Rethinking Progressivism and the Crisis of Liberal Humanism: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Education for Democratic Citizenship

Emery J. Hyslop-Margison Theresa Richardson*
Ball State University

Abstract

In this paper, we examine the current siege on progressivism in light of these dual tendencies from both an historical and contemporary perspective. We defend the democratic objectives of progressive education from various contemporary attacks that view student-centered learning as academically inefficacious. With the assistance of Dewey's arguments, we argue that public schools should produce students prepared to assume their democratic citizenship responsibilities by pursuing the liberal humanistic strand of progressive education. We believe that progressive education approaches that emphasize student centered learning and conjoint decision-making afford an indispensable element to achieve that critically important objective.

Introduction

The schooling reforms introduced in the United States between 1890-1914 reflected competing paradigms of progressive education. Some supporters of progressivism such as David Snedden and Charles Prosser promoted its *social efficiency* objectives, and sought to direct social change according to scientific principles that promoted hierarchical authority and instrumental order. Consistent with traditional conservative imperatives, the social efficiency strand of progressivism stressed bureaucratic order, scientism, accountability, and standardized assessment within traditional teacher-centered classrooms. Snedden, in particular, advocated an educational approach that responded directly to the human capital requirements of industry. Social efficiency proponents argued that educators must accept the industrial social system and its accompanying class structure as an inevitable fact of life, and channel their energies toward ensuring its efficient operation. The social efficiency strand of progressivism embraces the social Darwinian assumption that inherently disparate individual characteristics invariably produce an economically stratified society (Hyslop-Margison, 2000). Another strand of early progressivism was infused with a broad based *liberal humanism*, a perspective reflected in the views of John Dewey, where the ultimate goal was to improve the human condition. From this viewpoint, schooling should be student-centered to advance the political voice of all children and prepare them for active citizenship in a democratic society.

These two divergent strands of progressive education represent competing approaches in the theory and practice of schooling, and remain pervasive throughout contemporary educational discourse. The liberal humanist strand of progressive education has been the enduring subject of attack from a range of conservative opponents, coming under sharp criticism in the late 1940s and 1950s after a period of progressive experimentation during the 1930s. These attacks continued unabated during the last half of the twentieth century and progressive classroom practices are currently under siege once again. Contemporary challenges to progressivism emerge from a range of conservative scholars who condemn child-centered learning for popularizing ineffective and self-indulgent instructional approaches.

The United States is currently witnessing a period of rapid social, demographic, economic, and political change that parallels many of the challenges faced by educators during the early Progressive era. The use of education as a humanitarian tool that promotes the democratic empowerment of all citizens is a critical objective as the nation faces a diverse school population and declining voter participation in the nation's formal democratic processes. Statistics reveal that formal political participation is especially low

among younger citizens. For example, in the 2000 presidential election only 51% of eligible voters actually cast a ballot and when limited to include citizens between the ages of 18 and 24 voter participation drops to 46% (University of California, Santa Barbara, 2004). These troubling statistics raise the specter of whether the current emphasis on standardization and accountability, indebted to the social efficiency strand of progressivism, undermine the crucial role of schools in preparing students as engaged democratic citizens. Contemporary schooling reforms that stress social efficiency above all other considerations undermine democratic participation by portraying society in an ahistorical context that reduces the role of students to mere structural adaptation.

In this paper, we examine the current siege on progressivism in light of its dual legacies from both a historical and contemporary perspective. We defend the democratic and liberal humanitarian objectives of progressive education from various contemporary attacks that challenge student-centered learning as being academically inefficacious. With the assistance of Dewey's most compelling arguments, we argue that schools and teachers should prepare students to assume their democratic citizenship responsibilities by pursuing learning practices that foster their political voice. Finally, we suggest that progressive education approaches emphasizing student-centered learning and conjoint decision-making afford an indispensable mechanism to develop participatory democratic citizens.

