ACTION FOR DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION

George H. Wood
Ohio University

A subtle, yet noticeable, shift is occurring in recent debates over the reform of public schooling. In response to the reform reports of 1983 which stressed the need for schools to prepare workers, more recent reports have instead focused upon the preparation of citizens--in particular, the preparation of democratic citizens.[1]

This new wave of proposals echoes a traditional resistance against the scientific management ethos of the early 1900s. Then, as now, proposals for school reform emphasized the preparation of workers in order to generate industrial power. The emphasis was on more efficient use of resources--more hours, group drill, tracking, testing, and the like. As a direct result of these reforms, centralized, bureaucratic, and anti-democratic administrative structures were put in place.[2]

Opposition to earlier reform proposals arose from a variety of fronts. Margaret Haley, head of the Chicago Federation of Teachers, argued in 1924 that the factory was an inadequate metaphor for education, "the factory system carried into the public school . . . needs only the closing time whistle to make complete its identification with the great industrial plants."[3] Ella Flagg Young, Chicago Superintendent of Schools, saw in 1916 "a tendency toward factory-evolution and factory-management, and the teachers, like children who stand at machines, are told what to do. The teachers, instead of being a great moving force, educating and developing the powers of the human mind in such a way that they shall contribute to the power and efficiency of this democracy, tend to become mere workers on the treadmill. . . ."[4] Perhaps the most articulate and well known of the critics of scientific management was John Dewey.

The University of Iowa Libraries

More than anyone else, Dewey made it clear that the fundamental obligation of public schooling was to prepare citizens who could function democratically.[5] It was this central concern with the democratic obligation of public schooling that led Dewey, Young, and Haley to propose alternatives which included broader teacher autonomy, experiential learning, and the elimination of standardized testing, curricula, and teaching.

Now, as then, reforms such as these are in conflict with officially sanctioned reform agendas. The current federal administration defines appropriate reform as synonymous with tougher standards, merit pay, more days and hours, and more centralized control. In states, reform agendas focus on mandated curricula and competency testing, for teachers and students. In both cases, the agenda calls for excellence, loosely defined as more rapid consumption of subject matter.

However, reforms which take as their basis the development of democratic citizens have also gained a widening audience. There are multiple reasons for this trend. It has become obvious that the official reform positions propose add-ons rather than changes--increased time, control, and testing. None offer anything new. Teachers realize this and are less than enthusiastic about proposals which limit their control over their work and yet increase their responsibility for its outcome.

In response to these concerns, a wide range of democratic alternatives have been proposed for public schooling. Each of these reforms is centrally concerned with education for democratic empowerment. They focus on how schools can contribute to children gaining the intellectual and psychological wherewithall to remake the social order in ways that meet their collective needs. Further, these democratic alternatives address the conditions needed for empowering teachers as well. The reports and reforms calling for democratic empowerment

include calls for decentralized decision-making, emphasis on issues of equity, experiental curricula and pedagogy, and the involvement of a broader range of actors in educational decision-making.

The call is for schools to become communities of democratic empowerment. Central to this concept is the goal of developing in students and their teachers the academic skills, self-esteem, and sense of commitment necessary to live democratic lives. What is now needed are teachers and schools which are exemplars of democratic teaching practices who can teach others how to promote schools as democratic communities.

This essay attempts to set forth principles of democratic life and identify teaching practices which support those principles. It is not my intention to present models to be replicated. Rather, the paper aims to reveal that action for democratic education is possible and that democratic reforms have practical application. It is, perhaps even more centrally, an attempt to "recover" John Dewey's fundamental notion that we only learn democracy by experiencing it and the schools can be a site of such experiences.

Moral Principles and Action Guides

In a previous piece, Landon Beyer and I argued that there are moral principles which transcend social classes and can thus provide a basis on which to construct a normative framework for social life and, consequently, for schooling.[6] We suggest that equality, autonomy, and democracy make up the central moral principles which should guide educational action.

