

MARGARET SMITH CROCCO

THE ACCIDENTAL EDUCATIONIST

A friend once told me that the connotation of “educationist” was derisive. According to Merriam-Webster’s online dictionary, the denotation of the term is as follows: “one who specializes in educational theory and practice.” The term is more commonly used in Great Britain and, as such, has been associated with colonialism, which may explain its negative connotation there.

In the U.S. context, I have come to understand that the connotation is also problematic but for a different reason; scholars trained in the disciplines sometimes disparage scholars trained in education. In the case of social education, professors in history and political science have sometimes looked down on social educators, believing they are responsible for the notoriously poor results on tests showing what high school graduates know (or do not know) about their subjects.

As an individual with a doctorate in American Civilization, my first years of college teaching were spent in American Studies and History departments. My transition to a position in a College of Education was made with great enthusiasm since a career in social education allowed me to focus on my twin passions: interdisciplinary research into American history and culture and teaching, learning, and schooling. Whether or not the term is considered derisive, I embrace it. The label situates me firmly in my adopted disciplinary field.

This essay is part life history and part intellectual autobiography. Its main theme is that chance has played a large role in my professional career. From one perspective, becoming a social educator was a happy accident. From another perspective, becoming a social educator was pre-destined. My intellectual life owes a great deal to the influence of my family of origin and the educational experiences that shaped me growing up. In this essay, I will yoke the personal story to the process of becoming a social educator, folding in consideration of my own work and the key issues facing the field of social education then and now.

Along the way, I have come to recognize how important it is to make plans but how equally important it is to modify or abandon those plans when new opportunities appear. In my thirties, eight years spent teaching high school taught me an important lesson about flexibility; in school nothing ever goes as planned. This is a tough lesson for the consummate planner. But the message of survival became clear over those eight years: Don’t grouse. Adapt. Seize the moment!

SOCIAL JUSTICE

We are all products—to some extent—of our upbringing. The imprint of socialization is something we spend our lives evading or accepting. While denying its influence is conceivable, ignoring its effects comes at one's peril.

My mother had attended a Catholic high school run by the Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus in Waukegan, Illinois; she found it a liberating experience. Later, as the parent of six girls (and two sons), she was determined that her daughters would have a similar experience. As luck would have it, when the family moved to Westfield, New Jersey, she learned that this same order of nuns ran a school in Summit, NJ. That settled the matter. I enrolled at Oak Knoll School of the Holy Child in grade 6 and graduated from the high school in 1968. My five sisters followed behind me, and my mother eventually became principal of the school a decade after I graduated.

Mentioning the year 1968 should trigger in readers a set of lively images about this time period. Indeed, it was a tumultuous period, and the social upheaval of the day even managed to make it to as bucolic a setting as a small girls' school in Summit, NJ. I admit that naming Oak Knoll as a Catholic school run by nuns might also trigger a set of preconceptions in the reader, which would, I submit, be inaccurate if they stem from the stereotypes of repressive Catholic education that circulate widely in popular culture.

By contrast, a visionary educator, Sr. Ann Marie Durst, SHCJ, led the school. She introduced our school curriculum to interdisciplinary pursuits such as American Studies and to innovative pedagogical approaches labeled "Large Group Instruction," "Small Group Discussion," and "Independent Study." Our course schedules were modularized into 25 minute chunks, which could be combined for a variety of purposes into larger segments. During junior and senior year, I and a dozen other classmates spent six weeks studying French in the Loire Valley. In my senior year, I had two extraordinary experiences: an Independent Study of the collected works of Graham Greene and an intensive course on Chinese history. We were privileged, to be sure, but the nuns made every effort to insure that we received a serious and demanding education.

These educational experiences crystallized the intellectually liberating aspects of my Holy Child education: the school's dedication to nurturing "the whole child" and the seriousness of purpose with which these nuns approached the education of young women. We were encouraged to pursue our passions, invest in our own academic interests (I was allowed to do four years of French and Latin and three of math, sadly at the expense of science, which I now regret), and strive for excellence. This was not an education designed to produce secretaries, teachers, nurses, or nuns, but one that assumed we would go onto four-year colleges and whatever else we wished beyond that. There were no home economics classes when I attended the school, nor are there any today.

