

▶ 19

Progressivism and Education

In its origins, Progressivism in U.S. education began as a reaction against the formalism, verbalism, and authoritarianism of traditional schooling. While the various phases and nuances of Progressivism will be developed later in the chapter, an initial definition of Progressivism is presented here. Progressivism is the orientation that believes that improvement and reform in the human condition and society are both possible and desirable. Many early Progressive educators were looking for educational innovations that would liberate the child's energies. Other Progressives, identified with John Dewey's Pragmatism, believed that schools were part of a larger framework of institutional and social reform. In the sections that follow, we examine the sources of Progressivism, William H. Kilpatrick's project method, Progressivism's professional impact, and Progressivism's philosophical and ideological relationships.

SOURCES OF PROGRESSIVISM

Although the Progressive Education Association was formally organized in 1919, its antecedents reach back to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. Like the theorists of the Age of Reason, modern Progressives emphasized the concept of "Progress," which asserts that human beings are capable of improving and perfecting their environments by applying human intelligence and the scientific method to solving social, political, and economic problems. Like Rousseau, the Progressives rejected the doctrine of human depravity and believed that people were essentially benevolent.

Progressivism was also rooted in the spirit of social reform that gripped the early twentieth-century Progressive movement in U.S. politics. As a sociopolit-

ical movement, Progressivism held that human society could be refashioned by political reforms. Such U.S. political programs as Woodrow Wilson's "New Freedom," Theodore Roosevelt's "New Nationalism," and Robert LaFollette's "Wisconsin Idea," although varied in particulars, shared the common concern that the emerging corporate society should be ordered to function democratically for the benefit of all Americans.¹ The leaders in Progressive politics represented what was essentially the middle-class orientation to reform characterized by gradual change through legislation and peaceful social innovation through education.

U.S. educational Progressives could also look to the major educational reformers of Western Europe for inspiration and stimulation. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, author of *Émile*, had written about an education that proceeded along natural lines and that was free of coercion. As an early rebel against traditional schooling, Rousseau argued that learning was most effective when it followed the child's interests and needs.

Progressives could also feel an affinity for the work of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, a nineteenth-century Swiss educational reformer, who, as a willing disciple of Rousseau, asserted that education should be more than book learning. It should embrace the whole child—emotions, intellect, and body. Natural education, said Pestalozzi, should take place in an environment of emotional love and security. It should also begin in the child's immediate environment and involve the operations of the senses on the objects found in the environment.²

The work of the Viennese psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud was also useful to Progressive educators. In examining cases of hysteria, Freud had traced some mental illnesses to early childhood traumas. He believed that authoritarian parents had caused many children to repress their drives. This repression, especially in the case of sexual drives, could lead to neurotic behavior that had a deleterious effect on the child and on his or her adult life.

While the European educational reformers provided stimulus for Progressive educators, it was John Dewey and his followers who came to exert a profound influence on Progressive education. It should be clear, however, that not all Progressives were Deweyites. Progressive education as a movement was a convenient platform, a rallying point, for those who opposed educational traditionalism rather than a doctrinaire movement.

The Progressive Educational Platform

Before commenting on John Dewey's reactions to Progressive education, a review of the history of Progressive education provides a perspective on the work of the Progressive educators. Certain educators, such as Flora Cooke, principal of the Francis W. Parker School in Chicago, and Carleton Washburne of the Winnetka, Illinois Schools, had in the early twentieth century developed innovative methods that stressed the child's own initiative in learning. Junius L. Meriam of the University of Missouri had developed an activity curriculum that included excursions, constructive work, observation, and discussion. Marietta Johnson

(1864–1938) had also established the School of Organic Education in 1907 in Fairhope, Alabama. Johnson's Organic Theory of education emphasized the child's needs, interests, and activities. Special attention was given to creative activity that included dancing, sketching, drawing, singing, weaving, and other expressive activities. Formal instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic was reserved until the child was nine or ten years old. The general method of instruction was that of the free-flowing discussion.