By equality, we do not mean equality in the limited sense of equal opportunity. As William Ryan has pointed out, such notions of equality are usually apologetics for inequality. Equal opportunity, not taking into consideration prior conditions, offers only open access to social goods such as education and employment. What this means is that those individuals and groups who arrive at

The University of Iowa Libraries

the schoolhouse or workplace door with few prior resources (training, prior experience, adequate housing, or nutrition) have few prospects of successfully utilizing these available social goods. In this way, equal opportunity serves to legitimate the maintenance of unequal outcomes.[7]

Opposed to this is a notion of equal access to social goods. If equality is to have any genuine meaning, social support systems enabling individuals to utilize social goods must exist. This means moving beyond the passive act of opening up access to a proactive stance of creating conditions enabling all to utilize such access. For example, in health care such equal access requires going beyond eliminating discrimination by race in terms of hospital admittance to providing the resources to enable anyone who needs hospital care to receive it. Agencies such as fire departments or public libraries (especially those with literacy programs) are examples of equal access institutions.

By autonomy, we do not mean merely freedom from restraint or negative freedom. Fundamental to the notion of negative freedom is the ideal of the completely isolated individual acting on his or her wants without respect to the needs of others. Such a notion of freedom breaks apart community rather than building it. Opposed to this is the notion of the freedom to do, or positive freedom. The obligation here is for the social order to facilitate the making of free choices within a sense of communal cooperation and growth. An example of positive freedom, or freedom to do, would be the abolition of slavery. While it does restrain (or limit the negative freedom of) the slave-holder, it enables the former slave to act in ways previously unavailable to him/her.

By democracy, we mean the expansion of public participation into broader arenas of social decision-making. This sense of democracy, most clearly developed in the work of Carole Pateman and Benjamin Barber, projects democratic action as the empowerment of the public to make political, social, and economic

decisions.[8] It is not enough to rely upon intricate schemes of representation which remove the public from active involvement. Rather, the notion is to engage the community in direct decision-making whenever and wherever possible. Doing this both increases the range of possible social choices as well as engendering the attitudes and dispositions necessary for public participation. Put simply, the more people participate, the more they are willing and able to participate in the future. Examples of such direct democracy schemes are New England town meetings and various worker-owned industries.[9]

We invoked three criteria in identifying these as central moral principles: first, that such principles must arise from ongoing moral discourse without relation to class or status; second, that these principles must be consistent with the plurality of American society including recent cultural history as well as more traditional documents like the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, all a continuation of the Enlightenment tradition in Western thought; third, that principles promote what Habermas has called the "emancipatory" human interest. Habermas claims that the basic human project since the Enlightenment has been emancipation from "ideologically frozen relations of dependence."[10] This means a continued effort to free individuals and cultures from the limitations of myth, mysticism, class, or any other historical force working to limit the range of human potential. It also requires a continued expansion and promulgation of moral principles which are necessary to such emancipation. Equality, autonomy, and democracy are three moral principles which meet each condition.

Additionally, each of these three moral principles provides a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for the realization of the others. Is it possible to conceive of truly autonomous individuals who would be free from coercion if they did not each have equal access to economic, political, and

cultural resources? Is autonomous human judgment meaningful in any context short of one in which democracy is practiced? Is democracy genuinely participatory if citizens do not function in an autonomous and equal manner? Does equality for equality's sake have any meaning or is it understood best as a means to self-determination? Is equality possible under any social structure which does not value autonomous participatory political action? The inter-relatedness of the moral principles of equality, democracy, and autonomy is demonstrated by the negative answer each of these queries call forth.

Perhaps the most fundamental of these principles is democracy, a lived social practice requiring and facilitating human autonomy and equality. As Benjamin Barber has put it, "In strong democratic politics, participation is a way of defining the self, just as citizenship is a way of living."[11] Democracy thus gives meaning to autonomy and equality in a political and social sense, based on spheres of autonomous, equal action. Additionally, it binds together potentially fragmented individuals and publics through its demands for collective community and human interdependence.

