



Espacio, Tiempo y Educación

E-ISSN: 2340-7263

jlhuerta@espaciotiempoyeducacion.com

FahrenHouse

España

Rogacheva, Yelena

The Reception of John Dewey's Democratic Concept of School in Different Countries of
the World

Espacio, Tiempo y Educación, vol. 3, núm. 2, julio-diciembre, 2016, pp. 65-87

FahrenHouse

Salamanca, España

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=477455338004>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's homepage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System

Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal

Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

The Reception of John Dewey's Democratic Concept of School in Different Countries of the World

La acogida del concepto democrático de escuela de John Dewey en diferentes países del mundo

Yelena Rogacheva

e-mail: erogacheva@hotmail.com

Vladimir State University, Rusia

Abstract: The paper deals with John Dewey's democratic concept of school and its international significance. The man of the XX century, John Dewey (1859-1952) has made great impact on the development of world pedagogy. The masterwork «Democracy and Education» published in 1916 by American scholar and educational reformer is in the focus of attention too. The main elements of John Dewey's concept of child-oriented school are given along with the following three conditions: «democracy», «growth» and «experience». The author explains the reasons of Dewey's influence on educational thought and practice in the XXth century. The experience of old European countries such as Great Britain, France, Turkey, as well as Japan, Russia and Latin America is touched upon in the paper. It is stressed that cultural interpretations of Dewey's ideas and practices in different countries served as the instrument of modernization of the state and school reform stimulator. John Dewey's democratic ideas brought him international reputation of an outstanding philosopher and the best educator of the XXth century alongside with the other three: George Kershensteiner, Maria Montessori and Anton Makarenko.

Keywords: John Dewey's democratic concept of school; democracy; education; experience; growth; influence.

Resumen: El artículo aborda el concepto democrático de escuela de John Dewey y su importancia en el ámbito internacional. El hombre del siglo XX, John Dewey (1859-1952) causó un gran impacto en el desarrollo de la pedagogía mundial. La obra maestra «Democracia y Educación», publicada en 1916 por el profesor estadounidense y reformista de la educación, está también en el centro de atención de este trabajo. Los principales elementos del concepto de escuela, orientada a los niños de John Dewey, se dan en las tres condiciones siguientes: «democracia», «crecimiento» y «experiencia». La autora explica las razones de la influencia de Dewey sobre el pensamiento y la práctica educativa en el siglo XX. Se incluye en este documento la experiencia de viejos países europeos como Gran Bretaña, Francia, Turquía, así como Japón, Rusia y América Latina. Se hace hincapié en que las interpretaciones culturales de las ideas de Dewey y las prácticas de diferentes países sirvieron como instrumento de modernización del Estado y como estímulo para la reforma de la escuela. Las ideas democráticas de John Dewey le reportaron una excelente reputación internacional como destacado filósofo y como el mejor educador del siglo XX, junto con otros tres: George Kershensteiner, María Montessori y Anton Makarenko.

Palabras clave: concepción democrática de la escuela de John Dewey; democracia; educación; experiencia; crecimiento; influencia.

Dewey's influence on educational thought and practice was felt on six continents and was brought about in three ways: (1) Dewey's visits to foreign countries, most notably his visits to Japan, China, Turkey, and the U.S.S.R.; (2) translations of Dewey's books and other writings into at least thirty-five languages; and (3) the thousands of students from other lands who studied with Dewey and his colleagues at Teacher College, Columbia University and other American Universities and colleges where Dewey's philosophy was taught, and then returned home to become leaders in their countries' ministries and universities (Passow, 1982, p. 402).

In the focus of our paper there will be the problem of Dewey's democratic pedagogy perception in Great Britain, France, Turkey, Japan and Russia. Briefly we touch Latin American context as well to stress the fact that Dewey's democratic ideas were felt on different continents - Europe, Asia and America. It will allow us to realize how differently Dewey's democratic ideas were digested in different cultural contexts in different political regimes and within different economic conditions. For conservative traditional countries like Great Britain and France Dewey's educational philosophy sounded like a challenge. As Oelkers remarked about European perception of Dewey, it was relatively easy to link Dewey with the philosophy of Henri Bergson in Geneva, but impossible to bring about pragmatism and Dewey against neo-Kantianism in Germany before and after 1914. Critical theory up to Habermas showed no real interest in Dewey, at least not in his conceptions of democracy and education, although the social theories have very much in common. Pragmatic ideas of Dewey were more ignored than accepted.

In authoritarian regimes that Germany, Britain and France demonstrated till the beginning of 1960's Dewey's democratic vision of school and new role of the teacher was simply unacceptable. For Turkey, Mexico and Russia it served as the tool for modernization of society though it was not easy in Turkey to overcome theocratic culture and specific family structure of the country in implementing democratic ideas into practice. In Mexico with dependent capitalism in economy and lack of resources as blocking factors the implementation of Deweyan educational theory and practice was not easy too. In Russia it also was grasped sometimes very functionally and served as an instrument of solving political tasks of a new revolutionary regime. For Japan that has a strong mechanism for keeping cultural traditions Dewey's democratic concept was a sign of western technology that had to struggle with eastern morality.

The publication of John Dewey's «Democracy and Education», a work which, according to numerous scholars, was without doubt his most seminal

contribution took place in 1916. At that time John Dewey was already in New York at Teaching College of the University of Columbia enjoying great popularity among international scholars. He got the title «the teacher of teachers». His educational experience grew very much in Chicago period, where the American reformer founded his experimental school at the University of Chicago in 1896. His educational philosophy, grown out of his experiment at his school, seemed to be inspiring for many teachers because it met the demands of the changing society. In Special Collection of Regenstein Library at the University of Chicago one can see 143 items chronologically listed beginning from Dewey's letter of February 15th, 1894, optimistically viewing the opportunities in prospect at the University of Chicago. The archives give a chance to grasp the devotion of the scientist to his experiment and his reflection over it. Dewey's letter to president W. Harper about his friend G. H. Mead, who was his true and cooperative colleague at Lab School (dated April, 10th, 1894), his «Plan of Organization of the University Primary School as well as the records of his Lab School, nice pictures of it in different periods of its existence and even the letter of Dewey of June 16th, 1904, after he angrily had resigned from the University and was about to leave for Columbia and New York – all the documents show Dewey's commitment to the idea that the concerns of education are really worthy of the most serious scholarship that university can provide»¹.

As Russian philosopher N. Yulina points out, Dewey could be called the philosopher of modernism, as

he tried to grasp the dynamics of modernization, civilization and culture in the XX century, the strings, pushing the countries towards democracy and humanism, and at the same time to understand what forces block it. He believed in human wisdom, in science and scientific methods, in active social and moral role of philosophy in society, in open systems of thought and, he rejected dogmatism and authoritarianism, being confident of humanistic capacities of liberal democracy, and what is more important, in enlightenment as the main lever of democracy².