In 1919, a number of Progressive educators met in Washington, D.C., and organized the Progressive Education Association under the leadership of Stanwood Cobb, head of the Chevy Chase Country Day School. To give cohesion to the Progressive educational position, the association stressed the following principles: (1) Progressive education should provide the freedom that would encourage the child's natural development and growth through activities that cultivated his or her initiative, creativity, and self-expression; (2) all instruction should be guided by the child's own interest, stimulated by contact with the real world; (3) the Progressive teacher was to guide the child's learning as a director of research activities, rather than as a taskmaster; (4) student achievement was to be measured in terms of mental, physical, moral, and social development; (5) there should be greater cooperation among the teacher, the school, and the home and family in meeting the child's needs for growth and development; (6) the truly Progressive school should be a laboratory in innovative practices.³

At the onset, the Progressive Education Association as a child-centered movement was a reaction against the subject-matter curriculum of traditional schooling. It attracted teachers and parents associated with small, private experimental schools. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Progressive Education Association began to attract professional educators from colleges of education. Many of these educators had been influenced by John Dewey's Experimentalist philosophy of education.

Dewey's Critique of Progressive Education

Although John Dewey's Experimentalism has been discussed elsewhere in this book, the Progressive educational position is made clear by a brief examination of Dewey's critique of the movement, which appeared in *Experience and Education*.⁴

Dewey warned that the controversy between traditional and Progressive educators had tended to degenerate into an assertion of either/or positions. Although sympathetic to Progressivism, Dewey believed that many Progressives were merely reacting against traditional school practices and had failed to formulate an educational philosophy that was capable of serving as a plan of pragmatic operations.

Dewey's analysis of the traditional and the Progressive school is useful in highlighting the contrasts between these two institutions. The traditional school, he said, was a formal institution that emphasized a subject-matter curriculum

comprised of discretely organized disciplines, such as language, history, mathematics, and science. Traditionalists, such as Perennialists and Essentialists, held that the source of wisdom was located in humanity's cultural heritage. Morals, standards, and conduct were derived from tradition and were not subject to the test of the scientific method. The traditional teacher regarded the written word as the font of wisdom and relied on the textbook as the source of knowledge and the recitation as the means of eliciting it from students. Traditionalists had attempted to isolate the school from social controversies. Holding to their belief that learning was the transmission and mastery of bodies of knowledge inherited from the past, the traditionalists had ignored the learner's own needs and interests and had deliberately neglected urgent social and political issues. The products of conventional education (namely, the students) were expected to be receptive of the traditional wisdom, have habits and attitudes that were conducive to conformity, and were to be respectful of and obedient to authority.

Although Dewey shared the Progressive antagonism toward the traditional school, he feared that many Progressives were merely reacting against it. Too many Progressives had ignored the past and were concerned only with the present. In their opposition to the traditional school's passivity, some Progressives had come to emphasize any kind of activity, even purposeless activity. Many Progressives had become so antagonistic to education imposed by adults that they had begun to cater to childish whims, many of which were devoid of social and intellectual value.

After urging that Progressive educators avoid the polarization of an either/or educational position, Dewey outlined the philosophy that he believed was suited for the genuinely Progressive school. Progressive education needed a philosophy based on experience, the interaction of the person with the environment. Such an experiential philosophy was to have no set of external goals. Rather, the end product of education was growth—that ongoing experience which leads to the direction and control of subsequent experience.

Truly Progressive education should not ignore the past but rather should use it to reconstruct experience in the present and direct future experiences. For Dewey, education should be based on a continuum of ongoing experience that united the past and the present and led to the shaping of the future.

Dewey also warned that Progressive education should not become so absorbed in activity that it misconstrued the nature of activity. Mere movement was without value. Activity should be directed to solving problems; it should be purposeful and should contain social and intellectual possibilities that contributed to the learner's growth.

The true Progressive educator was a teacher skilled in relating the learner's internal conditions of experience—that is, the student's needs, interests, purposes, capacities, and desires—with the objective conditions of experience—the environmental factors that were historical, physical, economic, and sociological.

Dewey asserted that Progressivism should be free from a naive romanticization of child nature. Although children's interests and needs were always at the

beginning of learning, they were not its end. The child's instincts and impulses needed to be refined and developed into reflective social intelligence. Some impulses contained possibilities for growth and development; other impulses would have the opposite result in that their consequences would impede such growth. Impulse became reflective when the learner was able to estimate the consequences of acting on it. By developing an "end-in-view," the learner could conjecture the consequences that would result from action. Understanding the purpose of a particular act involved estimating the consequences that had occurred in similar situations in the past and forming a tentative judgment about the likely consequences of acting in the present. Thus, Progressive education should encourage the cultivation of purposeful, reflective patterns of inquiry in the learner.