How can these moral principles be utilized to guide educational action? In particular, can these principles be operationalized in ways that will both guide teaching practice and be useful in evaluating curricular or pedagogical schemes? What follows is a list of what Beyer and I refer to as moral action guides. These guides move our more universal moral principles of equality, autonomy, and democracy into curricular, pedagogical, and organizational recommendations.[12]

Equal access to knowledge: Primary to all the action-guides is the requirement of universal access to school knowledge. Thus, any curriculum designed to deliver knowledge on the basis of class, sex, or race, is explicitly rejected. This does not merely mean that every child is to be exposed to the same lectures, tests, drills, etc. Rather, support mechanisms need to be

created which enable students to enjoy engagement with all forms of knowledge in the classroom. Only by so doing can they begin to approximate our goal of equal access. Moreover, both democracy and autonomy require a foundation upon which individuals have the access to knowledge about the personal and political circumstances governing their lives.

In practice, this means that all forms of tracking are rejected. As Oakes has shown, such practices yield no positive results and function primarily to perpetuate inequality. Further, in an argument similar to the one being made here, she argues that tracking is prima facia unconstitutional.[13] Additionally, questions should be raised about the drastic increase in "pull-out" programs for an array of students labeled as everything from "learning disabled" to "gifted." New approaches need to be incorporated in classrooms where learning proceeds in a cooperative, noncompetitive, and nondiscriminatory way.[14]

Images of human equality: Much of what we now teach seems designed to celebrate human inequality, although attempts have been made to eliminate sexual, racial, and cultural stereotypes from curricular materials. However, each of these steps has aimed to create equality of opportunity rather than access. If the curriculum is to play a truly democratic role, then the images it generates must project equal rights and the ability to acquire them.

This means that a basic part of the curriculum should be devoted to dispelling the notion of equal opportunity as the limit of equality. Successful examples of equal access, in this country and outside of it, are available. Indeed, the school itself should be a place of equal access--where students and staff are entitled to share in every program and resource. This would involve vastly improved support systems which involve all without stigma or permanent segregation.

Critical consciousness: Schooling is too often interpreted as a laundry list of givens, facts to be memorized and restated. A democratic curriculum should focus on the nurturing of the "why" question in children. Students should be encouraged to try and make sense of the world. Asking "why" challenges all which went before, raises questions about the very essence of our actions. The curriculum must be designed to nurture such questions, continually focusing on the rationale for our social relations.

Self-reflectivity: As a complement to critical consciousness, democratic curricula must foster self-reflectivity. For the notion of human action suggested in this paper, reflective practice is central. We are, argues Habermas, essentially reflective beings. Yet this reflectivity is too often abandoned to a technocratic rationality where decisions are based solely upon what "works" as opposed to what is "right."[15] Assumptions such as these should be challenged and the primacy of human reflection restored. Reflection upon the human condition, one's own condition, and the consciousness of the age should be encouraged. Without such understanding, it is impossible to act in democratic ways.

Creativity: A democratic curriculum has to abandon the logic of right and wrong in favor of creative problem-solving. If we claim to assist children in becoming equal, autonomous, democratic decision-makers, we must realize, as Dewey did nearly a century ago, that the very problems they will face, and the answers to them, may not even be on the horizon.[16] To attempt to teach students frozen bits of knowledge with which to resolve as yet unidentified problems defies reason. What young people need is the nurturing of creative power.

Cultural acceptance: A democratic culture demands cultural tolerance and acceptance. Curricula for such a culture needs to locate culture, both "high"

and "popular," within shared social experience. It needs to ask when culture reinforces dominate/subordinate social relations and when it genuinely serves to further a vision of human fulfillment. How do we help children produce a culture rather than consume one? How do they come to understand choice over manipulation? These are questions without easy answers, but the attempt to solve them helps students to combat, for example, television's fabricated reality with lives of their own.

