

SN- 2407439

Assignment - Portfolio

Word Count- 3868

Introduction

Educational theory remains central to how learning, teaching, and childhood are conceptualised within contemporary educational discourse. Engagement with the work of influential educational theorists provides critical insight into the philosophical assumptions, values, and power relations that continue to shape pedagogical practice and policy. This portfolio offers a critical review of the contributions of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Maria Montessori, two theorists whose work has been highly influential in the development of child-centred educational approaches.

Rather than examining their ideas as discrete or static bodies of thought, this portfolio adopts a comparative perspective, analysing points of convergence and divergence in relation to their historical contexts, pedagogical principles, and underlying views of the child and learning. In doing so, it acknowledges that educational theories are socially and historically situated, reflecting particular responses to the educational challenges of their time (Biesta, 2015). Through critical analysis and reflective discussion, the portfolio evaluates the extent to which Pestalozzi's and Montessori's ideas retain relevance within contemporary educational practice, while also recognising the limitations and tensions that arise when historical theories are applied within modern, evidence-informed educational contexts. Ultimately, the discussion seeks to demonstrate how theoretical perspectives can support reflective, responsive, and ethically grounded educational practice in the twenty-first century.

Historical Review

Educational theorists are inescapably shaped by the social, political, and intellectual conditions of their time. This is particularly evident in the work of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Maria Montessori, two figures frequently associated with the development of child-centred education. Although their ideas are often positioned within progressive educational traditions, closer examination reveals that their pedagogical philosophies emerged from markedly different historical contexts and were driven by distinct motivations (Gutek, 2014). These contextual differences are significant, as they illuminate both the points of alignment and the underlying tensions within their respective approaches to teaching and learning.

Pestalozzi's work developed in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Europe, a period characterised by widespread poverty, social instability, and growing concern for social reform. His educational thinking was deeply intertwined with humanitarian aims, positioning education as a means of addressing social inequality at its roots (Silber, 1960). Working primarily with children from impoverished backgrounds, Pestalozzi placed strong emphasis on care, emotional security, and moral development. Education was therefore understood not merely as an intellectual pursuit, but as a

holistic process concerned with nurturing the “head, heart and hands” of the child (Pestalozzi, 1801). This framing reflects a moral vision of education grounded in compassion and relational responsibility.

Montessori’s work emerged over a century later within a substantially different intellectual climate. The early twentieth century was marked by increasing confidence in science, psychology, and empirical observation, all of which shaped Montessori’s educational thinking (Standing, 1998). Trained as a physician, Montessori approached education through systematic observation and experimentation rather than philosophical reflection alone. Her early work with children who were deemed ‘uneducable’ led her to challenge prevailing assumptions about intelligence and ability. She argued that many learning difficulties stemmed from unsuitable educational environments rather than inherent deficits within the child (Montessori, 1912). This perspective positioned education as a scientific endeavour concerned with optimising conditions for development.

While both theorists sought to challenge traditional models of schooling, the nature of their critiques differed in important ways. Pestalozzi opposed rigid discipline and rote learning primarily on moral and emotional grounds, viewing such practices as detrimental to children’s natural development, particularly for those already experiencing social disadvantage (Soëtard, 1994). Montessori likewise rejected authoritarian teaching methods, but her critique was grounded more firmly in developmental psychology and scientific reasoning. Whereas Pestalozzi prioritised compassion and relational care, Montessori emphasised independence, order, and the careful preparation of learning environments to support self-directed activity (Montessori, 1949).

These contextual distinctions are further reflected in how each theorist conceptualised childhood. Pestalozzi viewed children as naturally inclined towards goodness but in need of sensitive adult guidance to reach their full potential, reflecting broader Enlightenment ideas concerning nature and moral education (Gutek, 2014). In contrast, Montessori placed greater emphasis on the child’s innate drive towards autonomy and self-construction. She argued that, when provided with freedom within a structured and purposeful environment, children are capable of directing their own learning effectively (Montessori, 1912). Although both perspectives adopt a positive view of the child, they differ significantly in the degree of independence afforded to the learner.