Progressivism: History, Theory, and Practice

The later portion of the nineteenth century witnessed a critical shift in thinking about public education in America. Rapid industrial development and burgeoning population growth led to the idea of universal schooling, and these elements combined with the increased influence of evolutionary biology to promote major educational reform (Egan, 2002). Famed educational historian Lawrence Cremin (1962) describes the 1890s as a revolutionary decade for American public education. Progressivism in the United States began as a political movement responding to the country's transformation from a nation of small, independent farmers and trades people to one of employees and consumers subject to greater corporate influence. The rapid industrialization of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries required immense amounts of capital and American investors enjoyed the opportunity to enhance their individual wealth. The financial return experienced by these investors created tremendous concentrations of personal wealth, but also exacerbated class stratification by leaving a growing segment of the population without meaningful social status or political voice (Cremin, 1962; Hofstadter, 1963). With its emphasis on social progress, progressive education developed in response to these conditions and, as Cremin (1962) points out, "began as part of a vast humanitarian effort to apply the promise of American life – the ideal of government by, of, and for the people – to the puzzling new urban civilization that came into being during the latter half of the nineteenth-century" (p. viii).

The Progressive Education Association (PEA) was organized in the spring of 1919. Until the year 1955, the PEA sought to advance progressive views of education as a means to advance democratic learning objectives. The term "progressive" was chosen as an indication of the association's commitment to pursue best practices and social progress through schools. Progressive educators tended to support experimentation but the exact goals and practices they promoted were far from uniform or coherent: 1) children should have the freedom to learn naturally; 2) teachers should not be task masters but facilitators; 3) physical and mental development should be studied scientifically and taken into account in the organization of schools; 4) a child's learning and development is affected by the context; 5) progressive schools and teachers should lead educational reform (Altenbaugh, 2003, p. 192; Cremin, 1963, pp. 243-245).

Calls for public schools to restructure were gaining momentum in the1920s as the multiple changes after World War II transformed the American social landscape. Lois Meek (1930), child study researcher at Teachers College Columbia University, noted in 1930 that: "The World War, automobiles, airplanes, radios, prohibition, women suffrage, congested cities, subways, jazz, talkies, rouge and lipstick, short skirts, women's smoking are only a few of the things that have helped to change our lives these last two decades" (p. 457). These changes also altered student experiences and expectations, and

influenced what had to be learned if a person was to participate fully within a modernized social order (Krug, 1972).

In 1930, the PEA began work on a study of college entrance requirements and their coherence with high school curriculum. A survey was conducted in 1931 to identify American colleges willing to participate in a larger study. In 1932 the project became officially known as the Commission on the Relation between School and College. The Commission on the Relation between School and College and two other PEA commissions, the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum and the Commission on Human Relations, became an important part of the new general education program supported by the philanthropies of John D. Rockefeller Sr. The General Education Board (GEB - established in 1903) and the Rockefeller Foundation (established in 1913) supported these commissions with $1,622,000 in grants, a huge sum especially during the depression. Rockefeller philanthropies were established during the Progressive Era and operated in ways that highlight the theoretical contradictions of progressivism. For example, the GEB established public systems of education and health care in the southern states in collaboration with southern elites and other northern philanthropies. While access was provided for poor white and black children, the curriculum and resources were designed on the basis of social class and race.

The most recognized PEA project funded by Rockefeller philanthropy was the Eight-Year Study that was conducted between 1933 and 1941. The Eight Year Study was a longitudinal national project to investigate and change the institution of the high school from one with traditional academic curricula to one with a more popular and socially oriented mission (Lipka, 1998; Raubinger, 1969). It originated as the Committee on the Relation between School and College or the Committee on College Entrance and Secondary Schools. Wilford M. Aiken, headmaster of the John Burrough School in St. Louis, opposed the conventional admission policies for college entrance. Aiken brought his complaint to the PEA and on April 19, 1930, Harold Rugg agreed to create a committee to study the problem. By 1933, 250 colleges were identified as willing to admit students who did not meet traditional qualifications. Thirty city systems of secondary education (this was eventually reduced to 29) also agreed to participate by committing students with traditional credentials and some with unconventional qualifications to a longitudinal study (Krug, 1972; Raubinger, 1969).