Several other events of this era captured our interests: the Vietnam War, President Lyndon Baines Johnson's War on Poverty, and the Civil Rights Movement. As an

avid reader of the *New York Times* from the age of 13 on, I spent a lot of time during my high school years considering what the issues of the day meant for American society and its prospects. During the summer of 1967, Newark, NJ (along with dozens of other cities nationwide, including Plainfield, which was about 15 minutes from our home) erupted in race riots. The riots brought the civil rights movement home in frightening fashion. Almost a week of rampant violence in Newark led to destruction of large areas of the city, with more than two dozen people dead and scores injured and arrested. During the spring of my senior year, other events created an even more unsettled sense of the nation's situation in the world, among them, the Tet offensive (February), My Lai Massacre (March); Johnson's announcement that he would not seek another term in office (March); Robert F. Kennedy's and Martin Luther King's assassinations (April).

My concerns about the Vietnam War were political rather than personal. Given educational deferments from the draft, my immediate family was not in danger of the draft. Undoubtedly, too, because my family was situated comfortably in the upper middle class, on the eve of college, I did not know anyone who had been drafted. Nevertheless, as I read the newspaper and watched the evening news, it was clear to me that there was something terribly wrong with this War. And, as a fledging student of Chinese history, I suspected that China would ultimately have more sway in the "Indo-Chinese" region, as it was called, than would the West, especially the United States. Greene's novel, *The Quiet American* (1956), served as prescient testimony to the fate of other colonial powers such as Japan and France in trying to secure this country as its own.

Throughout my high school years, Sr. Ann Marie Durst provided both a formal and informal education into what we now call "social justice" concerns. We regularly talked about the issues of the day, especially poverty in Appalachia, the sacrifices made by those involved in the Civil Rights Movement down South, the ongoing problem of racism and discrimination in the North, the distance between what we heard from the news about the Vietnam War and what President Johnson and the generals were saying was happening. I joined the debate team and started a current events club. I invited a prominent New York Democrat who had taken an outspoken position against the War to speak at Oak Knoll. In all these things, I was encouraged and supported by a nun who later became a lawyer, and founded a practice in southern California to help immigrants, especially women and children, with securing refuge in the United States.

These school experiences left me with a zeal for learning more about the world that was distant from Westfield, NJ, and a commitment to inter-disciplinarity in curriculum and innovative approaches for educating "the whole child." As the oldest of eight children, I watched with keen interest the victories and challenges of my siblings with schooling. Not all my sisters enjoyed Oak Knoll as much as I did. My brothers attended very different schools from my own. Many lessons were learned as a result of watching their struggles with schooling and, to a considerable degree, how little difference that made to their ultimate life success.

M. S. CROCCO

During the summer of 1968, I prepared to head off to the School of Languages and Linguistics at Georgetown University in Washington, DC, in order to major in Chinese and perhaps minor in French. My plan was vague; I would learn languages and work in the import-export business, allowing me the opportunity to travel to the exciting and exotic “Middle Kingdom” and other fascinating places around the world.

PASSIONATELY PRAGMATIC

And then came Richard M. Nixon. As I spent ten hours a week, 8 am to 10 am, for two and a half years at Georgetown studying Chinese I grew increasingly certain that the anticipated opening up of “mainland China” would not happen under the regime of President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. How wrong I was! This was just one of several examples I might offer in which my ability to prognosticate proved sorely deficient.

To be honest, there were other complicating factors: a boyfriend; the dawning reality that, despite my good grades in Chinese, mastery of the written and spoken language was a decade-long undertaking according to my professors; a deepening interest in my philosophy classes; and the opening up of the College of Arts and Sciences at Georgetown in 1969 to women. I abandoned the study of Chinese and transferred into the College as a philosophy major in 1970 for the spring semester of my junior year.

At Georgetown, I had not lost my commitment to social justice: I tutored at the local high school, protested the presence of ROTC on campus by participating in a sit-in of the Dean’s office (which almost got me thrown out of college), and joined the “Moratorium to End the War” demonstration in Washington, DC in March 1969 and the demonstration against the Kent State massacre and Cambodia invasion on May 9, 1970.