Challenging Essentialism and Perennialism, Dewey warned educators against trying to "return to the intellectual methods and ideals that arose centuries before scientific method was developed." Truly Progressive educators would seek systematically to utilize the "scientific method as the pattern and ideal of intelligent exploration and exploitation of the potentialities inherent in experience."⁵

WILLIAM KILPATRICK AND THE PROJECT METHOD

Dewey's plea for a Progressive education based on human experience stimulated William Heard Kilpatrick (1871–1965), who was both an Experimentalist and a Progressive, to construct a methodology of instruction that united purpose and activity and that tested conjectured consequences in action. Kilpatrick, a popular professor at Columbia University's Teachers College, devised the "project method" that came to characterize Progressive education for many U.S. educators.

A brief discussion of Kilpatrick's route to the development of the project method is useful in understanding the Progressive impulse among U.S. educators. Born in rural White Plains, Georgia, the son of a Baptist minister, Kilpatrick received a traditional education. After attending Mercer University, he taught algebra and geometry in the public schools of Blakely in his native state.⁶

As a mathematics teacher, Kilpatrick inaugurated reforms in his classroom. For example, he believed that report cards and grades focused attention on extrinsic rewards that were disconnected from the natural consequences of learning. He abolished the practice of external marks, which he felt encouraged egotism among the achievers and inflicted a sense of inferiority on slower learners. In cultivating freedom in his classroom, he encouraged his students to work collaboratively. Early in his career Kilpatrick revealed a liberal attitude toward classroom discipline, which would later be more theoretically and systematically organized in his project method.

In 1907, Kilpatrick entered Teachers College at Columbia University to continue his professional and academic preparation in education. Here he encountered and accepted John Dewey's pragmatic philosophy.

Later, as a professor of education at Teachers College, Kilpatrick became a noted interpreter of Dewey. His writings and lectures, which espoused themes associated with Experimentalist philosophy and Progressive education, attracted a large and receptive audience. A gifted lecturer, Kilpatrick clarified many of Dewey's more difficult theoretical concepts. He was not, however, merely an interpreter. He also advanced his own educational philosophy, which synthesized Progressivism and Experimentalism into the "purposeful act," or the "project method."⁷ Because he reached a large number of teachers in his classes, Kilpatrick exerted a shaping influence over U.S. educational theory and practice.

Kilpatrick's project method rejected traditional education's reliance on a book-centered instruction. Although not an anti-intellectual, Kilpatrick asserted that books were not a substitute for learning through living. The most pernicious form of bookishness was found in the textbook's domination of conventional teaching. Too frequently, teachers relied exclusively on information in textbooks. This often led to mechanically organized, secondhand experiences. The student who succeeded in the traditional school was frequently of a bookish inclination and successful in memorizing but not always in understanding what was read. Because of its stress on bookishness and memorization, conventional schooling had degenerated into devitalized mechanical routines in which teachers assigned lessons from textbooks, drilled their students on the assignments, heard recitations of memorized responses, and then evaluated them on their recall of the material. Such schooling, in Kilpatrick's view, stifled individual creativity, led to boredom, and lacked collaborative social purposes.

In contrast to the rote nature of traditional book-centered education, Kilpatrick's project method was designed to elaborate a constructive Progressivism along Experimentalist lines. In the project method, students were to choose, plan, direct, and execute their work in activities, or projects, that would stimulate purposeful efforts. In its theoretical formulation, the project was a mode of problem solving. Students, either individually or in groups, would define problems that arose in their own experiences. Learning would be task centered in that success would come by solving the problem and testing the solution by acting on it. Action from purposeful planning would meet the pragmatic test and be judged by its consequences.

Kilpatrick recommended that the school curriculum be organized into four major classes of projects. First, the creative, or "construction," project involved concretizing a theoretical plan in external form. For example, the students might decide to write and then present a drama. They would write the script, assign the roles, and actually act out the play. Or, the creative project might actually involve the design of a blueprint for a library. The test would come in the construction of the library from the plan devised by the students. Second, the appreciation, or "enjoyment," project was designed to contribute to aesthetic enjoyment. Reading a novel, seeing a film, or hearing a symphony were examples of projects that would lead to aesthetic appreciation. Third, the "problem" project was one in which the students would be involved in resolving an intellectual problem. Such problems as the resolution of racial discrimination, the improvement of the qual-

ity of the environment, or the organization of recreational facilities were social problems that called for disciplined intellectual inquiry. Finally, the "specific learning" project involved the acquiring of a skill or an area of knowledge. Learning to type, swim, dance, read, or write were examples of the acquisition of a specific skill.