The historical contexts in which Pestalozzi and Montessori worked also influenced the dissemination and longevity of their ideas. Pestalozzi’s approach was often described as intuitive and deeply personal, shaped by his own experiences rather than articulated as a formalised system (Silber, 1960). Consequently, his influence was absorbed more subtly into broader educational thinking rather than institutionalised within a single, replicable model. Montessori’s pedagogy, by contrast, emerged during a period that valued standardisation and scientific legitimacy. Her carefully designed materials

and structured environments enabled consistent implementation across diverse contexts, contributing to the global spread and enduring presence of Montessori education (Standing, 1998).

Overall, while Pestalozzi and Montessori share a commitment to child-centred education, their theories reflect the distinct social and intellectual priorities of their respective eras. Pestalozzi's work can be understood as a humanitarian response to social inequality, whereas Montessori's represents a scientific response to misconceptions about child development. Recognising these contextual foundations provides a necessary basis for examining how their educational theories converge and diverge, and for understanding why their legacies continue to influence contemporary educational practice in different ways.

Exploration of Theories and Practices

Although Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Maria Montessori are frequently positioned within traditions of child-centred education, closer analysis of their theories and practices reveals important distinctions in how learning, teaching, and childhood are conceptualised. While both theorists rejected authoritarian models of schooling and challenged transmission-based pedagogy, their understandings of how learning occurs and the role of adults in supporting it diverge in significant ways. These distinctions can be most clearly examined through a comparative exploration of their views on learning processes, the role of the teacher, the learning environment, and curriculum design (Cunningham & Stanovich, 2004).

Central to Pestalozzi's educational thinking is the principle of holistic development, which foregrounds the interrelationship between intellectual, emotional, and moral growth. Scholars note that Pestalozzi viewed learning as a deeply relational process, in which cognition was inseparable from affective experience and ethical formation (Tröhler, 2013). Rather than prioritising academic outcomes alone, his approach emphasised the development of the whole child through meaningful engagement with people and experiences. Montessori likewise conceptualised learning as an active and constructive process; however, her interpretation was shaped more explicitly by emerging psychological and developmental theories. Her pedagogy is frequently understood as an early application of developmental science to education, emphasising stages of readiness and internal motivation (Lillard, 2017).

Despite shared recognition of learning as a natural process, Pestalozzi assigned a more prominent role to adult guidance in shaping development. His approach is often described as intentionally scaffolded, with learning progressing from simple to complex concepts under the careful support of the teacher (Gutek, 2014). This reflects his belief that children, particularly those experiencing disadvantage,

required structured guidance to support both intellectual and moral growth. Montessori, by contrast, argued that excessive adult intervention could inhibit learning. Research examining Montessori practice highlights her emphasis on self-directed activity, suggesting that autonomy and intrinsic motivation are fostered most effectively when adults intervene minimally (Marshall, 2017). This distinction reveals a fundamental tension between guided relational support and independence-driven learning.

The differing roles attributed to teachers further illustrate this contrast. Pestalozzi conceptualised teaching as a moral and relational vocation, in which the teacher's responsibility extended beyond instruction to include emotional care and ethical guidance. Historical analyses emphasise that Pestalozzi's model positioned the teacher as a formative influence on the child's character, particularly within socially disadvantaged contexts (Tröhler, 2013). Montessori, however, reconceptualised the teacher as a facilitator whose primary responsibility was to observe, prepare, and maintain an enabling environment. Contemporary evaluations of Montessori education describe this role as deliberately non-intrusive, designed to support independence rather than direct instruction (Lillard & Else-Quest, 2006).

Although both theorists emphasised respect for the individuality of the child, they differed significantly in how agency and authority were distributed within the classroom. Pestalozzi's approach retained a degree of adult authority, exercised through care and relational sensitivity rather than coercion. Montessori's pedagogy, in contrast, sought to redistribute power more explicitly, positioning children as active participants in shaping their own learning experiences (Marshall, 2017). This shift has important implications for classroom management, discipline, and learner autonomy, particularly within contemporary debates around pupil voice and agency.

The learning environment also occupies a central role within both pedagogical frameworks, though it is conceptualised differently. Pestalozzi emphasised the importance of emotional security, viewing a caring and supportive environment as a prerequisite for effective learning (Cunningham & Stanovich, 2004). Montessori, by contrast, foregrounded the physical organisation of the environment, arguing that order, accessibility, and carefully designed materials were essential in promoting independence and sustained concentration. Empirical research suggests that Montessori's structured environments can positively support self-regulation and executive functioning when implemented with fidelity (Diamond & Lee, 2011).