To varying degrees, these schools adopted a progressive curriculum and pedagogy, and were optimistically identified as “unshackled”. In other words, they were unencumbered by traditional pre-college pedagogy and courses that emphasized lecture, memorization and the classics in the liberal arts tradition. An equal group of schools that were termed “shackled” formed a control group in that they followed a more conventional college preparatory curriculum. The colleges participating in the survey agreed to admit students from both shackled and unshackled schools so that their academic progress could be monitored. The study found that students with progressive education experience in the unshackled schools academically surpassed the traditionally trained students by the time both groups reached the college level (Krug, 1972; Lipka, 1998).

With Rockefeller funding, the original 1930 project exceeded the original purpose of the study to investigate high school curriculum and college entrance. It became a way to demonstrate change and to actually transform the structure and purpose of high school education while tightening regulatory functions. The results of the evaluation were that the unshackled schools produced students equivalent, or superior, to shackled schools and that the more progressive the unshackled school in terms of innovation, the more superior they were to traditional high schools. The results of the longitudinal aspect of the Eight Year Study were published in five volumes between 1942 and 1951 (Chamberlin, 1942; Smith and Thayer, 1942; Chamberlin, 1943; Aikens, 1942; Redefer, 1951). In spite of the poor timing of the first publications during the first year of World War II the influences on secondary school curriculum were felt for more than two decades and attracted public criticism in the process. It is surprising that contemporary conservative critiques of progressivism conveniently overlook the Eight Year Study and its favorable findings on "unshackled" student-centered schools.

The Eight Year Study was often overshadowed by discussions over the aims and purposes of a high school and college education. In the fall of 1933, a Commission on Secondary School Curriculum

was established as a separate body by the executive board of the PEA with $350,000 from the GEB. V. T. Thayer of the Ethical Culture School was named chair. Thayer was concerned with changes in pedagogical styles, and the role of schooling in personality development. In 1928 she wrote, *The Passing of the Recitation*, a positive commentary on the introduction of lectures and "active" learning in the secondary school over the traditional recitation by students of memorized material. After the stock market crash in 1929, Thayer (1930) became even more thoroughly convinced that the schools were key to generating democratic social change:

> School functions arise from changing conditions. As the community disintegrates and the home becomes confused, the school serves more and more as the focusing point for influences bearing upon the child. Upon it now rests the responsibility for developing the child's personality and for socializing the individual in the interests of the future. To meet this new responsibility the school itself is undergoing transformation. (p. 457)

The PEA established commission initiated a major survey of secondary school curriculum and literature as well as innovative approaches to pedagogy and curriculum to address changing schools in a changing world (Thayer, Zackery and Kotinsky, 1939; Committee, 1940).

As a result of the survey, the idea of a core curriculum was introduced with a special basic or stem course as part of a "general education" program. Guidance and curriculum were blended into this course, which could be taught by a core teacher or teachers and could be either structured or unstructured. Core courses followed guidelines that closely resembled a "personal-social needs" framework so that students learned about themselves, how to live with others and about participating in a democratic society (Vars, 1972). "Communication" was expressly noted as an important part of the core curriculum and colleges were encouraged to experiment with interdisciplinary programs commonly identified with "the general education movement" to provide "integrative, common learning experiences that are significant to all students regardless of their fields of specialization" (Vars, 1972). These programs adopted Dewey's (1916) view that schools provide the most appropriate vehicle to foster the psychological dispositions required for democratic participation.

Other school districts were eventually targeted for experimental restructuring that pursued the social efficiency strand of progressive education. For example, Oakland Public Schools in the San Francisco Bay Area was reorganized and the curriculum restructured into tracks pursuant to the beliefs of Stanford University professor Lewis Terman. An educational psychologist, Terman contributed to the development of group intelligence tests during World War II and authored the Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale for individual testing. Terman argued that if high schools were to become common and universal institutions for all young people, especially considering the cost of education, students needed to be identified by ability and sorted into appropriate college bound or vocational course sequences. Students who failed to exhibit intellectual ability were to be offered a minimal academic curriculum with character development education stressed instead. Although it was recognized that some students would wish to continue beyond high school, they were considered incapable of contributing to research universities. Instead, two years of education beyond high school prepared these students for practical jobs that included technical components such as business training in typing and simple accounting (Terman, 1919; Terman, 1922; Chapman, 1988; Richardson and Johanningmeier, 1998).