In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey pointed out 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 have cause to be in

¹ Special Collection, University of Chicago, Regenstein Library, Laboratory Schools. Records. 1891-1986. Elementary School, 1898-1934 vol. I. (1898), box 1. Folder 1; vol. II (1899-1900), box 2. Folder 1; vol. III (1900-1901), box 3. Folder 1: pp. 1-639: July 10 The Plan of Organization of the University School. University Presidential Papers. Box 30. Folder 23.

² Yulina, N. Filosofija D. Džui i postmodernistijskij pragmatizam R. Rorty // Filosofskij pragmatizam Richarda Rorty i rossijskij kontekst. M.: Tradizija, 1997. cc. 172 – 173.

deliberate and systematic education. The devotion of democracy to education is a familiar one» (Dewey, 1966, p. 87).

The core elements of Dewey's school were – the child, the school and the society. To these three he added three more notions – democracy, growth and experience. Dewey wrote in *Democracy and Education*, that «education means the enterprise of supplying the conditions which insure growth, or adequacy of life, irrespective of age» (Dewey, 1966, p. 51). Dewey's school aimed at educating a flexible, creative, thinking and cooperative pupil and not a passive person. He wanted school to be a social institution representing life as vital to the child as that carried on at home. «A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individual a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorders» (Dewey, 1966, p. 99).

Very relevant for contemporary teachers are today Dewey's ideas of education as a process of living each day and not a preparation for future living. Dewey stressed that «the criterion of the value of school education is the extent in which it creates a desire for continued growth and supplies means for making the desire effective in fact» (Dewey, 1966, p. 53).

The man of the XX century, John Dewey has made great impact on the development of world pedagogy. The highlighting the metamorphosis that John Dewey's educational masterwork *Democracy and Education* has undergone throughout the century since its publication as well as his democratic pedagogy seems to be a good venture. Nowadays world integration makes the science cross the national borders, comparative research in education is becoming of great importance and comes to the focus of scientific discussions. Educators try to find out the facts and processes of cultural interlinks, though they understand how important it is to avoid superficial analogies, to deepen logical arguments in comparing different phenomena. The problems of educational transfer, perception and acceptance of the other have become of paramount significance.

Educational legacy of American scholar John Dewey is considered to be the subject of interest not by chance. According to D. Sidorsky (1977, p. VII) «John Dewey was the most influential figure in American philosophical thought in the first half of the twentieth century. His influence was both broad in scope and deep in impact... The impact of Dewey's ideas upon American philosophical and social thought was so great that it must be considered a major phenomenon of American cultural history of the twentieth century». He was not only the leader of North American educational reform that took place around the end of

the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, but one of the key figures in what was called «new education», «progressive education» or «reform pedagogy».

In Dewey's case we face an extraordinary versatility. W. R. McKenzi gave a summary of what Dewey was working at in the 1890s: «...Philosophy, psychology, philosophy of education, educational psychology, psychology of selected educational subjects, child study, elementary education, secondary education, Laboratory schools, pedagogy as a university discipline and others ...» (McKenzi, 1975, pp. IX-XYI).

John Dewey's influence on philosophical thought and educational reform was not limited to America. Before 1950 «Dewey in Europe» was somewhat of a trademark as Jurgen Oelkers stated in 2000. John Dewey was firmly linked to European "progressive education" and was read and received all over the continent. In 1946 the then director of the International Bureau of Education in Geneva, Robert Drottens, hailed Dewey as the person who had had the greatest influence on contemporary education worldwide (Brickman, 1964, p. 1). In 1961, the president of Hong Kong's New Asia College, Ou Tsui-Chen, commented: «John Dewey was one of the most important philosophers of education of this century; few educational theorists have equaled his widespread influence, which was not limited to his own society, but was felt throughout the world» (Ou Tsui-Chen, 1961, p. 277). In Soviet Russia in 1920s Stanislav Shatsky called Dewey «the best philosopher of contemporary school». On occasion of Dewey's ninetieth birthday (October 20, 1949) W. Brickman discussed Dewey's reputation as an educator in foreign countries and pointed to some examples of Dewey's influence on educational thought and practice abroad. Mentioning that «... a more accessible measure of Dewey's relationship to his contemporaries in foreign countries is his reputation as an educator», he determined it «...by translations of books and articles, professional reviews, discussions of ideas in professional and other publications, and references to theory and practice in miscellaneous sources» (Brickman, 1949, p. 258).

One cannot ignore the fact that the attitude towards John Dewey throughout the 20th century dynamically changed. After Robert Westbrook's magistral study, *John Dewey and American Democracy* (1991), research and literature on Dewey has exploded. In education alone ten to twenty doctoral dissertations, books, articles or collections appear every year. *Understanding John Dewey*, written by Campbell in 1995 has become of central interest to Anglo-Saxon philosophy and history of education in the nineties. After 1989 with the fall of socialist education interest in Dewey has increased in Europe too. For European education Dewey is no classic in the sense of «essential truths», his theory of education is a challenge to do better (Ryan, 1995).

In the older European countries at the beginning of the 20th century there was little tendency to look to America for new ideas in the realm of thought. W. Kilpatrick wrote that in such old European countries like Germany and England John Dewey's ideas have been interpreted rather narrowly, mostly in connection with the place of industries in elementary education, and George Kershensteiner's «Arbeitsschule» dealt with Dewey's critique of a child's activity (Kilpatrick, 1989, p. 471).

Being extential to the European Educational tradition John Dewey had close links to it and even visited Europe for some times. His first visit took place in January 1895 and he spent a year there with his wife and three young children. In 1904 Dewey visited Europe again and it was another 20 years before Dewey went to Europe to survey Turkey's educational system and to recommend ways for its improvement. In 1926 Dewey saw Paris, Madrid, Vienna, visiting museums together with art collector Albert Barnes. In 1928 he went to London, Berlin and again to Paris and afterwards visited Leningrad and Moscow to see schools in and around both cities as a member of a group of 25 American educators who were there by invitation of the Soviet commissioner of education. In April and May of 1929 Dewey was in Edinburgh, to give the prestigious Gifford Lectures. In 1930, he was in Paris to accept an honorary degree from the University of Paris and for a few weeks in Vienna. He came to Europe for the last time revisiting Paris and Vienna in 1933 (Dykhuisen, 1973, pp. 79, 115, 224-225, 222-223, 235, 230-240, 271).

Though Dewey did not receive his education in Europe, his intellectual background was closely connected with European thinking. Dewey positioned himself on a theoretical level in between the Herbartians and the Hegelians criticizing the Hegelians for their failure to connect the subject matter of the curriculum to the interests and the activities of the child and the Herbartians – the representatives of the child-study movement for their failure to connect the interests and the activities of the child to the subject matter of the curriculum (Dewey, 1972, pp. 115 and 146).