Curriculum design further highlights the divergence between the two approaches. Pestalozzi advocated for flexible, experience-based learning grounded in everyday life, with curriculum content emerging responsively from the child's needs and interests (Gutek, 2014). Montessori, while also valuing experiential learning, developed a more systematic curriculum organised around sequenced

materials and clearly defined learning aims. While this structure has been praised for supporting mastery and self-correction, critics argue that rigid application risks limiting creativity and responsiveness if detached from reflective practice (Ackerman, 2019).

Taken together, these distinctions illustrate that while Pestalozzi and Montessori share a commitment to child-centred education, they articulate fundamentally different pedagogical priorities. Pestalozzi foregrounds relational care, moral development, and guided learning, whereas Montessori prioritises autonomy, structure, and self-regulation. Both approaches continue to inform contemporary educational thinking, though their application requires critical engagement rather than uncritical adoption. Understanding these differences provides a foundation for evaluating their relevance within modern, inclusive, and evidence-informed educational contexts.

Review of Impact

The educational influence of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Maria Montessori can be traced not only through specific pedagogical approaches, but also through the broader values and assumptions that underpin contemporary education. While both theorists sought to challenge traditional schooling and re-centre the child within educational practice, the form, visibility, and durability of their impact differ significantly. These differences reflect not only the substance of their ideas, but also the ways in which those ideas were disseminated, interpreted, and sustained across time and contexts.

Pestalozzi's influence is most often characterised as foundational rather than institutional. Rather than establishing a distinct or enduring model of schooling, his contribution lies in reshaping how education came to be understood, particularly in relation to the moral, emotional, and social dimensions of learning. Historians of education argue that Pestalozzi's work played a critical role in shifting educational discourse away from authoritarian discipline towards more humane and child-focused ideals, influencing subsequent reform movements across Europe (Tröhler, 2011). His emphasis on education as a means of social renewal positioned schooling as a moral endeavour, contributing to the gradual emergence of values that remain central to contemporary child-centred education.

In contrast, Montessori's impact is far more visible and readily identifiable within modern educational systems. Her work resulted in a clearly articulated pedagogical model that could be implemented with a high degree of consistency across settings. This formalisation enabled Montessori education to expand internationally, supported by training programmes, professional organisations, and a distinctive material culture (Whitescarver & Cossentino, 2008). As a result, Montessori's influence extends beyond philosophical discourse to shape everyday classroom practices, institutional

structures, and professional identities. Her legacy can therefore be understood as both ideological and operational, offering a recognisable alternative to mainstream schooling.

Despite these differences in visibility, both theorists have had a significant impact on how children are positioned within educational discourse. Pestalozzi's work contributed to a re-conceptualisation of the child as a moral and emotional being whose development extends beyond academic attainment. Educational scholars suggest that this framing helped to legitimise later attention to care, attachment, and well-being within schooling (Smith, 2010). Montessori similarly reshaped perceptions of childhood, presenting children as competent, purposeful learners capable of self-regulation and sustained concentration. Her influence is evident in contemporary emphasis on learner agency, independence, and active engagement, particularly within early years education (Cossentino, 2009).

Critical evaluation of impact, however, requires attention to the limitations of each legacy. Pestalozzi's influence, while wide-reaching, is often described as diffuse. Because his ideas were not systematised into a single, transferable model, their uptake relied heavily on interpretation by later educators and reformers. This lack of formal structure has been identified as both a strength and a limitation, allowing flexibility but restricting large-scale implementation (Tröhler, 2011). Consequently, Pestalozzi's impact is more apparent in educational values and rhetoric than in clearly attributable pedagogical practices.

Montessori's approach, although praised for coherence and longevity, has also been subject to sustained critique. Scholars have questioned whether the standardisation required to maintain fidelity to Montessori principles can limit responsiveness to diverse cultural and contextual needs (Murray, 2011). Others argue that institutionalised Montessori practice risks becoming prescriptive if insufficiently adapted to contemporary educational priorities, such as inclusion and curriculum integration (Cossentino, 2009). These critiques suggest that visibility and scalability, while contributing to impact, may also constrain pedagogical flexibility.