Kilpatrick's project method should be interpreted both in terms of its suggested social consequences and its strictly educational aims. To be sure, the project method had educational objectives, such as improvement in creative, constructive, appreciative, intellectual, and skill competencies. However, acquiring these competencies was only a part of Kilpatrick's plan for educational reform. Kilpatrick believed, as did Dewey, that education as a social activity was a product of human association and collaboration. In a free society, democratic discussion, debate, decision, and action depended on the willingness of individuals to use the methods of open and uncoerced inquiry. Kilpatrick believed that the project method lent itself to group work, in which students could collaboratively pursue common problems and share in associative inquiry. Such was the essence of the democratic processes. Even more important than the acquiring of specific skills was the student's need to acquire attitudes appropriate to a democratic society.

The person that Kilpatrick envisioned as a result of education based on purposeful collaboration was the democratic man or woman. Such a person would possess an experimental attitude and would be willing to test inherited traditions, values, and beliefs. Through the project method, students would learn to use democratic methods of open discussion, carefully reasoned deliberation, decision making that respected both the rights of the majority and the minority, and action that resulted in peaceful social change.

Kilpatrick's model of the democratic citizen was much like that envisioned by the middle-class Progressives in politics and in education.⁸ This person would use a democratic methodology and would expect opponents to use the same procedure. As a reconstructive person, this Progressively educated man or woman would believe that social institutions were creations of human intelligence and could be periodically renovated when the situation required it. The democratic citizen would be open to using the scientific method and would discard theological, metaphysical, political, and economic absolutes as dogmatic impediments that blocked human inquiry into the conditions of life. Above all, Kilpatrick wanted to educate individuals who shared a common framework of democratic values. Such men and women would be wholehearted and willing participants in the democratic community.

PROGRESSIVISM'S PROFESSIONAL IMPACT

As indicated, Progressive educators such as Kilpatrick sought to reconceptualize the U.S. school curriculum and methods of instruction along more open-ended, experimental, and collaborative lines.⁹ However, the degree to which Progressive education actually was felt in educational practice has been much debated. His-

torians such as Cremin argue that certain Progressive educational innovations became so commonplace in the schools that they no longer appeared to be reforms. Critics of Progressivism, such as Essentialists, Perennialists, and Neo-Conservatives, have argued that Progressivism exercised a pervasive but deleterious influence on public schools in that it contributed to the lowering of academic standards and achievement.

Arthur Zilversmit, in *Changing Schools*, posed the question, Did Progressive philosophy actually impact educational policy and practices in local schools? He argues that the impact of any educational philosophy, including Progressivism, needs to be assessed in terms of U.S. public schooling's basic organizational reality. Public schools are local agencies, governed by local boards of education, administered by local superintendents, and taught by teachers who serve local populations. For Zilversmit, the impact of Progressivism must be assessed in terms of local personalities, their social and educational attitudes, and available community resources. While Progressivism had an impact on schools, Zilversmit found that it was more eclectic and less systematic than was generally assumed. According to his analysis, some Progressive educators inaugurated curricular and methodological reforms while others, primarily school administrators, emphasized efficiency, effectiveness, and economical organization, structures, and scheduling. Indeed, Winnetka's superintendent, Carleton Washburne, was a Progressive exemplar who competently blended curricular and administrative Progressivism.¹⁰

Progressivism entered schools eclectically in the administration of superintendents who were professionally prepared in what was called the "modern" philosophy of education. Concurrent with the Progressive movement and Progressive ideology, the modern, as contrasted with the traditional, philosophy selectively incorporated Progressive principles. The modern philosophy of education was an essential feature of many university programs of professional education. In the modern approach, key features were (1) larger schools facilitating more class sections and more curriculum diversity; (2) curriculum diversity enhancing educational enrichment; and (3) a propensity to create junior high or middle schools as distinct schools. These features were often endorsed by Progressives and became part of the modern school administrator's ideology.¹¹

In addition to its eclectic implementation in schools, Progressivism influenced the educational profession, especially in its professional organizations and journals. In the case of U.S. educational philosophy, its origins coincided with the more general Progressive movement. Kaminsky, in *A New History of Educational Philosophy*, relates the origins of educational philosophy to reformist tendencies that provided a critique of "America's version of Victorianism."¹² Progressives took the lead in the American Social Science Association to free social inquiry from metaphysically based formal constraints. Dewey and other Progressive intellectuals worked to make educational philosophy a weapon of social and educational reform against Herbert Spencer's entrenched Social Darwinism.