Though in the analysis of *Education and the Struggle for Democracy*, Carr and Hartnett (1996) concluded that, if to take the context of Britain, «John Dewey is doubtly the most influential educational philosopher of the twentieth century» (p. 54), at the same time when English political leaders want to find somebody to be blamed for all the faults at their schools they speak of Dewey's «undeniable» and «disastrous» influence on English education as presented in the report of John Major and his education secretary while adopting National Curriculum in 1991.

In the first half of the 20th century Dewey was in teacher training courses on the lists of prescribed reading, thanks largely to J. J. Findlay, professor of the

University of Manchester, who published a collection of Dewey's essays in 1906 under the title *The School and the Child*, and did much to introduce Dewey to an academic educationalists in Britain. But his ideas were not widely assimilated into practice or theory. Herbart's was still the favored theory at the start of the century.

A modest movement towards greater recognition of Dewey was felt in the 1930s in England. Three reports of the Consultative committee show this (1926 – no explicit references on Dewey, but the one in 1931 on the Primary school marks the beginning of acceptance of Dewey's ideas by the educational establishment. Though a passing reference to Dewey by name, its recommendations clearly have close affinities to Dewey's thinking, contrasting «traditional education» with «the real business of life». In the report of 1933 on Infant and Nursery Schools – a whole page is allotted to Dewey's ideas with the conclusion that «Dewey's works... have played an important part in the evolution of modern ideas on infant education in this country» (Darling & Nisbet, 2000, pp. 40-44).

In England only pedagogical ideas of Dewey had some impact but not his epistemological, social or political ones up to 1940s and only to extent that the notion was endorsed by some as a worthwhile principle, or at least as an aspiration, and generally accepted more by academics and reformers than by teachers.

Scotland (1969) links this «comparative lack of penetration» to the intellectual climate in his country at this time: «Project method and problem teaching and activity methods were lectured on in Scottish universities and colleges, much discussed in professional assemblies, but little practiced at schools. In a country with a strong tradition of Platonic idealism, Dewey's pragmatic attitude could hardly expect to be welcome, nor could a doctrine, which stressed the need for the learner to do the work appeal in a system where the ... teacher was the king..., where stern discipline was considered to build character» (Scotland, 1969, pp. 262-263). Dewey's emphasis on social context of education was in opposition to the individualistic philosophy of Nunn which was widely favored from 1920 until at least 1940. Long-established, rigid structures in British society, in which social class divisions were endemic, subject-oriented curriculum was the obstacle for Dewey's model of school.

Only in 1960s Britain saw a marked waning of deference to authority. Old ways were to be questioned and traditional practices challenged. In primary education in 1960s there were significant changes. Plowden Report (1967) advocated a strikingly progressive approach to education and Deweyesque nature is vivid: «At heart of the educational process lies the child. No advances in policy, no acquisition of new equipment have their desired effect unless they are in

harmony with the nature of the child, unless they are fundamentally accepted to him» (Plowden, p. 7). It reminds us of Dewey's change, «not unlike that introduced by Copernicus when the astronomical center shifted from the earth to the sun», and «... the child becomes the sun about which the appliances of education revolve; he is the center about which they are organized» (Dewey, 1990, p. 51).

In the early years of the century before the World War I, the ideas and practical suggestions of Dewey also became known in Australia largely through the interpretations of educational writers in England. In Australia this was the beginning, for Australia, of what has been called the «New Education». The second period, twenty years from the end of World War I to the beginning of World War II, had a much richer experience of progressive education. Herbartianism, which was seriously criticized by J. Dewey, had by then become the orthodox conservatism of educational thought and practice and was challenged by the Dewey's *Democracy and Education*, by the Project Method, and other new forms of instruction.

As for France, Dewey was first recorded there in 1883 after an anonymous review of a philosophical text by Dewey that had appeared in the April 1882. After this no notice was taken of Dewey in France for several years until the journal *L'Education*, edited from 1909 onwards by Georges Bertie, director of Ecole Roches, listed Dewey in its editorial as a leading contributor. From this period until 1960s, the reception of Dewey was restricted to the pedagogical element of his heritage. It is important to mention that Dewey's ideas didn't penetrate deeply in French educational system, though they were popular in academic discussions. Only in 1901 the church was separated from the state in France. It was not easy for Dewey's active pedagogy to be accepted in the tradition where the center was on a teacher. In the period before the World War I there appeared first translations of John Dewey. The critical reception on Dewey in France may be explained by the conflict in this country between new education and traditional school. The experiments in French schools, proclaimed like Dewey's experiment sometimes didn't correspond to the original idea. In 1965 there appeared in France the book entitled *John Dewey's Pedagogy*, written by Gerald Dalledalle, with the introduction by Maurice Debesse. Debesse came to conclusion that though Dewey was considered in France to be a very important author within New Education, the French didn't know him very well. Only Gerald Dalledalle tried to pay serious attention to Dewey's works. He systematically studied John Dewey's works and wrote many books on pragmatism and his founders³. Delladalle

³ Gerald Delledalle. *Histoire de la philosophie americaine* (Paris, 1954), *Ecrits sur, le signe* (Paris, 1979), Charles S. Pierce, *phenomenologue et semioticien* (Amsterdam, 1987) and *La Philosophie americaine* (Paris, 1987).

wrote that John Dewey's educational ideas were rather influential in France but it is very hard to trace this influence on different French educators. Dalledalle himself confirmed that American philosophy in general and Dewey's ideas in particular served his intellectual background. He accepted John Dewey's idea of cooperative work and considered the Ecolle de Roches to be experimental sides for John Dewey's principles. «New classes», introduced in three French schools (Sevres, Montgeron, Pontoise) reflected the ideas of American reformer. This scientist stressed very important roles played by Claparede, Ferrier and Decroly in empirical reception of Dewey's ideas in France. In 1975 Dalledalle published the translation of John Dewey's *Democracy and Education*. In his introduction he pointed to five central aspects of John Dewey's pedagogy: spontaneous and intellectual activity concentrated on the interests of a child, the sociality of whom should be shaped at school, reflecting the structure of the existing society, in case if the structure is based on the principle of continuity (Schneider, 2000, pp. 76-77). This author thought that John Dewey was falsely blamed by all the mistakes of American school system. He thought that many teachers tried to copy the ideas of Dewey's school without understanding of his experimental method. John Dewey's idea of constant reconstruction of experience demanded to take into consideration the changing conditions of life, it was incompatible with «orthodoxy of undeflected passage along a single path of salvation» (Schneider, 2000, p. 77).