The official student newspaper at Georgetown reflected on the Moratorium, an event that involved scores of college campuses and thousands of students in the spring of 1970:

“Classes Called Off for Week During May.” Georgetown Today, July 1970

The overwhelming majority of the faculty believed that we, right on the doorstep of the national government, just could not conduct business as usual. Somehow we had to remake things so that those who wished could engage in political activity. We also had to recognize that the troubled campus atmosphere made intensive study usually characteristic of mid-May unattainable. – Fr. Thomas R. Fitzgerald, S.J. (Academic Vice President)

The Student Senate voted for a strike of classes from Wednesday, May 6, to Friday, May 8, 1970. The strike came two days after the deaths at Kent State University and centered around demands for the U.S. Government to cease

escalation of the Vietnam War into Cambodia and Laos and to unilaterally withdraw all troops from Southeast Asia.... In response, a Main Campus faculty group voted 156–13 to suspend classes.

No classes were held from May 8–15, although students were able to meet with their teachers and to take final exams as scheduled on a voluntary basis. Alternatively, students were able to settle for existing grades or make arrangements to submit papers in place of final exams.

The next year, anti-war protests drew over 500,000 demonstrators to Washington, DC. Various press reports indicated that at least a few of the groups planning the event intended to commit civil disobedience and to shut down the federal government. Worldwide demonstrations against the war were taking on an increasingly violent tone as the anti-war movement shifted from its stance of non-violence.

Over the course of three days in early May 1971, tensions built between protestors and local police, leading to President Nixon's calling out the National Guard and other federal troops, including thousands of paratroopers. By May 3, the police had forced protestors away from the Mall near the White House and out towards Georgetown, ultimately pressuring them to move quite a distance, all the way to the main entrance for Georgetown University at 37th and O Streets, NW. When they arrived at this point, the police began throwing tear gas, dispersing the protestors across the front lawn of campus. Having retreated from the disturbances downtown the day before, I witnessed the tear-gassing of protestors from the window of my fifth-floor dorm room in Copley Hall, right across the lawn from the front entrance to Georgetown's main gate. At graduation in May 1972, I chose to wear a black armband instead of the traditional academic garb as a silent protest against the War.

During the last year at Georgetown, I made my way—quickly—through the degree requirements for a philosophy major. I discovered American Pragmatism and Dr. Jesse Mann, from whom I took three courses. The idea that truth was revealed in the doing, through the effects of an idea, however vague, was enormously appealing. Our high school's motto had been "Action not Words." The fundamental problems of truth, ethics, and meaning seemed intellectually attractive after the time spent on learning to write Chinese characters and to master pronunciations of Chinese words. Moreover, it was helping me understand more about my country, about which I was feeling quite conflicted at this time.

As for the Pragmatists, I found C.S. Peirce interesting but sterile. William James's notion of multiple truths as well as his brilliant work on psychology were more compelling. But the real draw for me was John Dewey. I ended my seven semesters and bachelor's degree at Georgetown having taken three classes with Dr. Mann on the Pragmatists, and I was hooked. The central role played by experience in Dewey's philosophical framework and the answers I found there to questions that consumed me about life, the War, American society, and social justice led me back to the interdisciplinary study of art, literature, history, and culture for my Ph.D. program. Little did I realize at the time how useful my grounding in American Pragmatism

M. S. CROCCO

would be for a career later in life as an “educationist” at that bastion of Deweyism, Teachers College, Columbia University.

INTERDISCIPLINARITY

Graduate school afforded me an opportunity to pursue a fundamental question from diverse perspectives: What does it mean to be an American? And, what, if anything, does America mean?

Despite the Vietnam War, the murders of JFK, RFK, and MLK, and the scores of race riots across the country, American “exceptionalism” was being hotly debated. The chance to pursue a doctorate that allowed scope for my fickle intellectual interests (I called it “breadth”) at the University of Pennsylvania was exciting. Penn had, in some sense, invented the field of what it called “American Civilization,” a label for its interdisciplinary program of study into history, culture, arts, letters, and material culture of the United States, which owed more to the program’s 1930s origins than the judgment of students and faculty in the program in 1972.

Of lasting importance to my intellectual development was an idea at the heart of Penn’s AmCiv program: studying American history and culture from a comparative perspective. The idea of culture stood as the bedrock concept on which the program was built and the methodological approach was to view American history ethnographically through an interdisciplinary examination of its people, products, and processes. Practically speaking, this meant that those of us focused on history and the social sciences took courses in these areas to test the idea of American exceptionalism across time and through comparison with other cultures. Besides the AmCiv courses, the ones I enjoyed most were in the Anthropology Department at Penn. I used these course opportunities to conduct an ethnography of a local school and to investigate cross-cultural approaches to the socialization of youth.