Progressives were members of a complex and interlocking network of professional organizations such as the National Educational Association, the Progressive Education Association, the John Dewey Society, and the Philosophy of Education Society, and published in professional journals such as *Progressive Education*, *The Social Frontier*, and *Educational Theory*.¹³

The Progressive Teacher

Progressive education called for a teacher who was different in temperament, training, and techniques from teachers in more traditional schools. Although the Progressive teacher needed to be competent in the content and methods of inquiry of such academic disciplines as history, science, mathematics, and language, instruction in the Progressive classroom required more than a chronological or a systematic subject-matter presentation of the various learned disciplines. The Progressive approach was interdisciplinary. Problems were not specifically located within a particular learned discipline but rather intersected them in interdisciplinary fashion.

Because the Progressive classroom was oriented to purposeful activity, the Progressive teacher needed to know how to motivate the students so that they initiated, planned, and carried out their projects. As learning was centered in the participating group, the Progressive teacher needed to know how to use collaborative processes.

Perhaps the most difficult challenge for the teacher was to act as a guide rather than the center of learning. The skilled teacher, in the Progressive context, did not dominate the classroom as its focal point. Rather, he or she made the interests of the learner central. The teacher was properly a guide to discussing, planning, and executing learning.

PROGRESSIVISM'S PHILOSOPHICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS

As a theory of education, Progressivism draws heavily from the philosophies of Naturalism, examined in Chapter 5, and Pragmatism, examined in Chapter 6. From Naturalists, such as Rousseau, Progressives borrowed the doctrine that children should be free to develop according to their interests and needs. As indicated, the Experimentalists who were part of the Progressive persuasion disagreed when the child-centered Progressives exaggerated children's interests to the point of ignoring or discounting the educative role of society.

The child-centered Progressives' emphasis on children's needs and interests led them to conclude that the curriculum should develop from the child and that the most effective school environment was a permissive one in which children were free to explore and act on their interests. From the origins of Progressivism

to the present. Progressives have stressed children's directly expressed needs and interests over academic subject matter.

While some Progressives were influenced by Naturalism, others drew their educational rationale from the Pragmatism or Experimentalism of John Dewey. Although they could agree that children should be liberated from repressive schooling, they disagreed on the extent to which education was a social force or involved some degree of social imposition. Believing that human intelligence was shaped by social interaction, Deweyan Progressives gave a greater role to the group and to social issues and problems. Deweyan Progressives also emphasized the power of the scientific method to achieve complete and reflective thought. Deweyan Progressives would see Rousseau's isolation of the child from society and complete reliance on the child's freedom to be a romanticization of the child's nature and an abandonment of the educator's social responsibility. Thus, Progressivism's philosophical reliance on both Naturalism and Pragmatism has caused internal tensions.

Progressivism rejects the more traditional philosophies of Idealism, Realism, and Thomism and their emphasis on antecedent reality, hierarchical categories, and subject matter. It should be pointed out, however, that the Idealist emphasis on child growth, exemplified in Froebel's kindergarten, was an early influence on many Progressives. Moreover, the Idealist concern for social integration had an impact on Dewey's thought.

Ideologically, Progressivism is most compatible with Liberalism, in both its classical and more modern forms, than with other ideologies. Liberalism's concern for individual rights and freedom finds an educational corollary in Progressivism's emphasis on the individual child. The freedom to inquire and test ideas, exemplified by Liberal theorists such as John Stuart Mill, is also stressed by Progressives.

The Progressive inclination toward change rather than stasis is much like the Liberal orientation. Progressivism is seen by Conservatives as threatening cultural continuity, eroding the power of tradition as a stabilizing factor, and jeopardizing legitimate authority. Conservatives fear that Progressive permissiveness, like Liberal individualism, will weaken standards.

The Liberal emphasis on representative institutions and gradual incremental reform rather than sweeping Utopian grand designs or Marxist revolution is compatible with Progressive social reform. Progressive social reformers such as Jane Addams, Woodrow Wilson, and Theodore Roosevelt worked within the social and political system. Their efforts at reform were designed to improve the system by using representative institutions and processes to remedy its internal weaknesses. Progressive reformers, like Liberals in general, prefer open-ended reform, which has limited ends-in-view rather than the preconceived ends found in both Utopian and Marxist ideologies.

