,[10] Newberg and Borton's

Education for Student Concerns[11] and Borton's Reach, Touch, and Teach.[12]

"In view of the definitions being used for affect and curriculum,

which you found easy to accept, wouldn't Bruner be out of place as a

model?" (Alpren)

Adorno agrees. He notes its value for use of process. His

program uses mirroring, gaming, role-playing, and patterning. Further

questioning and later checking reveal these to be activities encouraged

by the Newburg-Borton model.[13]

2. What goals for students?

"Help them know themselves and others to survive in the world.

"Also, help prepare them for service jobs in the adult

world." (Adorno)

"Would you accept the first statement as affective; the second

as a vocational preparatory goal?" (Alpren)

"Yes, except that the first statement is related to the second

one. We are concerned about the kind of people they become and follow-ups

after they are on the job are conducted to see if they do try to influence

others, such as the racial prejudice that exists in many hospitals." (Adorno)

Adorno attempts to relate goals for the students to curriculum.

He notes that the school works with a child development program at a

local university and it has three phases. The cognitive phase is the

knowledge of child development; the reality phase is the high school

students dealing directly with the children; the affective phase is

a family group curriculum. In addition to these program phases, they

provide for vocational orientation and preparation for service jobs.

On the means-ends question, Adorno does take a position, viz.,

that affect is used as a means toward a combined academic and vocational

end. He qualifies it, however, by indicating that this would not be

true for all the teachers and youth in the school.

3. Any curriculum on paper?

"You implied a paper curriculum earlier when you referred to

a Family Group Curriculum." (Alpren)

"Yes, it is a series of 28 weekly units." (Adorno)

"May I have a copy?" (Alpren)

"Yes. If we don't have one, we'll mail it to you." (Adorno)

After six weeks of phone calls, including one from an associate

superintendent in the central office, and repeated promises, none was

ever received. As with Dr. X, above, I had to give up.

"Would you say that most of your attention to affect is a

matter of instruction and classroom climate?" (Alpren)

Adorno agrees.

4. How are teachers prepared?

They use the literature models noted above (including the second

half of Bruner for process, motivation, et. al., which he admits to not

being curricular). The teachers are subjected to the intentions for

students (gaming, role-plays, mirroring, patterning).

5. Any other comments?

"It consistently works." (Adorno)

"How do you know?" (Alpren)

"We don't know." (Adorno)

C. Interview with Joanne Weaver, Elementary School Curriculum Specialist,

Human Development Program, Abington Schools, Abington, Pa. The program

(also called "The Magic Circle") is 1½ years in practice.

1. What models from the literature?

The model is Glasser's Schools Without Failure.[14]

2. What goals for students?

Listen to kids talk about things important to them.

Help children learn to listen, as well.

Affect is the primary end--to help children become better people.

"Have you thought this last point out?" (Alpren)

"Guess I'm not sure." (Miss Weaver)

"Join the crowd." (Alpren)

3. Any curriculum on paper?

"We have a curriculum for both the teachers and the students."

(Miss Weaver)

"Is it prescribed on paper?" (Alpren)

"It is both pre-planned and open-ended." (Miss Weaver)

(For the first time, I do receive materials that would qualify,

by any standards, as a curriculum. As Joanne Weaver noted above, the

Glasser text[15] is for the teachers. In addition, I receive two published

works by Bessell and Palomares.[16] These materials are both for teacher

lesson planning and for use by students. Yes, Virginia, there is an

affective curriculum.)

4. How are teachers prepared?

The model and curriculum materials noted above are used to

in-service teachers. There is an extensive program in existence. One

group receives help before school, one morning per week, and twice per

month after school. This totals 45-50 hours per year and is directed

by Miss Weaver with the aid of guidance personnel.

A second group is getting under way with junior high teachers.

Racial problems at the high school (grade 9-10) has led to acceptance

of in-service for 20 social science teachers; to begin soon.

5. Anything else to add?

They plan to use pre and post tests to assess program. They

admit that their judgments have been subjective.

D. Summary and Conclusions

The attempt to relate model to curriculum was successful only in the

Abington example. The curriculum was never evident in the other examples.

In all but the last case, there was much obvious defensiveness on the

part of the innovative people. This was true even though the interviewer

went out of his way to be supportive. Or are the very questions too threat-

ening, in themselves?

Has the question been dealt with adequately to respond to the degree to

which there is an affective curriculum? Probably not. The reader must ask

himself how many such programs are really functioning in a manner that

promises a good chance of dissemination.

The writer can state that, with Abington's "Magic Circle," there is a

model (Glasser's work), there is a curriculum that both specifies substance

and allows for teacher and pupil open-endedness, and that the materials are

consistent with each other. Furthermore, these materials are more revealing

of goals and justifications than are most standard fare in conventional

school curricula.

III. Critique of the Issues

One of the remaining questions about the existence of affect, as a
curriculum piece, is where can it fit into a school's day. Many of its
advocates beg the question by stating that it's inseparable from cognition.
Nonsense. Why is it not separable?

Earlier in this paper, I dismissed it as an appreciation (as appreciating
geometric forms). But this does not mean that some affective people deny it
for use by disciplinary-oriented teachers (Dr. X and its use in value clari-
fication in a science class). Unfortunately, they mislead us by tending to
provide one or two examples and leaving us there. This constitutes the
teasing, incomplete curriculum statement. It reminds me of the numerous
statements advocating interdisciplinary curriculum in the 1950's. Such
proponents talked about combining math and science, gave us one or two
examples, such as the use of metric systems, and did not serve us to spread
the idea, no matter how worthy it was. Where is the interdisciplinary
movement, beyond lip service?