My focus on history and anthropology provided a conceptual framework for critiquing what is meant by concepts such as “civilization” and “culture,” “high culture” and “low culture” and the implicit hierarchies such terminology implied. I served as Teaching Assistant in a course on African American history, for which I was selected due, no doubt, to an undergraduate course I had taken at Georgetown on “Black Theology, Religion, and Racism.” These courses and the civil rights movement planted seeds for my later attraction to multicultural education.

The program was led by an expert in the history of American philosophy, Dr. Murray Murphey, whose lectures allowed me to deepen my understanding of the place of American Pragmatism in American history. I studied children’s literature with Professor R. Gordon Kelly and American political behavior with Professor Melvyn Hammarberg. My dissertation advisor, Dr. John L. Caughey, introduced me to ethnographic analysis, through an examination of a psychiatric ward at a nearby hospital. Given the events of this period (e.g., Watergate, the “fall of Saigon,” and Ford’s pardon of Nixon, among others), the question of psychological “normalcy” seemed a worthy intellectual pursuit. My dissertation topic became an ethnographic

analysis of a psychotherapeutic clinic for adolescents, where “storm and stress” was the motif for the role as defined within the American life cycle.

When I left Penn, I took a position as a Visiting Assistant Professor of American Studies for a year at the University of Maryland. Although brief, this experience afforded me a wonderful opportunity to develop my interests in culture, socialization, and ethnography.

WOMEN’S STUDIES

During my year teaching at Maryland, several important events occurred that re-oriented my academic life towards women’s studies. I was teaching courses in life history and the “ages and stages” of American development along with “Death and Dying in American Culture,” the second most popular course on campus in terms of numbers enrolled (the most popular course was one on soap operas). I was invited to attend a meeting called by a group of women professors interested in organizing a women’s studies program on campus. That year, Judy Chicago’s work “The Dinner Party” came to the University of Maryland, and it opened the eyes of many of us about women’s forgotten past.

For me, this installation stimulated an epiphany: Where had women been in history? Why had I had so few women professors in my undergraduate and graduate education? As I taught life history and the age/stage structure of American society past and present, I increasingly turned my attention to investigating the role that gender played in the American status system. Of course, it was no coincidence that at this time I was also struggling with trying to combine marriage, family, and a career as an academic. This was a period during which the role models for doing so were few and far between; daycare centers very difficult to find; and a cultural ethos that—in many quarters—called into question the idea of putting one’s children in the hands of another caregiver when a mother went back to work.

Clearly some women have always worked. So, perhaps my own dissatisfaction with my circumstances was a case of status discontent. In the upper middle class milieu in which I grew up, women generally did not work when they had small children. To be honest, I was relieved not to have to work full-time when my children were very young. So, when we moved to Texas and I found part-time employment teaching US History at a local community college in the evenings, this arrangement allowed me an opportunity to continue as an academic on terms with which I was comfortable.

In 1981 when we moved back to New Jersey, I found a job teaching at the high school (Oak Knoll School) that I had attended. Teaching at a private school meant creating curriculum with great freedom. I introduced a course on Women’s History and infused women’s history into the Advanced Placement and regular American History courses I taught, making explicit connections between the women’s movement and the civil rights movement of the twentieth century. I sought out textbooks and readings that incorporated social and cultural history, framing the

M. S. CROCCO

courses as “history from the bottom up.” Interestingly, one of the questions on my doctoral certification exams had focused on the work in the “new social history” of the early twentieth century by James Harvey Robinson and Charles Beard, among others, opening up a life-long interest in curriculum change.

In 1986, the head of school, Sister Cynthia Vives, SHCJ, asked me if I would like to become the professional development coordinator for the school. This opportunity allowed me to work with faculty across grades kindergarten to 12 on the project of making our curriculum more multicultural. She also recommended me for a unique professional development experience, the Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity Program (SEED), run by Dr. Peggy McIntosh of Wellesley College and Emily Style, a teacher at that time in the Maplewood-South Orange School District.

This was an intellectually stimulating and, for me, career changing event. The seminar brought together teachers from public and private schools across northern New Jersey for monthly discussions aimed at making our curriculum and teaching more inclusive of different perspectives regarding gender, race, class, and sexual orientation. Participation in the SEED program required that after our year together as a cohort we assemble a volunteer group of teachers in our school or district for a similar experience of opening up the curriculum—across all fields—to these perspectives. The experience helped me understand better the limitations of my own (self-taught) introduction to women’s studies and set the stage for my invitation to join the faculty at Teachers College, two years after leaving my position at Oak Knoll.