Moral responsibility: Are we obligated to one another or merely to ourselves? A technocratic, individualistic curriculum tends to locate its commitments in the latter. We are locked into a structure which leads us to believe that acting only in our own interests is the key to our freedom. In fact, we enslave ourselves to larger social forces by freeing ourselves of obligation to our neighbors. Democratic schooling needs to focus on a sense of shared social responsibility.

Recently, Benjamin Barber has made this case in contrasting the celluloid, Hollywood vision of America with the more realistic, communal history we share. As he puts it:

> What have we dreamed for ourselves and our children and our neighbors? To be a land open to private dreams, America must itself be a public dream. And what is this dream made of? Democracy, precarious in the few places where it has taken root, unknown to most of the world; racial and sexual and economic justice, mocked by most systems, aspired to but hardly achieved in ours; mutualism, that is defining our power and dignity as individuals by what we do together; citizenship, through which women and men dare to transcend themselves and become neighbors, and shapers of a common destiny.[17]

Political empowerment: This is a three-part action-guide. First, it means that the school should be designed to give students an experience with self-governance and nurture a belief that such action is both possible and useful. Second, the curriculum should be organized in a manner that would increase every child's stock of cultural capital. That is, the knowledge that students are

members of a vital and worthwhile cultural tradition and as such have a right to act politically. Third, alternatives to current social practices must be offered in order to demonstrate the possibly meaningful results of democratic action.

While all three of these empowering structures have been more extensively discussed in a previous piece, it is worth restating the rationale for these structures again.[18] Preparing individuals who will act democratically, out of sense of equality and autonomy, requires a perception of the self as a political actor. Developing such a self-perception originates in experiences in self-governance and in the presence of strong sense of cultural history and social options.

Theory into Practice

Through the Institute for Democratic Education (IDE) at Ohio University's College of Education, practical applications of these action guides have proceeded in a variety of programs.[19] The Institute was organized in response to requests by teachers committed to democractic education. They were teachers who believed that schooling for democratic citizenship had been lost in a blizzard of tests, objectives, and textbooks. In these ways, the Institute can be seen as an attempt to recover the 'practical' side of Dewey. That is, to take Dewey (and others) seriously enough to commit his theory to practice.

The intent of IDE is to aid teachers, administrators, parents, and students in making education more democratic. This has involved workshops on democratic alternatives in education, a curriculum library of resources for democratic pedagogy, meetings on topics pertaining to democratic education, a newsletter, and other publications. In each case, the goal has been to put the previously outlined action-guides into practice.

The summer workshops on democratic alternatives have been the most exciting of these projects. Teachers, administrators, parents, school board members, and university faculty gather for two weeks and several follow-up sessions (without pay or university credit) to work on pedagogy, curriculum, and educational policy for democratic empowerment. At this time, ideas generated from this work are being implemented in schools throughout southeastern Ohio.

In the range and depth of these projects, all eight of the action-guides are visible. For example, ability-grouping in a middle school is being eliminated. High school students have undertaken community action projects such as fasts for African famine and utilize alternative sources in American and world history classes. Additionally, a project using Appalachian culture and cultural history as subject matter in English and social studies classes has been proposed.[20]

In elementary classrooms attention has focused on discipline, reading, and integrated day teaching. Two projects on discipline emphasize conflict resolution through student rather than teacher intervention. Additionally, teachers are working to give more control over classroom activities to students in order to promote a more collaborative classroom.

With reading, teachers expand student control of the written word by encouraging them to read their own writing, set their own words for study, and experience reading as a wholistic rather than fragmented enterprise. Additionally, projects to engage parents and the community in reading are being undertaken. In the same spirit, work with British Integrated Day, a method focusing on teaching all subjects through a unified theme, is being carried out.

Administratively, giving students, parents, and teachers more control over the processes of schooling are surfacing. There are attempts to expand teacher control over the curriculum, to create parent planning committees, and student

self-government. In one case this has allowed teachers and parents to select new teachers. In what follows, examples of each of these projects are used to illustrate the moral action-guides in practice.