Deweyan Progressives, while sharing many Liberal attitudes, reject the competitive ethic associated with Classical Liberalism and Social Darwinism. The old Liberalism was judged to be personally egotistical and socially and economically wasteful by Dewey, who condemned it and called for a new Liberalism

that encouraged cooperation, social planning, and scientifically directed human experience.

Progressivism, like Experimentalism and Liberalism, is incompatible with both political and social totalitarianism and with the authoritarianism in education that flows from it. The Progressive emphasis on freedom to follow one's interests violates the totalitarian requirement that subordinates individual interests to the will of the leader or to the dictates of the state or party. The Progressive emphasis on experimentation and the testing of ideas and values in experience encourages a questioning attitude that is contrary to the totalitarian rule for unquestioning obedience.

Progressivism, as a theory of education, opposes many of the concepts and practices associated with Essentialism and Perennialism. The points of disagreement become clear by contrasting the positions of the basic educator and the Progressive educator. The basic educator, whose pedagogical position reflects the more traditional and conservative Essentialism and Perennialism, advocates the following:

1. Learning the general cultural tool skills that are foundational to other kinds of learning. For example, reading, writing, and arithmetic are identified as basic, foundational, and generative of other school subjects and out-of-school activities. Early on, the advocates of basic education construe schooling to be literary and book centered.
2. Organizing the curriculum around well-defined essential skills and subject matters. There is a general opposition to ill-defined, undifferentiated, and amorphous curricular patterns that emphasize open education, learning through field experiences, projects, activities, and other unstructured kinds of learning.
3. Identifying the school, its administrators, and teachers as academic experts who have knowledge of content and of instructional methods. The basic education proponent opposes using the school as a vehicle for social change, innovation, and experimentation. The classroom is dominated by the teacher and instruction is planned and directed by the teacher.

The Progressive educator, in contrast, takes the following pedagogical posture:

1. Rather than introducing basic skills directly, it is better to have children acquire methods of learning and investigating by solving their problems and satisfying their needs. For example, John Dewey argued that children learned to think by using the scientific method to solve problems. William Heard Kilpatrick stressed learning by means of collaborative activities in his project method. In other words, learning, the curriculum, and instruction come from the child's interests.
2. The school should be immersed in social issues and in advancing social change. Externally, school administrators and teachers should break down

the theoretical and political walls that separate the school from society. They should also demolish the inner walls of school organization that divide it into subject areas, grade levels, and departments.

3. Teachers should be project directors, stimulators of learning, counselors, and learning consultants rather than transmitters of information. Instruction should be varied and often indirect.

CONCLUSION

Progressive education urges the liberation of the child from a pedagogical tradition that emphasizes rote learning, lesson recitations, and textbook authority. In opposition to the conventional subject-matter disciplines of the traditional curriculum, Progressives seek to develop alternative modes of curricular organization. They encourage such varied but related alternatives as activities, experiences, problem solving, and the project method. Progressive education is characterized by (1) a focus on the child as the learner rather than on subject matter, (2) an emphasis on activities and experiences that are direct rather than an exclusive reliance on verbal and literary skills and knowledge, (3) the encouragement of collaborative group-learning activities rather than competitive individualized lesson learning. In its broad social directions, Progressivism in education encourages democratic procedures designed to create community participation and social reform. It also cultivates a cultural or ethical relativism that critically appraises and often rejects inherited traditions, attitudes, and values.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Identify and analyze the sources of Progressivism in terms of their theoretical compatibility and internal consistency.
2. Compare and contrast the traditional and the Progressive schools.
3. Compare and contrast the Progressive and Conservative views of the past and their applications to instruction.
4. Using Kilpatrick's project method as a case study, analyze how theory is formulated from practice.
5. Identify the elements in Kilpatrick's project method that are derived from either Naturalism or Pragmatism.
6. Review Essentialism treated in Chapter 17. Using the Essentialist preference for differentiated learning, critique Kilpatrick's project method.
7. Using the Neo-Marxist concept of the "hidden curriculum," examine Kilpatrick's project method.

8. Compare and contrast the Progressive and basic education (Essentialist and Perennialist) conceptions of curriculum and instruction.