A SERENDIPITOUS ENCOUNTER

During the summer of 1993, I attended a conference on women’s studies at Rutgers University. In chatting with a friend at the conference whose neighbor worked at Teachers College, Columbia University, she mentioned that there was an opening in Social Studies Education. It was June; one of the two faculty members in the program had just announced he was leaving. They were looking for someone with a Ph.D. who had taught at the secondary level. Might she pass my name along to the program coordinator?

When the call came from Steve Thornton a week or so later, I explained that my background wasn’t exactly what I thought he needed since my background in education was so thin. What I didn’t know at that time was that Teachers College had a long history of hiring individuals trained in fields outside education but who had, nevertheless, pursued successful careers within education. This made a lot of sense since Teachers College had essentially invented many fields of education over its storied history.

I got the job, and thus was fortunate enough to begin another round in my lifelong process of retooling my knowledge and skill set, which by now the reader will recognize as the signature theme of my story. I love to learn, and accepting a learning challenge was something that I had done happily for decades. Sharing my work

at Oak Knoll in professional development and revamping the K-12 curriculum to make it more inclusive seemed to strike a responsive chord in the hiring committee. Taking up the work of an educational researcher and teacher educator offered fresh opportunities for considering how gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation had been situated in the “canon” just at a time when the “culture wars” were heating up. When I learned that Steve’s mentor at Stanford was Nel Noddings, I was hooked. Her book *Caring* (1984) had been one of our core texts at Oak Knoll during our curriculum overhaul. I embraced this new opportunity at Teachers College with great enthusiasm.

Nevertheless, at countless times over the next decade, the title of one of Peggy McIntosh’s lectures frequently came to mind: “feeling like a fraud.” I was adopting the professional role of educationist in New York City with no grounding in urban schooling and scant familiarity with many of the critical ideas concerning education beyond those that made their way into the *New York Times*, *Kappan*, or *Independent School*. The learning curve was steep, and restarting my research, especially research acceptable for gaining tenure in a school of education, was daunting.

I was fortunate to have a colleague as supportive as Steve. I tried to absorb the highlights of his wonderful doctoral education at Stanford, which he shared generously and proudly. I was gratified by the fact that many understandings I had come to through my years of teaching practice and reading broadly were ones that we shared—about curriculum and pedagogy, the importance of interdisciplinary approaches to the study of the past, and the contributions of John Dewey to American life and education.

As I came to appreciate more fully later on in my years at Teachers College, I was also fortunate to be working in a field as expansive as social education. Many colleagues had their own unique paths into this arena—through political science, anthropology, geography, economics, law, and history. Happily for me, the field was characterized by longstanding debate about what the idea of social studies meant—history and all the rest (the federationist model) or an interdisciplinary pursuit focused on social issues and problems (the fusionist model). Although these debates seemed somewhat arcane to me, my relative lack of familiarity with them or their chief advocates over the decades was not a serious impediment to advancement, either at Teachers College or within the College and University Faculty Assembly (CUFA) of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS).

In developing my role within the Program in Social Studies at Teachers College, I concentrated my research, writing, and teaching on bringing a gendered and multi-cultural orientation into the field. Through excavating the history of social studies and long-forgotten female “forebears” or considering the role of diversity in social studies teacher education, I dedicated myself to figuring out how such a once innovative school subject had become so out of touch with the many currents of intellectual debate within the cognate disciplines, especially gender, race/ethnicity, and sexuality. I introduced two new courses into our program: *Diversity and the Social Studies Curriculum* and *Women of the World: Issues in Teaching*. In both

M. S. CROCCO

courses, students considered issues related to the transformation of knowledge and curriculum. And, as I investigated the situation in social studies, I learned that there was very little attention being devoted to gender more broadly in teacher education. Multicultural education efforts had, in a sense, “leapfrogged” over the feminist activities within NCSS of the 1980s. In education generally, perhaps because of the strong influence of psychology on so many aspects of research in the field, many considerations about “difference” that had suffused the humanities in the 1970s and 1980s were only slowly being taken up within the behavioral and social sciences with which education identifies so strongly.