From its earliest beginnings, then, progressive education did not represent a unified body of thought, but operated under the general objective of "social progress" and developed disparate learning principles and practices supposedly engineered to improve the lives of students. The liberal humanist strand of progressivism emphasized social equality and democratic participation while the social efficiency strand sought to prepare students for a predetermined social order. Cremin (1962) explains:

> First, [progressivism] meant broadening the program and function of the school to include direct concern for health, vocation, and the quality of family and community life. Second, it meant applying in the classroom the pedagogical principles derived from the new scientific research in psychology and the social sciences. Third, it meant tailoring instruction more and more to the different kinds and classes of children who were being brought within the purview of the school.

> Finally, progressivism implied that radical faith that culture could be democratized without being vulgarized. (p. ix)

The principles of progressive education were obviously diverse enough to allow individuals with different educational priorities and social agendas to claim membership in the movement. Social efficiency proponent David Snedden, for example, adopted social Darwinian principles to argue that most working class students would derive no benefit from an academically structured education and should be therefore streamed into vocational training programs (Drost, 1967). Psychologists such as Edward L. Thorndike (1949) pursued the pseudo-scientific elements of progressivism by advancing an entirely behaviorist approach to learning.

In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1916) charted a decidedly different course in mapping the direction of the progressive education movement. Although supporting certain aspects of the emerging science and the scientific method as a problem-solving mechanism, he challenged the social efficiency assumptions advanced by Snedden and others. Dewey (1916) argued that the goal of education within democracies is not social reproduction but rather reconstruction, or "a constant reorganizing or reconstructing of experience. It is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (p. 89). Dewey (1916) believed that flexible and continuous adaptation is crucial to social and democratic progress. He suggested that democratic education is not simply learning about democratic forms of governance, and understood that the inculcation of personal habits such as cooperation and public spiritedness are central goals in promoting democratic learning objectives. When functioning effectively, then, democratic learning produces an organized community of individuals who address society's problems through experimental and inventive rather than dogmatic means. The development of these democratic habits or dispositions, Dewey argued in *School and Society* (1900) and *Democracy and Education* (1916), must begin during the earliest years of a child's educational experience.

Contemporary Challenges to Progressivism

E. D. Hirsch (2001), disregarding the Eight Year Study and Dewey's observations on the importance of personal dispositions, claims that although progressive education practices have been employed in schools for decades there is a paucity of empirical evidence suggesting their pedagogical effectiveness. He cites the 1980s research of sociologist James Coleman who reported that Catholic schools achieve more academic success than their public counterparts because the former "follow a rich and demanding curriculum; provide a structured, orderly environment; offer lots of explicit instruction including drill and practice" (p. 49). This type of structured pedagogy, according to Hirsch, stands in sharp contrast "to the progressivist ideals of unstructured, implicit teaching now predominate in public schools" (p. 51).

In "Romancing the Child," Hirsch (2001) similarly condemns contemporary student-centered learning practices as simply "rebottled versions of earlier progressivist schemes going back at least 100 years" (p. 34). Since they failed at the time of their initial introduction, he claims there is no reason to believe they will prove academically effective now. Hirsch (2001) again cites a plethora of empirical data indicating most academically successful schools pursue structured learning practices consistent with imparting propositional knowledge to students:

> Effective schools are characterized by explicit, agreed-upon goals for all children; a strong focus on academics; order and discipline in the classroom; maximum time on learning tasks; and frequent evaluations of student performance. In fact, the progressivist way of running a school is essentially the opposite of what the effective schools research has taught us. (p. 36)

Hirsch attacks student-centered learning ideals as unrealistic because they allegedly reflect a hopelessly "romantic" view of the child. He claims that the present "liberal" trend toward "test bashing" pursues the same misguided idea espoused by Rousseau in *Emile* that children are best left to their own interests and devices when it comes to learning.

Hirsch's entire argument against contemporary progressive education relies on selected empirical data suggesting students acquire more propositional knowledge within structured schooling formats that eschew student-centered teaching practices. Although some empirical evidence does suggest this type of learning is enhanced by structured classroom environments (Pratt, 1994), Hirsch provides no accompanying analysis of what actually constitutes "academic success," nor any evidence to support the view that progressivist practices dominate contemporary schooling. Even if Hirsch is correct in his claim regarding instructional efficiency, he consistently fails to address Dewey's central arguments on how progressive student-centered learning practices contribute to the dispositional goals of education within a democratic society.