In Turkey Dewey's involvement in educational reform and democratization of educational system in the country was evoked by an invitation of the Turkish Government under the presidency of Mustapha Kemal, named Ataturk, to survey the Turkish educational system and organization and to make recommendations for its improvements. Dewey's investigations resulted in his Report and Recommendation upon Turkish Education (Dewey, 1983, pp. 273-297).

Dewey came to Turkey when it was changing from a Muslim theocracy into a secular state. In 1923, the Turkish government was proclaimed, State and society were secularized, all citizens got equal rights, but at the same time American educator marked that Turkish nationalism was propagated against anti-Turkish nationalism (mostly Armenian and Greek) (Dewey, 1983, pp. 144-149). The Turkish government thought John Dewey's philosophy of education «to fit the democratic aims of Turkish educational reform movement» (Dykhuizen, 1973, p. 224). In Dewey's report the main end to be secured by the Turkish educational system was «the development of Turkey as a vital, free, independent and lay republic in full membership in the circle of civilized states» (Dewey, 1983, p. 275). American reformer suggested that Turkish schools should:

1) form proper political habits and ideas, 2) foster the various forms of economic and commercial skill and ability; and 3) develop the traits and dispositions of character, intellectual and moral, which fit men and women for self-government, economic self-support and industrial progress; namely, initiative and inventiveness, in dependence of judgment, ability to think scientifically and to cooperate for common purposes socially (Dewey, 1983, p. 275).

Dewey wanted to educate the mass of Turkish citizens «for intellectual participation in the political, economic and cultural growth of the country» (Dewey, 1983, p. 275); he didn't limit this aim to certain leaders. The American scholar stressed the importance of the existence of different types of schools - vocational and agricultural in addition with existing schools with only academic training. He saw in private schools an experiment station for public schools. He recommended foreign schools in Turkey (mostly French and American) because they embodied a variety of typical methods of school administration and instruction from which mainstream Turkish educators could profit. He also stressed the need for better salaries for teachers as an indication of the recognition of the society and government of the teacher's status. Dewey wanted to introduce in Turkish teacher education modern and progressive pedagogical ideas, he also suggested that teachers had to be sent abroad to experience other systems and solutions. Traveling specially trained supervising inspectors and libraries were seen like good means of improving Turkish schools (Biesta and Miedema, 1996, p. 11). The American educator thought it important for Turkish government to sponsor the translation of foreign books and particularly that «those, dealing with practical methods and equipment in progressive schools» should be «widely circulated» and «carefully studied by teachers» (Brickman, 1964, p. 14). It is important to mention that while Dewey was in Turkey the schools were not in operation. He relied on impressions and information given him about the structure and climate of Turkish schools. Maxwell - Hyslops asserted that: «The aims and nature of the organization of education in Turkey today offer proof of the extent to which [Dewey's] recommendations were followed» (Brickman, 1964, p. 14).

Dewey's report had a great impact on a Turkish educational practice. His ideas on teacher training, teacher payment and differentiation between teacher training schools and training of inspectors nearly completely was set into practice. But the policy of prohibition and strict control, regarding the foreign schools didn't change (Büyükdüvenci, 1995, pp. 228-230). It is a pity that some of Dewey's views were interpreted rather narrowly in Turkey, that led to positivistic, technological and product-oriented patterns of action. Theocratic culture and the family structure of the country blocked democratic reform in Dewey's sense. The case of Turkey is a good example of the use of progressive ideas in

the modernization of the State. Though we can clearly see the misinterpretation of Dewey's educational ideas by Turkish official government that destabilized pluralism in educational system, contrary to his recommendations.

The experience of Japan in perception of Dewey's educational ideas is of particular interest as it helps to see how Japanese tradition tried to meet and interpret innovative western ideas. John Dewey's reputation as the recognized leader of the pragmatic movement in philosophy and pedagogy came to oriental countries like Japan and China in the beginning of the 20th century. When Dewey settled in New York at Columbia's University in 1905, he was already rather famous. In January 1918 as Dewey and his wife were about to sail for a vacation to the «Orient», he received an invitation to deliver some lectures in Japan. At the end of the 19th century Japan was very open to western innovations. In creating Japanese educational system, the Japanese had full confidence in foreign educators and counselors. As for Dewey's pedagogy, it became known in Japan even at the end of the 19th century. A famous book by Sudzi Ivasa was written under the influence of J. Dewey's philosophy of education and became a manual for teachers of Japan. Among supporters of westernization movement in Japanese school there were different positions. Some of them supported Herbert and didn't accept pragmatism, though many others positively accepted many key elements of Dewey's philosophy of education. It is remarkable that Americans first drew attention to Dewey after in one of the journals there was a paper of Japanese author Motoori Norinori in 1887. The paper was devoted to psychology and the author was the first of Japanese pioneers – a Christian protestant, studying American philosophy. He evidently heard of Dewey at the lectures of professor Stanley Hall at the University of John Hopkins. Later Motora became the Head of Japanese Association of Child Study founded in 1902. After coming back home Motora became the professor of the University in Tokyo and Tokyo High Normal School. It was Motora who let it possible for Japanese to know one more representative of pragmatism – W. James. Motora wrote some papers about him and was the editor of the first translation of W. James' «Principles of Psychology» (Kobayashi, 1962).

One more Japanese scientist Nikaima Rikiso has made his contribution to Dewey's reception in Japan by discussing Dewey's work «The Outlines of Critical Theory of Ethics», that first appeared in Japanese translation in 1900. Next year Japan saw Dewey's book «School and Society» and in 1905, 1923, 1935 and 1950 – four more of his main translated in Japanese books.

When Dewey came to Japan during his two-and-a-half-month's visit he delivered a series of eight lectures at the National Imperial University in Tokyo. These lectures were organized around a general theme dealing «with the problem

of reconstructing moral and social thinking and he benefits to be derived from a democratic way of life» (Howlett, 1977, p. 45).

Dewey thought that the lectures would give him a chance to express his ideas for world peace. Since Dewey's visit in 1919 Dewey's influence on Japanese educational thought seems to have been continuous and reached its peak, in all probability, during the «Americanization» of Japanese education following the World War II (Passow, 1982/83, p. 402).

The name of Dewey was often mentioned in the lectures and papers of Japanese educator Naruse. He admitted that Dewey's educational idea appealed to him greatly. In 1912 Naruse visited Dewey in New York and Dewey got his chance to pay him a visit later in 1918 when he had a lecture at Imperial Tokyo University on «New Tendencies in Philosophy, Religion and Education» (*Collected lectures of Professor Naruse*, 1940, vol. 6, p. 2).