INQUIRY PROJECTS

- Prepare a paper that identifies and analyzes the antecedents of Progressivism.
- Prepare a biographical sketch of a Progressive educator such as Francis Parker, Jane Addams, Carleton Washburne, Junius Meriam, Marietta Johnson, William Heard Kilpatrick, or Harold Rugg.
- Based on the principles of Progressive education, prepare a character sketch of a Progressive teacher.
- Review Lawrence Cremin's *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education*.
- Review John Dewey's *Experience and Education*.
- Devise and prepare a lesson plan based on Kilpatrick's project method.
- Visit a school that embodies Progressive methods in its program. Report your observations to the class.
- Review national reports on education such as *A Nation at Risk* and *Action for Excellence*. Do these reports reflect an anti-Progressive point of view?

FURTHER READINGS

- | | |
|---|--|
| Blum, John M. <i>The Progressive Presidents: Roosevelt, Wilson, Roosevelt, Johnson</i> . New York: W. W. Norton, 1982. | Kilpatrick, William H. <i>Education for a Changing Civilization</i> . New York: Macmillan, 1925. |
| Cremin, Lawrence A. <i>The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957</i> . New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961. | Kilpatrick, William H. <i>The Foundations of Method</i> . New York: Macmillan, 1925. |
| Crunden, Robert M. <i>Ministers of Reform: The Progressives' Achievement in American Civilization, 1889-1920</i> . Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984. | Kilpatrick, William H. <i>Philosophy of Education</i> . New York: Macmillan, 1951. |
| Dewey, John. <i>Experience and Education</i> . New York: Collier Books, 1963. | Kilpatrick, William H. <i>The Project Method</i> . New York: Teachers College Press, 1921. |
| Graham, Patricia A. <i>Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe: A History of the Progressive Education Association, 1919-1955</i> . New York: Teachers College Press, 1967. | Kliebard, Herbert M. <i>The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958</i> . Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986. |
| Kaminsky, James S. <i>A New History of Educational Philosophy</i> . Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993. | Lauderdale, William B. <i>Progressive Education: Lessons from Three Schools</i> . Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1981. |
| | Pratt, Caroline. <i>I Learn from Children</i> . New York: Simon & Schuster, 1948. |

- Ravitch, Diane. *The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945–1980*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Reese, William J. *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements During the Progressive Era*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.
- Rugg, Harold O., and Ann Schumaker. *The Child-Centered School*. New York: World Book Co., 1928.
- Tanner, Daniel. *Crusade for Democracy: Progressive Education at the Crossroads*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Tenenbaum, Samuel. *William Heard Kilpatrick: Trail Blazer in Education*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Washburne, Carlton. *What Is Progressive Education?* New York: John Day, 1952.
- Zilversmit, Arthur. *Changing Schools: Progressive Education Theory and Practice, 1930–1960*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

ENDNOTES

1. For a discussion of Progressivism in U.S. politics, see John Morton Blum, *The Progressive Presidents: Roosevelt, Wilson, Roosevelt, Johnson* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1982).
2. For a discussion of Pestalozzi's educational theory and its significance for Progressivism, see Gerald L. Gutek, *Pestalozzi and Education* (New York: Random House, 1968).
3. For the definitive treatment of the Progressive Education Association, see Patricia Albjerg Graham, *Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe—A History of the Progressive Education Association, 1919–1955* (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1967); the definitive history of Progressive Education in the context of U.S. Progressivism can be found in Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876–1957* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961).
4. John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (New York: Collier Books, 1963).
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 85–86.
6. For a study of Kilpatrick's life, educational philosophy, and influence, see Samuel Tenenbaum, *William Heard Kilpatrick: Trail Blazer in Education* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951).
7. William Heard Kilpatrick, "The Project Method," *Teachers College Record*, XIX (1918): 319–335, and *The Project Method* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1921).
8. For a discussion of middle-class Progressivism, see Robert M. Crunden, *Ministers of Reform: The Progressive's Achievement in American Civilization, 1889–1920* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984).
9. Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893–1958* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986).
10. Arthur Zilversmit, *Changing Schools: Progressive Education Theory and Practice, 1930–1960* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), pp. 38–56.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 168–183.
12. James S. Kaminsky, *A New History of Educational Philosophy* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993), pp. 19–23.
13. For a history of the John Dewey Society, see Daniel Tanner, *Crusade for Democracy: Progressive Education at the Crossroads* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).