In *Left Back*, Ravitch (2000) criticizes progressive education practices such as individual assessments, collaborative learning exercises and group projects. She specifically challenges the egalitarian mission of Dewey's educational project, surprisingly blaming the liberal humanist strand of progressivism for the longstanding class divisions and economic inequality within American society. Since progressivism developed partially in response to increasing social stratification, her claim on this point is, at best, historically misleading and, at worst, intellectually disingenuous. Ravitch advocates what she describes as an "academic curriculum" to replace progressivism, the former pursuing the "systematic study of language and literature, science and mathematics, history, the arts, and foreign languages" because these subjects convey "important knowledge and skills, cultivate aesthetic imagination, and teach students to think critically and reflectively about the world in which they live" (p. 15). With its emphasis on a traditional "back to the basics" style of learning, *Left Back* is reminiscent of earlier conservative attacks on progressive education launched by Allan Bloom in *The Closing of the American Mind* and E. D. Hirsch in *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know.*

In *Getting it Wrong From the Beginning*, *Our Progressivist Inheritance from Herbert Spencer, John Dewey, and Jean Piaget*, Egan (2002) suggests that contemporary schooling is awash with specious progressivist practices that originate with the pseudo-scientific theories and fallacious presuppositions of 19th century British philosopher Herbert Spencer. Egan denounces the learning principles developed by Spencer and condemns their impact on the progressivist learning theories subsequently developed by Piaget and Dewey. Although re-coded in Vygotsky's language of cultural and cognitive tools, Egan's vision of education remains a decidedly conservative one based on a view of schooling as social reproduction. For example, the Vygotskyian version of constructivism adopted by Egan, and its utilization of so-called cultural tools, considers cultural reproduction the principal aim of education:

> The internationalization of cultural forms of behavior involves the reconstruction of psychological activity on the basis of sign operations. Psychological processes as they appear in animals actually cease to exist; they are incorporated into this system of behavior and culturally reconstituted and developed to form a new psychological entity. The internalization of socially rooted and historically developed activities is the distinguishing feature of human psychology. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57)

Unlike the socially reproductive constructivism adopted by Egan, Dewey's version of constructivism celebrates the capacity of students to shape their social and cultural experience through personal reflection and agency. Glassman (2001) explains this critically important distinction:

> Dewey sees the child as a free agent who achieves goals through her own interest in the activity. Dewey emphasizes human inquiry, and the role it plays in the creation of experience/cultural and, eventually, social systems. One of the major purposes of education [on Dewey's view] is to instill the ability and desire for change in experience, and possible resultant changes in social history through individual inquiry. (p. 3)

Similar to the attacks launched by Hirsch and Ravitch, Egan neglects perhaps progressivism's most valuable contribution to education, that is, the inevitable political connection between democratically structured student-centered education, student agency, and participatory citizenship.

Although they generally neglect the role of education in promoting democratic ideals, there is still much to learn from some critics of progressivism. Egan's analysis, in particular, raises legitimate concerns about Piagetian psychology precepts that potentially and needlessly lower academic

expectations for students. Progressivists often condemn rote learning as universally unacceptable, and conveniently ignore the conceptual confusion surrounding terms such as *natural* and *active* learning, reducing them to mere educational slogans. Further, and this point is consistently raised by critics of progressivism, some student-centered progressivists downplay the decisive role content knowledge plays in affording students a quality academic experience. Hirsch (1987) correctly observes, for example, that subject knowledge and understanding should be fundamental academic objectives even among those individuals seeking social change: "Cultural literacy constitutes the only sure avenue of opportunity for disadvantaged children, the only reliable way of combating the social determinism that now condemns them to remain in the same social and educational condition as their parents" (p. xii). Simply providing students with boundless propositional and cultural knowledge, however, does not exhaust the objectives of education within democratic societies.