At the beginning of the 20th century many young Japanese students who studied in U.S. took interest in Dewey's ideas in Japanese educational thought and wrote that Naruse took some elements of Dewey's didactics in his school, but he was not a very good specialist in Dewey's philosophy. One of the serious researchers of Dewey's pragmatism was Tanaka Odo (1867-1932). He listened to Dewey's lectures at the University of Chicago in 1889 after the graduation from the University of Chicago Tanaka taught at High Industrial School in Tokyo and then at Waseda University. He did not share all the positions with Dewey on societal problems and was greatly influenced by Hegel. Tanaka was an idealist in the case of social progress but reproached his Japanese colleagues for «Philosophy in armchair» in tune with Dewey and criticized them for «being isolated from a real world in an iron tower». In this book «Off the library to the street» (1911) Tanaka asked the scientists to leave their study-rooms and to study a real social world. It was Tanaka who did his best for Waseda University to become the center of pragmatism. A famous «Waseda group» consisted of Sugimoro Kojiri, Hoashi Rijichiro and Tanaka. Hoashi called himself «The pupil of Dewey's pupil».

Though in Kobajashi's view Dewey's brief lecture tour in 1919 did not have a significant impact but his ideas as transmitted through his writings in the years following did influence Japanese thought. The popularity of Dewey in the postwar period was amazing as Japan was an Asian country long known for its authoritarian tradition in education. Still Japanese kept to look for «Western technology» but tried to adhere to «Eastern morals».

Between the two world wars of the last century dedicated Dewey's scholars who had studied in Northern America tried their students with democratic ideas of American reformer. When in 1927 William Heard Kilpatrick visited Japan and lectured on his version of the project method, which had been inspired by

Dewey's ideas, his lectures reached a very wide audience through various media, including radio. The Dalton Plan and the project method became very popular with Japanese education at that time. A number of schools had been founded following the pattern of progressive schools that had been started in the United States (Passow, 1982/83, p. 413).

In 1964 in Kobayashi's study on Dewey there is an indication that two years earlier, a Japanese journalist had stated «no one can deny Dewey's great influence on educational thought in Japan in the last eighteen years. It exceeds that of any other educational thinker» (Collected lectures of Professor Naruse, 1940, vol. 6, p. 2). The Japanese Bibliography of Education for 1945-1957 contained 176 entries under the heading «Studies of Educational Thinkers». Almost half – eighty-one – dealt with John Dewey; the U.S.S.R. educator Makarenko was second in frequency with only eighteen entries. Nagano's General Introduction to Dewey's Philosophy, published in 1946, was in its sixteenth printing by 1948.

Kobayashi cites other evidence of popularity of Dewey in post – World War II Japan brisk book sales, 21 translations of Dewey's works, papers presented on Dewey at meetings of educational research associations from 1946 – every year at least one, but in 1951 – 8 papers on Dewey. Many students at the Universities did their master's papers on Dewey. The popularity of Dewey was so high that in 1959 in the year of his 100th Anniversary of birth there appeared a catalogue on Dewey's studies in Japan. In the country of festivals there was the festival of Dewey on Shikoku Island. On June 1, in 1953 the University of Hokkaido organized «The Night of John Dewey». In 1957 the Japanese Society of John Dewey was organized and by 1962 it united 130 educators and philosophers (Nishitani Kendo, 1962, p. 2).

Many Japanese educators perceived the «New Education» of the Occupation years following World War II as continuing the «New Education Movement» that had existed in Japan between 1912 and 1926 (which had led to Dewey's influence at the time) and that had been curtailed by the rising militarism and the war (Kobayashi, 1962, p. 7). Though we can make a strong case for John Dewey's influencing Japanese educational thought it is not easy to determine Dewey's impact on school practices. Even those Japanese educators, who viewed the educational reforms promulgated by the U.S. Occupation as «based on Deweyan principles, differ among themselves on the extent to which Deweyan ideas have penetrated classroom activities. Furthermore, the Deweyan approach being more an attitude rather than a set procedure of teaching is difficult to observe directly and to judge objectively» (Kobayashi, 1962, p. 8).

In Latin America Dewey seems to be also famous at the beginning of the century. In Chili (1908), Cuba (1925), Mexico (1929) and Argentina (1939)

the first translations of his famous books gave a chance for the educators in those countries to get to know his philosophy of education. In Brazil the educational heritage of Dewey was known thanks to Lourenzo Filho. He even gave the title to his own book *Dewey and World Educational Reform*. In 1930 a famous book of Dewey *Democracy and Education* and in 1933 his famous text *How we think* appeared in translation (Brickman, 1964, p. 261).

Though his ideas were not too influential in Latin America as socio-cultural situation in such countries like Mexico, for example, differed greatly from that one in North America, his action pedagogy was even officially adopted there in 1923 and played some role in the modernization of society. Dewey visited Mexico two times. In this country two main of his ideas - observation and experience as the means of individual efficiency and cooperative work were seen as the means to strengthen the spirit of fraternity and to provide future new social order (BSEP2, nos. 5/6 (1923-1924), pp. 294-295). According to M. Vaughan, progressive reform associated with Deweyan philosophy of education could not become a wide- spread movement as the situation of dependent capitalism in economy and lack of resources blocked it. It was just an experiment (Vaughan, 1982, p. 171).

The political context in Russia during the XXth century influenced the process of John Dewey's democratic philosophic and educational legacy digesting. Analyzing the process of Dewey's reception in Russia one can identify four distinct periods:

1. The pre-revolutionary period (the first two decades);
2. The 1920's- the period of his most popularity;
3. The 1930s: the period of the de-Deweyization of Soviet education;
4. The late 1980s-1990s when, as a part of the movement of «the pedagogy of cooperation», Dewey's ideas became the focus of attention in Russia again.

At the beginning of the century Dewey's idea of a child-oriented school penetrated Russia with the publication of his book «School and Society». It was translated into Russian in 1907 and had a great impact on many talented educators of the time, such as N. Krupskaya, A. Lunacharsky, P. Blonsky, A. Pinkevich, and S. Shatsky. Before the revolution in setting his «Settlement» program Shatsky and his colleagues A. Zelenko and L. Shleger were greatly inspired by Dewey's new philosophy of education, his democratic model of the school, and his idea of the organization of the child's vital activities. The «Settlement» was the first club for children in Russia in the working men's quarter of Moscow, at Maryina Rosha. A. Zelenko was connected with the University «Settlement» in New York City. When he came back to Russia, he also told Shatsky about the Hull-House.

The Hull-House as a community center for all of Chicago, organized by Jane Addams, was for Dewey, associated with it, a sort of a social center. It turned out to become later «a cultural center, a social service school, a university, and a church» (Addams, 1981).