Considerations of access and equity further complicate assessments of influence. Pestalozzi's commitment to educating disadvantaged children positioned his work firmly within early social justice traditions, yet the reliance on individual reformers limited systemic change. Montessori education, despite its philosophical commitment to equality and independence, has often been associated with private provision, raising concerns about accessibility and socio-economic exclusion (Whitescarver & Cossentino, 2008). This tension highlights the gap that can emerge between pedagogical ideals and structural realities, particularly within market-driven educational contexts.

Within contemporary education, the influence of both theorists is more commonly observed through adaptation than direct adoption. Elements of Pestalozzian thinking can be identified in current

emphasis on pupil well-being, emotional literacy, and holistic development, while Montessori's legacy is reflected in practices that promote autonomy, self-regulation, and purposeful activity. Educational theorists argue that such selective integration reflects a pragmatic engagement with theory, in which historical ideas are re-interpreted to meet modern demands rather than applied uncritically (Biesta, 2017).

Overall, the impact of Pestalozzi and Montessori represents two distinct forms of educational legacy. Pestalozzi's influence is subtle yet enduring, embedded within the ethical and philosophical foundations of child-centred education. Montessori's impact is more explicit and institutional, offering a recognisable and sustained model of practice. Both have played a crucial role in reshaping educational thought, though in different ways. Evaluating their impact underscores the importance of considering not only the content of educational theories, but also the conditions under which they are translated into practice and sustained over time. This distinction provides a valuable lens for critically reflecting on the relevance of their ideas within contemporary educational contexts.

Critical Reflection

Critical reflection on the educational theories of Pestalozzi and Montessori highlights the enduring appeal of child-centred education, while also revealing tensions that emerge when historical theories are applied within contemporary educational contexts. Although both theorists position the child as an active participant in learning, their differing emphases on autonomy, structure, and adult involvement raise important questions about how child-centred principles can be enacted in modern classrooms shaped by accountability pressures, curriculum demands, and diverse learner needs.

One significant point of tension lies in how each theorist conceptualises the role of the teacher. Pestalozzi's emphasis on relational care, moral responsibility, and emotional attunement resonates strongly with contemporary research that foregrounds the importance of positive teacher–pupil relationships in supporting learning and wellbeing. Educational research consistently highlights that pupils' emotional security and sense of belonging are closely linked to engagement and achievement (Noddings, 2013; Hattie, 2023). However, while Pestalozzi's relational approach offers an ethically compelling vision of teaching, it also raises concerns regarding sustainability. In contemporary educational settings, where teachers face increasing workloads and accountability pressures, the emotional labour associated with constant relational responsiveness may be difficult to maintain consistently. This suggests that while Pestalozzian care remains desirable, it requires systemic support rather than reliance on individual teacher capacity.

Montessori's reconceptualisation of the teacher as an observer and facilitator presents a contrasting model that may appear more compatible with structured educational systems. By emphasising independence, self-regulation, and intrinsic motivation, Montessori-inspired approaches align with contemporary priorities surrounding learner agency and active engagement. Research into autonomy-supportive classrooms suggests that such approaches can positively influence motivation and self-efficacy when implemented thoughtfully (Ryan & Deci, 2020). However, there is a risk that rigid adherence to minimal intervention may overlook the emotional and relational needs of some learners, particularly those requiring additional support. This highlights a potential limitation of autonomy-focused models when applied without sufficient relational scaffolding.

The theorists' contrasting interpretations of freedom further complicate their application in practice. Montessori's assertion that freedom within a structured environment enables the development of self-discipline remains influential in contemporary educational thinking, particularly within early years pedagogy. However, critics argue that this perspective may underestimate the impact of external factors such as trauma, socio-economic disadvantage, or unmet emotional needs on children's capacity for self-regulation (OECD, 2021). Pestalozzi's more cautious view of freedom, grounded in adult guidance and moral responsibility, may therefore offer a more responsive framework for supporting vulnerable learners. This comparison suggests that freedom in learning cannot be considered in isolation from context, relationships, and individual readiness.

Within contemporary classrooms, it is neither realistic nor desirable to adopt either theorist's approach in its original form. Modern education operates within complex systems shaped by statutory curricula, assessment frameworks, and inclusion agendas. Nevertheless, elements of both Pestalozzian and Montessori principles remain highly relevant. Pestalozzi's emphasis on holistic development and emotional wellbeing aligns closely with current concerns around pupil mental health and resilience. Montessori's focus on purposeful activity and structured independence offers valuable insights into how learning environments can be designed to support engagement and self-directed learning.