Divergent Paths in Progressive Education

Progressive educators sought to provide access to secondary education and to transform pedagogy and society in the process. They wanted to address the "whole" student and to individualize instruction in ways that would adjust personality differences toward a proper relationship with American culture and society. During the interwar years, progressive educators believed that it was possible to create experts with a "scientific" understanding of how human beings and social organizations function. Based on this knowledge they sought to create an education system that would ensure specific advantages for individual students, for secondary schools as public places, and for society in general.

We believe progressives were overly optimistic about their ability to achieve a complete understanding of human learning behavior that would facilitate the scientific management of education. However, progressive efforts in the expansion of secondary education in the 1930s not only reflected attempts to create socially efficient institutions, but humanistic, democratic and student centered schooling environments as well. Contrary to the argument advanced by many contemporary conservative scholars, it is the social efficiency strand that is progressivism's most pervasive and enduring legacy. We reject, then, the contemporary attacks by educators such as Hirsch, Ravitch and Egan, and believe that the liberal humanist orientation of progressive education can make a significant contribution to American public schooling.

Progressivism as Democratic Learning

While most industrialized societies are deemed democratic, democracy in a robust sense of the term requires more than the simple right to vote. Although individuals may enjoy the opportunity to vote for a particular individual or political party, they may not possess the participatory dispositions and sense of political empowerment to exercise that franchise in an engaged, critical and continuous fashion. These character qualities must be fostered through an education that creates a sense of intellectual agency and political voice among students:

> Restrictions on the development of individual autonomy, which it has been claimed are the inevitable accompaniment of the imposition of a curriculum whose content is imposed by the dominant group within a society, can only be avoided by planning curricula in a form and manner which will promote rather than obviate individual autonomy. (Kelly, 1995, p. 112)

Perhaps more than any other educator, Dewey (1916) understood that public education provides the best available means to prepare learners to achieve their full democratic potential. He suggests this aim can be achieved by simulating within the schooling environment the various elements of an appropriately designed and fully functioning democratic society:

> Upon the educational side, we note first that the realization of a form of social life in which interests are mutually interpenetrating, and where progress, or readjustment, is an important consideration, makes a democratic community more interested than other communities in deliberate and systematic education. Since a democratic society repudiates the principle of

> external authority, it must find a substitute in voluntary disposition and interest; these can be created only by education. (p. 87)

Dewey's basic point is that democratic citizens must be provided with the educational opportunity as students to develop a sense of voice and empowerment within various social arrangements that mimic the political relations of democratic society. If students are not so disposed through an education based on participatory inquiry and collaborative decision-making, then it is unrealistic to believe they will accept and fulfill their democratic citizenship responsibilities as adults.

Dewey (1916) rejected the notion that a child's education was merely coded preparation for society during which various facts and ideas are conveyed by the teacher and memorized by the student to utilize sometime in the future. Schools are extensions of democratic society and students should be correspondingly encouraged to operate as members of a community who collaborate with others to achieve social improvement. It is a process of self-directed learning, combined with the cultural resources supplied by teachers, that Dewey believes prepares students for the demands of responsible membership within democratic societies. Above all other considerations, then, Dewey (1916) believed the role of education was to foster the psychological dispositions to create engaged, interested, collaborative and politically active learners prepared to pursue democratic imperatives:

> A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder. (p. 115)

Dewey argues that for classrooms to function as laboratories of democracy, students must be provided with opportunities for conjoint collaborative learning and pursue community problem-solving experiences. If students are not disposed toward these basic democratic citizenship requirements through schooling, they will be unable to meet the corresponding imperatives of democratic citizenship.

Conclusion

To allege that the present hail of bullets fired by conservative scholars such as Hirsch, Ravitch and Egan at progressive education reflects a coordinated political agenda to protect class privilege in American society constitutes an inferential stretch. Nevertheless, the combined effect of these attacks, if successful, will be to undermine even further the political and educational preparation of American students to assume their full democratic citizenship responsibilities. Whether the current conservative call to arms is cloaked under the guise of cultural literacy, an academic curriculum, or cultural tools, its ultimate impact denies learners the sense of political agency required for social reconstruction. The objectives of a democratic education are multifarious and, even as conservative scholars suggest, ought to include student exposure to the cultural ideas that inevitably influence social experience. It is equally critical, however, that both teachers and students acquire the necessary character dispositions to reflect on and potentially reconstruct that experience through meaningful political engagement. In the absence of progressive education practices that foster these characteristics, we believe the hope of creating a genuine democracy, as Dewey so wonderfully articulated, is seriously undermined.