Equal access to knowledge: Nowhere is grouping or tracking perhaps more insidious than in the elementary classroom. This is where patterns are set for future success in schools, class lines are drawn, and the inegalitarian nature of schooling is most clearly demonstrated. Much of this grouping occurs in heterogeneous classes and occurs for reasons other than ability.

Some of the teacher projects have focused on eliminating grouping in the earlier grades. Reading groups, if they are used at all, are formed by student interest. Peer-teaching practices benefit both the student instructor and learner. (As one participant put it, "I try to look at my classroom as 25 teachers, each with strengths and interests to share.") The strategy is to avoid the labeling of students finding ways for every student to succeed in instructing his/her peers.[21]

Images of human equality: Southeastern Ohio is an area with a rich cultural history. It was a stop on the Underground Railroad and a safe haven for Indians being run out of the Eastern United States. Much of this history has been lost (or stolen) and, as in most of the country, considerable racist sentiment abounds. Several middle-grade teachers have decided to work directly against these attitudes through the study of local cultural history. Local residents share with students stories of Indian contributions. The abolitionist spirit is revived and current treatment of blacks in the area informs the discussions. The agenda in these classrooms considers common roots as opposed to current differences.

Critical consciousness: Breaking reliance on the textbook represents one area for the cultivation of critical consciousness. In one high school social

studies class, students are first exposed to the textbook version of an event. Then they are challenged as to what they really know by virtue of this account: Who wrote the account? Why? Is he/she trustworthy? Could he/she be wrong? Students are then encouraged to pursue any area in which they are interested through reading additional accounts of the same event. After this reading, the same questions emerge but with the addition of a critical edge: Why are the accounts different?

The intent is that students learn that history is interpretation, not merely narrative truth. They learn to make choices among competing accounts and to question the reporter. Most importantly, they learn that the written word is not a truth that controls them but rather a version of reality competing for their loyalties.

Self-reflectivity: Many disciplinary techniques are directed toward the imposition of standards, norms, and rules. Students are confronted with classrooms where their only choices are obedience or punishment. The teacher decides what works and goes about finding ways to enforce it.

Opposed to this, several elementary teachers in the projects are using more humane, student-centered classroom atmosphere approaches. These teachers have students collectively decide how they would like to be treated and how they want to treat one another. Students examine the potential outcomes of each such idea and consider their own willingness to engage in such a practice. The goal here is that students reflect on what they want to be and what the shared space of the classroom can become.

Creativity: Enter most elementary school classrooms and you will be confronted by the artwork of Disney studios. Or perhaps you will see twenty-five identical cut and color projects. The creative moment is lost to the standards of the teacher or curriculum package.

As an alternative to this arrangement, several first-grade and kindergarten teachers turned their rooms over to their students. In one room, students were confronted with materials and encouraged to decorate the room. Other teachers allow only student-prepared work to grace their classroom walls. These rooms provide a visual feast. More importantly, children take pride in these places. They have created them and believe in their own ability to create.

Cultural acceptance: This is an area where very little work is being done by IDE participants. There is concern with the cultural regulation in the form of television and the corporate control of music. In response to the concerns with music in particular, one teacher is working with children expanding and creating their own folk songs. Other teachers are looking at ways to revive traditional music along side of pop or rock music. As yet, these are not systematic strategies.

Moral responsibility: Schools seem to thrive on competition over grades, prizes, trophies, and other rewards. Rather than encourage team spirit, competition more frequently fragments and encourages self-centered, unconnected individuals.

Cooperative learning and play is an alternative to competition. Teachers in the middle grades build classroom cooperation through projects relying upon group products. Teachers often involve entire classes in the production of books, plays, art work--to be shared with the larger community. Similar activities occur in lower grades as whole classes make books for the classroom or for younger students. In each case, the focus is upon the dependence of the group on each individual and the individual's need for the collective process.