CONCLUSION

A new generation of social studies scholars is at work on shaping the field for the next several decades. It is my hope that those who come after me will remain closely connected to the intellectual debates within the arts and sciences. One of my current efforts has to do with bringing an emphasis on sustainability into the field, or should I say, “bringing back” an emphasis on the environment as a pressing social issue.

Over the weeks that I have been writing this piece during the summer of 2012, numerous news outlets have remarked upon the fact that this summer in the United States is the warmest on record. A drought has afflicted the Midwest, shriveling up the corn and soybean plants that several months ago farmers anticipated were going to be “bumper crops.” Wildfires in Colorado burned through thousands of acres of dry tinder until firemen were able to bring the conflagration under control. In the fall of 2012, the very destructive storm, Hurricane Sandy, wreaked havoc in New York and New Jersey, with over 100 dead and billions of dollars worth of damage to property and infrastructure.

Sustainability has been defined as using resources in a way that does not imperil the access of future generations to those resources. As nations such as China and India come more fully into the status of developed nations over the next several decades, the challenges of sustainability will become even more pressing than they are today. Americans are, sadly, all too disposed to short-term thinking. I believe that the field of social education could make a major contribution to shaping the educational debate about sustainability should it choose to do so, contributing an inter-disciplinary, social issues-oriented perspective to the work that needs to be done in schools, colleges of teacher education, and communities through curriculum such as *Teaching The Levees* (www.teachingthelevees.org).

As an accidental educationist, who now has about a quarter century invested in social education, I hope that this field will seize the opportunity to play a leadership role—along with our colleagues in science education and other fields—to bring sustainability into schools and teacher education programs. Doing so will require vision and persistence since many educators are distracted by testing, the achievement gap, and international competition in science and math, which have collectively marginalized the field of social education for over ten years. Yet, social

educators were once agitators within the world of the disciplines; perhaps we can become so once again.

FAVORITE WORKS

Mine

- Crocco, M. S. (2012). Social studies and sustainability: A global competency framework, with A. Marri & T. Chandler. In R. McKeown & V. Nolet (Eds.), *Schooling for sustainability in the United States and Canada*. Springer.
- Crocco, M. S. (2010). (How) do we teach about women of the world in teacher education? In B. Subedi (Ed.), *Rethinking curricular knowledge on global societies*. Information Age.
- Crocco, M. S. (2007). *Teaching The Levees: A curriculum for democratic dialogue and civic engagement*. Teachers College Press.
- Crocco, M. S. (2007). Education and marginality: Race and gender in higher education, 1940–1955, with C. Waite. *History of Education Quarterly*, 47(1).
- Crocco, M. S. (2005). Teaching *Shabanu*: The challenges of using world literature in the US social studies classroom. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(5).
- Crocco, M. S. (2005). Women and the social studies: The long rise and rapid fall of feminist activity in the National Council for the Social Studies. In C. Woysner, J. Watras, & M. S. Crocco (Eds.), *Social education in the twentieth century: Curriculum and context for citizenships*. Peter Lang.
- Crocco, M. S. (2004). *Learning to teach in an age of accountability*, with A. Costigan, Erlbaum.
- Crocco, M. S. (2004). Dealing with difference in the social studies. *The International Journal of Social Education*, 18(1).
- Crocco, M. S. (2001). The missing discourse on gender and sexuality in the social studies. *Theory into Practice*, 40(1).
- Crocco, M. S. (1999). *Pedagogies of resistance: Women educator activists 1880–1960*, with P. Munro & K. Weiler. Teachers College Press.

Others

- Bailyn, B. (1970). *Education in the forming of American society: Needs and opportunities for study*. Williamsburg, VA: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Banks, J. A. (2013). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Englewood, NJ: Pearson.
- Curti, M. (1995). *The growth of American thought* (3rd ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- De Tocqueville, A. (2003). *Democracy in America*. London, UK and New York, NY: Penguin Classics.
- Dewey, J. (n.d.). *Democracy and education; Art as experience; School and society*.
- Katz, M. (1968). *The irony of early school reform: Educational innovation in mid-nineteenth century Massachusetts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McCurdy, D., & Spradley, J. (1972). *The cultural experience: Ethnography in a complex society*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Minnich, E. (2004). *Transforming knowledge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Noddings, N. (1983). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1995). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Spradley, J., & Mann, B. (2008). *The cocktail waitress: Women's work in a man's world*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.