Shatsky was very inspired by the American experience and tried to operate along non-political lines and in the neutral fields of children's clubs, recreation, and health. A group of children was made to concentrate on agricultural work and manage its own affairs. Shatsky tried in his experiment to discover regularities in the way groups of children behave; he did his best to find ways and means to help the young generation master progressive and cultural norms. While experimenting, Shatsky met with constant opposition and embarrassment from the Tsarist regime and his experiment was soon halted. His wife Valentina Shatskaya taught aesthetics at school and made a program for the society «Child's Work and Leisure», which was in tune with Dewey's ideas.

At the beginning of the last century Russian educator Stanislav Shatsky mentioned that future teachers should study Dewey's works very thoroughly. Dewey attracts the reader by his great ability to reflect over his own educational experience, over the vast number of well- analyzed facts.

In 1911, Shatsky organized a summer colony called «Bodraya Zhyzn» in Kaluzhskaya region. He considered the most important task of school to be the organization of children's vital activities. Later, after visiting Shatsky's colony as a member of an American delegation, Dewey wrote in 1929 in «Impressions of Soviet Russia», that his school was based «on a combination of Tolstoy's version of Rousseau's doctrine of freedom and the idea of the educational value of productive work derived from American sources» (Dewey, 1929, p. 64).

Shatsky tried to implement many of Dewey's ideas in his practical work in the colony. For Shatsky, education meant «organization of children's life» and he tried to act in conformity with nature and did not ignore the influence of environment. Shatsky thought that the main task for a teacher was to create facilities for a child to display his/her «forces and abilities» in order to give vent to all natural instincts. Inspired by Dewey, he tried to implement Dewey's principles and practice of democracy into school life and administration, and showed increased human interest in current social affairs. But Shatsky went further than Dewey's adaptation to society idea and tried to change the environment by means of the school.

In 1922-1933 Dewey's theory and practice greatly influenced existing Soviet educational practice. J. Dewey visited Russia in 1928 as a member of an American delegation, and saw tremendous changes in the relationships of teachers and pupils in Soviet schools. Dewey's concept of a teacher as a guide, and organizer

of various activities was taken by Shatsky and other Soviet progressive educators as a main principle in their experimental educational practice. While in Russia Dewey was impressed by the phenomenal achievements of the Soviet school system, which were due to the deep and constant attention which Soviet society paid to the upbringing of the younger generation. Although he found much political propaganda at schools, Dewey noted the enthusiasm of remarkable Russian men and women, students and teachers, who were ardently convinced of the necessity place of education with a social aim and cooperative methods in securing the purposes of the revolution. After his visit Dewey wrote a series of articles very sympathetic in tone to the USSR, which led to his being described as a «Bolshevik» and a «red» in the conservative press.

It is not by chance that Dewey gave such high evaluation of the school of 1920s. Many specialists consider this period to be the brightest period of Soviet education, as it was a period of a dialogue in educational science and innovative search in education. The «Era of Krupskaya», as this period is sometimes called, may be characterized by the fact that many talented people such as P. Blonsky, A. Kalashnikov, S. Shatsky, A. Pinkevich and others cooperated with N. Krupskaya-at that time the Deputy Chairperson of the People's Commissariat of Education (headed by A. Lunacharsky) on school programs, plans, and textbooks. According to P. Blonsky, under the guidance of Krupskaya «all kinds of public dialogue took place, as did public criticism of various pedagogical positions and undertakings» (Blonski, 1971, p. 174).

During Dewey's visit to Russia he met Krupskaya and had fruitful discussions with her on the problem of the labor school. Krupskaya knew the works of Dewey well and in her book *Narodnaje Obrazovaniye i Demokratija* (Popular Education and Democracy) she analyzed the theory and practice of education from a historical perspective. Dewey's school of activity appealed to Krupskaya, as she also thought that schoolwork should be inseparably connected with science and culture. The Soviet educator B. Komarovsky published in the 1920s two books devoted to the analysis of J. Dewey's ideas. Komarovsky called Dewey a prominent researcher in the fields of logics and epistemology, pedagogy and psychology, ethics and social philosophy (Komarovski, 1926, p. 8). M. Bernstein named Dewey as the best American educator and «the best of the best Americans» A. Lunacharsky gave Dewey the title of «one of the greatest educators of our century» (Lunacharski, 1976, p. 470).

The innovation movement in Soviet education at that time reflected the American influence. M. Pistrak, a member of the State Academic Council, confessed in the pedagogical discussion of 1928 that the Russians adapted the Dalton System from Western Europe and America and tried to apply it, but

not very successfully. Russian pedagogues as P. P. Blonsky, S. T. Shatsky, and A. Zelenko and other Soviet educators in the 1920s tried to learn about experiences in American high and secondary schools (M. S. Bernstein, G. F. Svadkovsky), some visited the United States and thought that it was the main educational laboratory at that time (Bernstein, 1930, p. 4).

Soviet educators actively used the testing and project methods. But in the late 1930s Stalin's command-administrative directives and later in 1940-s «the iron curtain» blocked close cooperation between Soviet and American educators. Any signs of the American way of life were to be condemned and abolished. In 1932 the Dalton System in Soviet Russia was abolished by a special statement of VKP (B). The official reasons for this were the low role of the pedagogue and the disregard for the individual capacities of pupils. But the real aims of Stalin's policy were to make Soviet school a part of a command-administrative system, and make the pupil a small screw in the state machine. The fear caused by the statement prohibiting the Dalton System and other American methods lasted for a long time and is even nowadays a blocking factor today to educational reform in Russian high and secondary schools. The complex programs that were elaborated by the members of the scientific-pedagogical section of the State Academic Council may be considered to be an example to combine Marxist principles with progressive educational ideas. The subject matter in the program was organized in three columns: nature, labor, and society. All the teaching was based on «integral instruction» through themes and not on regular discipline. The programs were to be filled with regional materials, corresponding to the vital needs of the environment in which the child lived.

The influence of Dewey's ideas is clearly observed in the complex programs. The Soviet educators were looking for a new school that could focus its attention on the children, their interests, and their inclination for action. The educators thought that the programs should reflect the growing complexity of children's lives and their personalities. The new programs were aimed at getting children acquainted with something essential for their present life and future. The implementation of the ideas embodied in complex programs proved to be not so good in practice as it seemed in theory. First, the programs were applied universally, to all schools in the Soviet Union. This was problematic for such a vast country where schools differed greatly in material resources and facilities. Second, the teachers were not prepared for the creative implementation of the ideas. Sometimes the task of linking the program with the local needs of the school and its surroundings led to frivolous things; some pupils devoted much time to such complex themes as «The Duck», «The Birch Tree», and so on. These links seemed to be very artificial. The authors of the new programs did their best to improve the complex programs until the 1930s. At that time all the school

experiments were ended by the authoritarian regime of Stalin. In hindsight, we can see that the ideas that informed the complex programs were not accompanied by the necessary means of implementation, trying to give new content to their schools, but having no forms in which to stack and organize it. Sometimes complex programs were simply ignored by the teaching staff, or simplified to such an extent that the essence of the complex method was completely lost.