Political endowment: Pieces of this moral action-guide can be found in action in each of the others. Students work to govern themselves in classrooms through collaborative rule-setting and classroom organization. The cultural

capital of each child is increased through the study of local history and culture. Social alternatives are found in competing accounts of history and cooperative classroom activities. All of these practices aim to nurture political efficacy and encourage children to believe in themselves and their collective power.

Reading as an Example

Much more could be said about each of these practices. By focusing on the teaching of reading, on which most Institute participants have been active, a feel for how all of these tie together can be gained. Southeastern Ohio is located in the northern part of the Appalachian region. Unemployment and poverty rates are high, natural beauty and ethnic diversity abound, and illiteracy and political powerlessness go hand-in-hand. IDE teachers want to help children own words, rather than being owned by them.

This concern has brought about an extended project in alternative reading methods. At the elementary level, the project encourages a variety of strategies, including whole-book approaches and writing books to read. In the middle grades, reading webs form the means by which students choose topics and books, and gather them for class use and project ideas. At the high school level, the right of individuals to read is accented, and the political ramifications of this right (censorship, access to information, political participation) become a focus.

This brief sampling hints at how pedagogy and curriculum interact with autonomy, equality, and democracy through the moral action-guides. Pedagogical practices stress equal access to reading, creative approaches to the production of words, ownership of the ability to read and write, and a consciousness of what it is to know by virtue of reading. The curriculum embraces student interest, cultural differences, human equality, and social alternatives. In

fact, curriculum and pedagogy are not separable within practices that work to empower children to use words in building the mutuality necessary for communities of self-governance.[22]

Conclusion

There is, in this space, no way to do justice to attempts by teachers to put democratic education into practice. All that is offered is a sampling of the ways in which real teachers with real students are working toward schooling practices that embrace autonomy, equality, and democracy. The belief behind all of these practices is that the primary purpose of American public education should be to help students to live democratically.

Any of these practices have limitations. For some, they will be too radical; for others, not radical enough. They all fall short of being perfect exemplars of education for equality, autonomy, and democracy. Of course, there are also those who will dispute that these three are indeed central moral principles in our society. There is no adequate response to any of these claims that can be developed within the confines of this paper.[23]

What is important are the possibilities held out by such practices. Foremost among these is the reconstruction of the civic essence of public schooling. Recent educational debates have focused on vocational aspects of schooling. Thus, demands are made for more testing, recitation, and drill--all anti-democratic in nature. They point to technological failures, unemployment, and youth problems and generate limited, instrumentalist approaches to schooling and school administration. Projecting the possible in terms of equality, autonomy, and democracy demands an approach to schooling which celebrates human potential, individuality and community, and focuses on tools for self-government. It is this latter task that the activities of the IDE teachers approximate.

A second possibility demonstrated by these practices is that democratic education is possible. Much of what reformers concerned with the civic tasks of schooling suggest can occur only if schools are drastically reorganized or perhaps abolished.[24] While at some future date reorganization may take place, what teachers need now are ways of coping with the daily demands of schools, while working simultaneously for democratic education. Recently, Eliot Wigginton of the Foxfire program addressed exactly this issue, offering both theory and strategies for democratic action within today's schools.[25] The practices outlined in this essay demonstrate similar possibilities within individual classrooms and entire schools. As such, they do two things: First, they offer hope to individual teachers; second, they are exemplars of democratic practice which demonstrate alternative, realistic approaches to public schooling.

Finally, these practices recreate for teachers the arena so many of them desire. Foremost among the reasons that teachers enter teaching is the desire to work with children. As schooling becomes increasingly bound by demands of test scores and learning objectives, teachers find themselves removed from students preoccupied by learning packages, computers, and workbooks. The practices outlined above work to create a moral community in which the interaction of teachers and students is vital. These practices create classrooms where mutual respect, trust, and communication are central to learning, not mere add-ons to the curriculum. Thus, these classrooms become places where teachers, in one participant's words, are "empowered to do the things that makes teaching, teaching again."