Herein lies a major question about the movement. It's not clear
whether it stands for much more than a change in educational environment

and classroom climate. The lack of curriculum statements and materials

leads, in part, to this conclusion. It also leads to a question. Is affect

an anti-academic movement which presumes the lack of need on the part of

students for any set of intended learnings or objectives?

Many of the affective people would have us concern ourselves with

relevancy in the subjects. By what token do the disciplines pretend to

relevancy? They don't. Why not call things what they are? If affect is

to deal with the personal or personal-social concerns of students, then

let's have this as the task for some or most teachers twice or five times

a week with support; and support here means in-service and curriculum materials

to help teachers. The subject can be called Personal Growth, Group Guidance,

or even Applications of Social-Psychology. My contention is that pressing

for affect as a road to relevancy of the subjects and refusing to distinguish

between the meanings of affect and cognition all constitute a cop-out.

If it's all worth doing, and doing means taking responsibility for

producing curriculum materials for teachers and students, it is necessary to

face the question of who will develop the curriculum? In raising the

question, I do not assume that it must be prescriptive. Nor do I assume that

adults must do all of the developing. As with the Abington "Magic Circle,"

curriculum materials were initially developed in El Cajon, California, with

a conceptual base emanating from Glasser. Teachers are given help with these

materials to provide a security base for them and their students. However,

much of the substance comes from incidents among students, student questions,

and teachers move ahead from there. The classes can return to the materials

already developed or continue to use real problems as they perceive them.

This does not deny that school personnel cannot develop their own.

However, until we see such examples, and see them spread, we can't place our

bets on local, concentrated efforts. Such efforts may be ideal, in many ways,

but let's see them first.

The notion of growth and spread of a movement forces a return to the

question of how attainable is an affective curriculum? Let's examine this by

first examining some mythology about educational movements.

One notion has it that the charisma of innovative people will spread the

movement. It doesn't. A second myth lies within the exhortations made by

professors of education to improve the humanism of teachers. It assumes that

we can appeal to and exhort personality changes. It assumes that teachers

are gifted and creative and human and near-perfect. Neither of these myths

place faith in curriculum materials nor do they assume that teachers, en

masse, are "average" people.

I contend that the affective movement is not likely to grow if it depends

on either the giftedness of teachers or on the seductive quality of its

proponents. Too many of us are mixed up enough about our own values to help

others. "Doctor, heal thyself."

A most obvious conclusion is that there is much confusion about the

affective movement. There is a need for more investigative description and

dialogue to bring out its real thinking and direction. So long as the

movement goes unchallenged, it is more likely to die. If it is really worth

saving, and I think it is, let us get more advocates to stand up and fight

for it, not with rhetoric, but by articulating their thinking with the

social and political realities of American Education.

Having been fairly presumptuous to this point, I'd like to go further, in concluding, by making a prediction. Based on my experiences, readings, and the brief work for this paper, I do not see too much hope for an increased movement in affective curriculum or education. At this point in time, I don't think it will "stick."

It should continue to be good business for a while for those doing the teaching, the writing, and the consulting. Then it will die down for another ten or fifteen years and re-emerge with new, confusing labels. First, however, we'll have to pass through a most conservative era in our society, our government, and our institutions.

In making this statement, I cannot help but wonder how much of it stems from experience and study; how much of it is obvious from the history of education in our society? Broudy's recent analysis of the problem of school responsiveness to change[17] serves to reenforce the prediction.

[1] Krathwohl, David R., Bloom, Benjamin S., and Masia, Bartram B., Taxonomy
of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain, David McKay,
N. Y., 1964, p. 7.

[2] Alpren, Morton, "Differentiating Affective Concerns," Educational Leadership,
April, 1972.

[3] Popham, W. James, Paper delivered at AERA, Professors of Curriculum Theory,
New York, Feb. 1971.

[4] Educational Service Bureau, "An Evaluation of the American Institutes for
Research's Sequencing and Scheduling Project," Temple University,
Philadelphia, Pa., Feb., 1971.

[5] Popham, W. James, "Empirical Based Revision of Affective Measuring Instruments,"
Paper presented at Annual Meeting of CERA, San Jose, Calif., Nov. 8-9, 1972.

[6] Newberg, Norman, and Borton, Terry, have been active in such endeavors.
See Education for Student Concerns, Urban Affairs Anthology, and Making
Sense, paperbound materials, Phila. Public Schools, 1968-69.

[7] Simon, Sidney B., Howe, Leland W., and Kirschenbaum, Howard, Values Clarification,
Hart Publishing Co., New York, 1972.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Harmin, Merrill, Kirschenbaum, Howard, and Simon, Sidney B., "Teaching Science
with a Focus on Values," Science Teacher, Jan., 1970.

[10] To cite Bruner's work here would be an example of attempting scholarly
accuracy that would be misleading. As noted just below the reference,
Adorno was encouraged to delete the work as an example of an affective
model. To cite it here would contaminate the sources for purposes of
a paper on affective curriculum.

[11] Newberg and Borton, op. cit.

[12] Borton, Terry, Reach, Touch and Teach, McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, 1970.

[13] Newberg and Borton, op. cit.

[14] Glasser, William, Schools Without Failure, Harper and Row, New York, 1969.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Bessell, Harold, and Palomares, Uvaldo, Methods in Human Development: Theory
Manual, Hum. Dev. Train. Inst., El Cajon, Calif., 1970; also 8 additional
lesson guides, same publisher, later dates.

[17] Broudy, Harry S., The Real World of the Public Schools, Harcourt, Brace,
Jahonovich, New York, 1972, Ch. 2.