Rather than viewing these theories as competing models, a more productive approach is to consider how they might be integrated in practice. A classroom grounded in emotional security and strong teacher–pupil relationships may provide the necessary conditions for children to develop the independence and autonomy emphasised by Montessori. Such integration reflects contemporary understandings of effective pedagogy, which recognise that autonomy is most successfully fostered when learners feel supported, valued, and safe (Biesta, 2017). This blended approach mirrors how many educators draw pragmatically on multiple theoretical traditions rather than adhering rigidly to a single philosophy.

This comparison also foregrounds the importance of professional judgement. Neither Pestalozzi nor Montessori offers a complete solution to the complexities of contemporary education. Instead, their theories function most effectively as guiding frameworks that inform reflective decision-making. Contemporary educational scholarship increasingly emphasises the role of teacher judgement in navigating competing priorities, adapting theory to context, and responding to the needs of diverse learners (Biesta, 2022). Engaging critically with theory, rather than applying it prescriptively, is therefore essential to effective practice.

Implications for Contemporary Educational Practice

While the theories of Pestalozzi and Montessori emerged within specific historical contexts, their continued influence raises important questions about how educational theory should inform contemporary classroom practice. Modern education is characterised by increasing diversity, heightened accountability, and a strong emphasis on inclusion, requiring teachers to adapt historical ideas thoughtfully rather than apply them uncritically. Examining the practical implications of Pestalozzian and Montessori principles within this context highlights both their enduring relevance and their limitations.

One significant implication concerns the balance between relational pedagogy and structural demands. Pestalozzi's emphasis on care, emotional security, and moral responsibility aligns closely with contemporary frameworks that foreground learner wellbeing as a foundation for academic success. Research indicates that positive teacher–pupil relationships are particularly important for pupils experiencing disadvantage or additional learning needs, supporting engagement, behaviour, and attainment (Hamre & Pianta, 2006). However, contemporary classrooms are often constrained by curricular pacing, assessment pressures, and limited time for individualised support. This suggests that while relational pedagogy remains vital, it must be supported by whole-school systems and policies rather than relying solely on individual teacher capacity.

Montessori's structured approach to independence offers contrasting insights into classroom organisation and pedagogy. Her emphasis on purposeful activity, self-regulation, and carefully designed environments resonates with current approaches that promote active learning and learner autonomy. Studies examining learner-centred environments suggest that opportunities for choice and independence can enhance motivation and deepen engagement when appropriately scaffolded (Kirschner, Sweller & Clark, 2006). However, this research also cautions against minimal guidance approaches that fail to account for cognitive load or learner readiness. In this sense, Montessori's

emphasis on structure alongside freedom remains particularly relevant, highlighting the importance of intentional design rather than laissez-faire practice.

In inclusive educational contexts, the integration of both theorists' ideas becomes especially significant. Contemporary classrooms are increasingly diverse, encompassing a wide range of cognitive, emotional, and social needs. Pestalozzi's focus on holistic development and moral responsibility provides a strong ethical framework for inclusion, emphasising dignity, care, and relational understanding. Montessori's attention to environmental design and individual pacing offers practical strategies for supporting diverse learners, particularly through differentiated materials and opportunities for self-paced engagement. Research on inclusive pedagogy suggests that flexible learning environments, combined with strong relational foundations, are key to meeting diverse needs effectively (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011).

The role of teacher professionalism also emerges as a critical consideration. Both Pestalozzi and Montessori assume a high level of professional judgement, whether through relational responsiveness or careful observation and preparation. Contemporary scholarship increasingly emphasises teaching as an interpretive and ethical practice rather than a purely technical one (Sockett, 2012). From this perspective, educational theory serves not as a set of instructions but as a resource for informed decision-making. Engaging with Pestalozzian and Montessori principles can therefore support teachers in developing reflective practice, enabling them to justify pedagogical choices in relation to both learner needs and educational values.

Importantly, contemporary policy contexts can both enable and constrain the application of these ideas. Accountability frameworks and standardised assessments may limit opportunities for autonomy and holistic development if applied rigidly. However, policy discourses that emphasise wellbeing, inclusion, and learner agency create space for educators to draw meaningfully on child-centred traditions. This highlights the need for alignment between educational values, classroom practice, and systemic structures if the insights of historical theorists are to be realised effectively in modern education.