The project method, originated by Dewey's pupil W. Kilpatrick, was also introduced in the Russian school of the 1920s. Being a modification of Dewey's problem method, it was adapted to the Soviet system with the aim of realizing the principle of education in the collective - the main principle of Soviet school of that time. Soviet educators made an attempt to compile new textbooks for schools practicing the project method. Soon the method was established to such an extent that it led to the neglect of scientific knowledge, reading, writing, and arithmetic skills. These extremes were most characteristic in the educational practice of the Lefts (V. N. Shulgin, A.V.Shapiro and V. M.Pozner).

It is remarkable that Dewey's ideas were adopted both in pre- and post revolutionary Russia. The Revolution marked a decisive change in the outlook of Russian educators with regard to the role of the school in the transformation of society. Dewey's ideas happened to be fit first, because they stressed on the continuity between school and society, on the intrinsic relationship between learning and work, and on the cooperative attitude (Dewey, 1984, p. 235).

The ban of pedagogy in 1936 and its liquidation as a humanistic discipline by the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Party paralyzed the development of all sciences dealing with childhood and stopped a very serious experiment in education. Stalin's command-administrative system was strengthening step by step. It is worth mentioning that later in his autobiography Dewey wrote that the reports that came to him after the high-pressure five year plan was put into effect of the increasing regimentation of the schools and of their use as tools for limited ends were a great disappointment to him.

The process of de-Deweyization in Russia started with the elimination of encyclopedia articles on Dewey in the period of the late 1930s-1950s and also with the criticism of progressive experimentation in the schools. During the Cold War Dewey was labeled in Russia as «the wicked enemy of all the freedom loving peoples on our earth» and in the 1950s all the articles and books written about him belittled his educational contribution and stressed his misguided social and political orientation. His pragmatic philosophy was criticized too. The publications of Soviet researchers on Dewey in the 1960s and 1970s were in the same tone. Only in the late 1980s and early 1990s was there a shift in the perception of John Dewey's philosophy of education in Russia, that brought a sort of revival

of interest to the ideas of American reformer, this time in connection with the category of experience, active learning, dialogue-oriented pedagogy, cooperative and interactive methods of teaching and idea of inter-subjectivity. Trying to find a democratic model of school Russian Educators turned to historical legacy of progressive educators in Russia and abroad. They could already read *Democracy and Education* in Russian. Dewey's ideas served as an instrument in the change of society. In the articles, monographs on John Dewey written by B. Vulfson, B. Bim-Bad, V. Malinin, Y. Rogacheva, G. Kornetov, L. Valeeva and others Dewey's democratic concept of school and his educational philosophy have become the focus of attention as the compass to democratic changes at school. Researchers tried to write on different aspects of his educational theory and practice⁴. The myth created in Stalin time about Dewey as «the enemy of all progressive mankind» was crushed in Russia in 1990's by the efforts of many researchers. Publications of the translated books of American scholar in the last two decades gave the possibility for Russian readers to see the texts of Dewey instead of many stereotypic interpretations of his ideas.

According to the French historian L. Fevre, «the only lesson of history is precisely that it offers no lessons». This is true, but at the same time the historical material can be very effective in solving contemporary problems not by giving ready answers, but by searching for unused ways and conditions of successful implementation into practice of this or that idea.

For about 30 years educational writings of J. Dewey served as my intellectual background as I attempted to reconstruct the pragmatic paradigm

⁴ Малинин, В.И. Джон Дьюи в оценке прогрессивной русской педагогики // Советская педагогика. 1976. №6. С. 119; Юлина, Н.С. Философия Джона Дьюи и постмодернистский прагматизм Ричарда Рорти // Философский прагматизм Ричарда Рорти и российский контекст. Отв. ред.. А.В. Рубцов. - М.: «Традиция», 1997. с.172-173; Шемякина И.В. Государство и общество в системе взглядов Джона Дьюи. М, 2003 (диссертация канд. истор. наук) и др. Е.Ю. Рогачева. Педагогика Джона Дьюи в XX веке: кросскультурный контекст, монография-Владимир, 2005; Джон Дьюи: педагогические эксперименты в семье и школе. Монография, Мин-во образования и науки Рос. Федерации, Федер.гос.бюджетное образов. Учр. Высш. Проф. Образования «Владим. гос.ун-т им. А.Г. и Н.Г. Столетовых»-Владимир:Транзит-ИКС, 2015 г.; Г.Б.Корнетов, А.А.Романов, А.И.Салов Педагогика первой трети XX века (G.B.Kornetov,A.A.Romanov, A.I.Salov The Pedagogy of the First third part of the XXth Century), edited by G.B.Kornetov, АСОУ, 2012; Кванг-Те-Ким Теория рефлексивного мышления Джона Дьюи и философия образования С-Петербург., 1996 (дисс. канд. фил. наук); Валеева, Лилия Агзамовна Дидактическая система Джона Дьюи: : становление и реализация в педагогической практике. Монография/Л.А.Валеева –Казань: ТГГПУ, 2008, «Становление и реализация дидактической системы Джона Дьюи», Казань, 2008 (диссертация канд.пед.наук), Белоцветова Е.М. Политическая философия Джона Дьюи и проблемы формирования гражданского общества (диссертация канд.политических наук), Москва, 2011 г.

in education, to question the «identity» of this paradigm and to trace its influence on the development of educational theory and practice in Russia and other parts of the world. According to J. Lovinger: «Scientists are similar to lovers: they find tokens of their beloved everywhere». While studying the process of reception of Dewey's pedagogy in Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Turkey, Japan, China and Latin America⁵ it became clear that only in a cross-cultural dialogue one could grasp the resemblances and differences of innovative educational developments caused by new pedagogy of activity and Dewey's democratic model of school. More to it, understanding that the notion «influence» lost, to a great extent, its explanatory power as a tool in intellectual history of ideas strengthened. In such complex issues like educational transfer we deal with the process of reception the ideas within a specific cultural context and they interact with existing traditions, ideas, and practices. So, the specific context is of decisive influence on the way in which these ideas and practices are taken up, digested, translated, transformed and eventually made into something new.

As Quentin Skinner points out, there are three conditions that must be met in order to conclude that the appearance of a given set of ideas in a text may be explained by their appearance in the text of an earlier writer. First of all there must be a genuine similarity. Further, it must be the case that the ideas in the later text could not be found in the work of any other writer but the one said to have influence. And, finally the probability of the similarity being random should be very low. So, I agree with the positions of some other Deweyan scholars (Biesta & Miedema, 2000, pp. 33-34; Bretony, 1997, pp. 428-429) that only taking into consideration a specific cultural context it becomes possible to explain why, for example, despite the manifest influence of Dewey on the thought of prominent educationalists in many countries this did not result in any tangible influence on educational practice, or why while Dewey's ideas were not only well-known but appear to have been integrated into existing traditions, there were other factors, unrelated to the quality or significance of Dewey's ideas, that exerted a decisive influence on the eventual course of events.