References

Aikens, W. (1942). *The story of the eight year study*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Altenbaugh, R. J. (2003) *The American people and their education*. New Jersey: Merrill, Prentice-Hall.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (1993). *Education still under siege.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Brown, S. I. and M. E. Finn, eds., (1988). *Readings from progressive education*. New Jersey: University Press of America.

Chamberlin, D. (1942). *Did they succeed in college?* New York: Harper & brothers.

Chamberlin, D. (1943). *Thirty schools tell their story*. New York: Harper & brothers.

Chapman, P. D. (1988). *Schools as sorters: Lewis M. Terman, applied psychology and the intelligence testing movement, 1890-1930*. New York: New York University.

Committee on the Function of English in General Education. (1940). *Language in general education.* New York: D. Appleton-Century.

Cremin, L. A. (1962). *The transformation of the schools.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Dewey, J. (1900). *The school and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.

Drost, W. H. (1967). *David Snedden and education for social efficiency.* Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Egan, K. (2002). *Getting it wrong from the beginning: Our progressivist inheritance from Herbert Spencer, John Dewey, and Jean Piaget*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Glassman, M. (2001). Dewey and Vygotsky: Society. Experience and inquiry in educational practice. *Educational Researcher,* 30 (4), 3-14.

Hirsch, E. D. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Hirsch, E. D. (2001). Romancing the child. *Education Matters*. *Spring,* 34-39.

Hofstadter, R. (1963). *The progressive movement, 1900-1915*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2000). An Assessment of the Historical Arguments in Vocational Education Reform. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, *17* (1), 23-30.

Krug, E. A. (1972). *The shaping of the American high school, 1920-1941*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Lipka, R. P. (1998). *The eight year study revisited: lessons from the past for the present*. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Meek, L. (1930). Teachers college in the news. *Teachers College Record*. January, 457-486.

Pratt, D. (1994). *Curriculum planning: A handbook for professionals.* New York: Harcourt Brace.

Raubinger, F. M. (1969). *The development of secondary education*. New York: MacMillan.

Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of failed school reforms*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Redefer, F. L. (1951). The eight year study: eight years later. Ed.D. Dissertation Columbia University.

Richardson, T. and Johanningmeier, E.V. (1998). Intelligence testing: the legitimation of a meritocratic educational science. *International Journal of Educational Research*, pp. 699-307.

Smith, E. and Thayer, V. T. (1942). Appraising and recording student progress. New York: Harper.

Terman, L. (1919). *The intelligence of school children*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Terman, L. (1922). *Intelligence tests and school reorganization.* Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Company.

Thayer, V. T. (1930). School and the shifting home. *Survey*. September, 486.

Thayer, V. T., Zackery, C. B., & Kotinsky, R. (1939). *Reorganizing secondary education*. New York: Appleton-Century Company.

Thorndike, E. L. (1949). *Selected writings from a connectionist's psychology*. New York: Greenwood Press.

University of California, Santa Barbara. (2004). Voter Turnout in Presidential Elections. Retrieved August 14, 2004, from http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/site/data/turnout.php

Vars, G. F. (1972). Curriculum in secondary schools and colleges, in Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). *Yearbook: a new look at progressive education*. Washington D.C.: ASCD

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

***Authors' Details**

Dr. Emery J. Hyslop-Margison is a Tier II Canada Research Chair nominee in the Department of Education, Concordia University in Montreal, Canada. He has published extensively in the area of democratic learning including a recently completed book, *Liberalizing Vocational Study: Democratic Approaches to Career Education*, with the University Press of America.

Dr. Theresa Richardson is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Educational Studies at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana. She has a recently published book with E. V. Johanningmeier of the University of South Florida, *Race, Ethnicity, and Education: What is Taught in School*, with Information Age Publishing in their series on International Perspectives on Curriculum. An historian of education, childhood, and philanthropy, she is especially concerned with issues of equity and diversity in educational policy and practice.