Ultimately, the implications of Pestalozzi's and Montessori's work for contemporary practice lie not in replication, but in interpretation. Their theories offer complementary perspectives on care, autonomy, structure, and moral purpose, all of which remain relevant to current educational challenges. When integrated thoughtfully, these ideas can inform pedagogies that are both ethically grounded and practically responsive, supporting learners academically, emotionally, and socially within complex modern classrooms.

Conclusion

In conclusion, critical reflection on the work of Pestalozzi and Montessori reinforces the continued relevance of child-centred education while also highlighting the challenges of translating historical theory into modern practice. Pestalozzi's focus on relational care and holistic development provides an essential ethical foundation, while Montessori's emphasis on autonomy and structured environments offers practical strategies for fostering independence. Neither approach is sufficient in isolation. Instead, the most effective application of their ideas lies in a critical integration of both perspectives, where emotional security underpins opportunities for self-directed learning. Such an approach recognises the complexity of contemporary classrooms and affirms the central role of reflective, informed professional judgement in educational practice.

Reference List:

- Ackerman, D.J. (2019) 'Montessori education: Reforming early childhood education', *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 47(3), pp. 321–329.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-019-00951-1>
- Biesta, G. (2015) *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. London: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315635811>
- Biesta, G. (2017) *The rediscovery of teaching*. London: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315678627>
- Biesta, G. (2022) *World-centred education: A view for the present*. London: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003098331>
- Cossentino, J. (2009) 'Culture, craft, and coherence: The unexpected vitality of Montessori teacher training', *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), pp. 520–527.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109344593>
- Cunningham, A.E. and Stanovich, K.E. (2004) 'Does the Montessori method help children learn?', *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), pp. 329–342.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-6>
- Diamond, A. and Lee, K. (2011) 'Interventions shown to aid executive function development in children', *Science*, 333(6045), pp. 959–964.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1204529>
- Florian, L. and Black-Hawkins, K. (2011) 'Exploring inclusive pedagogy', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(4), pp. 513–528.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2011.625005>
- Guttek, G.L. (2014) *Philosophical, ideological and theoretical perspectives on education*. 2nd edn. Boston: Pearson.
- Hamre, B.K. and Pianta, R.C. (2006) 'Student–teacher relationships', *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), pp. 217–248.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076002217>
- Hattie, J. (2023) *Visible learning: The sequel*. London: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003378327>
- Kirschner, P.A., Sweller, J. and Clark, R.E. (2006) 'Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work', *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), pp. 75–86.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1

- Lillard, A.S. (2017) *Montessori: The science behind the genius*. 3rd edn. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lillard, A.S. and Else-Quest, N. (2006) 'The early years', *Science*, 313(5795), pp. 1893–1894. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1132362>
- Marshall, C. (2017) 'Montessori education', *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(4), pp. 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-017-9412-7>
- Montessori, M. (1912) *The Montessori method*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company.
- Montessori, M. (1949) *The absorbent mind*. Madras: Theosophical Publishing House.
- Murray, A. (2011) 'Montessori elementary philosophy', *Montessori Life*, 23(1), pp. 22–29.
- Noddings, N. (2013) *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education*. 2nd edn. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- OECD (2021) *Beyond academic learning: First results from the Survey of Social and Emotional Skills*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/92a11084-en>
- Pestalozzi, J.H. (1801) *How Gertrude teaches her children*. London: Swan Sonnenschein.
- Silber, K. (1960) *Pestalozzi: The man and his work*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Smith, M.K. (2010) 'What is pedagogy?', *The Encyclopaedia of Pedagogy*. Available at: <https://infed.org> (Accessed: [insert your access date]).
- Soëttard, M. (1994) *Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi*. Paris: UNESCO: International Bureau of Education.
- Standing, E.M. (1998) *Maria Montessori: Her life and work*. New York: Plume.
- Tröhler, D. (2011) 'Languages of education', *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(8), pp. 759–772. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2009.00553.x>
- Tröhler, D. (2013) *Pestalozzi and the educationalization of the world*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137346858>
- Whitescarver, K. and Cossentino, J. (2008) 'Montessori and the mainstream', *Teachers College Record*, 110(12), pp. 2571–2600.