Dewey's philosophy of education and his experimental practice had to pass national filters. The «Russian Dewey», the «English Dewey», the «Turkish Dewey» or the «Japanese Dewey» were just cultural interpretations of Dewey's

⁵ Рогачева, Е.Ю. Педагогика Джона Дьюи в XX веке: кросс-культурный контекст [Текст] / Е.Ю.Рогачева. – Владимир, 2005. – 333 с. ISBN 5-87846-461-6. (Rogacheva Y. John Dewey's Pedagogy in the XXth Century: cross-cultural context. - Vladimir, 2005; Джон Дьюи: педагогические эксперименты в семье и школе. Монография, Мин-во образования и науки Рос. Федерации, Федер. гос. бюджетное образов. Учр. Высш. Проф. Образования «Владим. гос. ун-т им. А.Г. и Н.Г. Столетовых» - Владимир: Транзит-ИКС, 2015 г. John Dewey: Educational experiments in the family and at school. – monograph, Vladimir: Transit-IKS, 2015

ideas and practices. In any country – Britain, Russia, Turkey, Latin America or Japan, the cultural canvass every time would correct the model sample digesting and interpreting. In some countries they were used as a means in modernization of the state, in some – to stimulate educational discourse in school reform. In any case, it is hard to deny that Dewey's reputation as a world famous pedagogue and thinker was observed in many countries.

References

- Addams, J. (1981). *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. New York: A signet Classic.
- Bernstein, M.S. (1930). *Po Pedagogicheskoi Amerike*. Moscow.
- Biesta, G., & Miedema, S. (2000). Context and Interaction. How to Assess Dewey's Influence on Educational Reform in Europe? In Oelkers, J., & Rhyn, H., *Dewey and European Education. General Problems and Case Studies* (pp. 21-37). From Studies in Philosophy and Education 19.
- Biesta, G., & Miedema, S. (1996). Dewey in Europe: A Case Study on the International Dimensions of the Turn-of-the-Century Educational Reform. *American Journal of Education*, 105(1), 1-26.
- Blonski, P. (1971). *Moi Vospominaniya*. Moscow.
- Bretony, K. J. (1997) .«Undeniable» and «Disastrous» Influence? Dewey and English Education (1895-1939). *Oxford Review*, 23.
- Brickman, W.W. (1949). John Dewey's Foreign Reputation as an Educator. *School and Society*, 70(October 22).
- Brickman, W. (1964). *John Dewey's Impressions of Soviet Russia and the Revolutionary World: Mexico-China-Turkey, 1929*. New York: Teacher's college press.
- Büyükdüvenci, S. (1995). John Dewey's Impact on Turkish Education. In Garrison, J. (Ed.), *The New Scholarship on Dewey*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Carr, W., & Hartner, A. (1996). *Education and the Struggle for Democracy*. Open University Press.
- Darling, J., & Nisbet., J. (2000). *J. Dewey in Britain / Dewey and European Education, General Problems and Case Studies*. Ed. by Jurgen Oelkers & Heinz Rhyn, reprinted from Studies in Philosophy of Education, vol.19, Nov.1-2, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Delledalle. G. (1954). *Histoire de la philosophie americaine*. Paris.
- Dewey and European Education. General Problems and case studies* (2000), ed. By Jurgen Oelkers and Hein Rhyn, reprinted from Studies in Philosophy of Education. Vol. 19, Nov.1-2, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and Education. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. London: The Free Press, New York Collier-Macmillan Limited, First Free Press paperback Edition.
- Dewey, J. (1899). *Interest in Relation to Training of the Will in John Dewey: The Early Works, 1882-1898*, vol. 5. Edited by Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972.
- Dewey, J. (1928). Impressions of Soviet Russia. In Boydston, J. A. (Ed.), *John Dewey: The later works, 1925-1953*, vol. 3. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University press, 1984.
- Dewey, J. (1924). Foreign Schools in Turkey. In Boydston, J. A. (Ed.), *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1899-1924*, vol. 15. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.
- Dewey, J. (1939) Report and Recommendation upon Turkish Education. In Boydston, J. A. (Ed.), *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1899-1924*, vol. 15. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.
- Dewey, J. (1900). *School and Society. The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dykhuizen, G. (1973). *The Life and Mind of John Dewey*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Julina, N. (1977). *Filosofija D.Džui I postmodernistijskij pragmatism R.Rorti // Filosofskij pragmatism Richarda Rorti i rossijskij kontekst*. M.: Tradizija.
- Howlett, C.F. (1977). *Troubled Philosopher: John Dewey and the Struggle for World Peace*. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press.
- Kendo., N. (1962). *The History and Present Status of the John Dewey Society*. Tokyo.
- Kobayashi, V. (1940). Collected lectures of Professor Naruse. In *John Dewey in Japanese Educational Thought*. University of Michigan Press.
- Kobayashi., V. (1962). *John Dewey in Japanese Educational Thought*. University of Michigan Press.
- Komarovski., B. (1926). *Pedagogika Džui (Dewey's Pedagogy)*. Ch.1. Filosofskije predposilki, Baku.
- Kilpatrick, W. (1989). Dewey's Influence on Education. In Shlipp, P.A., & Hahn, L.E. (Eds.), *The Philosophy of John Dewey*. Illinois: LaSalle.
- Lunacharski, A.V. (1976). *O Vospitanii I obrazovanii* [On Upbringing and Education]. Moscow.
- McKenzi. (1975). Introduction towards Unity of Thought and Action. In *John Dewey. Early Works*. New York.

- Ou Tsui-Chen. (1961). A Re-evaluation of the Educational Theory of John Dewey. *Educational Forum*, 25, March, 277.
- Passow, A.H. (1982). *John Dewey's Influence on Education around the World*. N.Y.: Columbia University Record.
- Schneider, H. (2000). *John Dewey in France. Studies in philosophy of education*, 19. Kluwer academic publishers.
- Scotland, J. (1969). *The History of Scottish Education*, vol.2. University of London Press.
- Sidorsky, D. (1977). *John Dewey. The Essential Writings*. New York: Harpe & Row.
- Rogacheva, Y. (2015). *Djon Djui: Pedagogicheskiye eksperimenti v semje i shkole*. Vladimir: Transit-IKS.
- Ryan, A. (1995). *John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism*. New York/London: Norton.
- Vaughan, M.K. (1982). *Action Pedagogy in Mexico in the 1920s in State, Education and Social Class in Mexico. 1880-1928*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.