Much is left to be done. Institute teachers are working to expand upon their practices and develop ways to share them more broadly. The moral action-guides each need further expansion and their ramifications for practice made

explicit. Finally, it is time to establish a deliberate research agenda exploring the meaning of schooling for democratic action, its practices, and effects. Most importantly, attention in education needs to be refocused on the civic purposes of schooling, both in public schools and in colleges and schools of education. In these ways we can recover Dewey's essentially democratic pedagogical agenda--teaching for democratic citizenship democratically.

ENDNOTES

*The author would like to thank Paul Bredeson, Penn State University, for his helpful and insightful comments on this manuscript. Additional appreciation is extended to the teachers involved in the Institute for Democratic Education, whose work is a source of constant inspiration.

[1]The first phase of reports includes The National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1983); The National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science, and Technology, Educating Americans for the 21st Century (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1983); Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Action for Excellence (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1983); The Twentieth Century Fund, Making the Grade (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1983). Democratic alternatives to such reports are Public Education Information Network, Equity and Excellence: Toward an Agenda for School Reform (St. Louis: Public Education Information Network, 1985); Mary Ann Raywid, Charles Tesconi, and Donald Warren, Pride and Promise: Schools of Excellence for all the People (Westbury, N.Y.: American Educational Studies Association, 1984); Ann Bastian, et al., Choosing Equality: The Case for Democratic Schooling (New York: The New World Foundation, 1985); Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, Education Under Siege (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey, 1985).

[2]Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962); Arthur Wirth, Productive Work - In Industry and Schools (New York: University Press of America, 1983).

[3]Margaret A. Haley, "The Factory System," The New Republic (November 12, 1924), 19.

[4]Ella Flagg Young, "A Reply," Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA, 1916 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Assocation, 1916), 367.

[5]John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1916).

[6]Landon Beyer and George H. Wood, "Critical Inquiry and Moral Action in Education," Educational Theory 36 (Winter 1986), 1-14.

[7]William Ryan, Equality (New York: Random House, 1981).

[8]Benjamin Barber, Strong Democracy (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1984); Carole Pateman, Participation and Democratic Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

[9]Wirth, Productive Work; Martin Carnoy and Derek Shearer, Economic Democracy (White Plains, N.Y.: M.E. Sharp, 1980).

[10]Jurgen Habermas, Knowledge and Human Interest, trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), 310.

[11]Benjamin Barber, Strong Democracy, 31.

[12]These guides are revised from those previously appearing in Beyer and Wood, "Critical Inquiry."

[13]Jeannie Oakes, Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985).

[14]David W. Johnson and Roger Johnson, Learning Together and Learning Alone: Cooperation, Competition and Individualization (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975).

[15]It is also important to note here that what "works" often does not. As Wirth (Productive Work) has pointed out, many technological decisions are made in the name of vulgar efficiency. They are efficient only in the sense of making a profit but may generate a wide variety of unintended side effects (environmental degradation for example).

[16]John Dewey, The School and Society (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1899).

[17]Benjamin Barber, "Celluloid Vistas: What the President's Dreams Are Made Of," Harpers (July 1985), 75.

[18]George Wood, "Education in a Democracy: Transformation or Reproduction?" Educational Theory, 34 (Summer 1984), 219-239.

[19]More information on the Institute for Democratic Education can be obtained by writing George Wood, Coordinator, Institute for Democratic Education, Ohio University, College of Education, McCracken Hall, Athens, Ohio 45701.

[20]An expanded discussion of using Appalachian cultural materials for political empowerment can be found in George H. Wood, "Education in Appalachia: Power, Powerlessness, and the School Curriculum," The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, forthcoming.

[21]In another exciting recent development, teachers and the administration at the local middle school are working to eliminate the "phasing" system. Phasing is the practice of dividing students into five separate groups for instruction in academic areas by ability level. Institute members are playing a role in changing the practice and the Institute in providing materials to help with the change.

[22]See Barber, Strong Democracy, for an expanded discussion of political talk, mutuality, and community.

[23]See Beyer and Wood, "Practical Philosophy" for extensive responses to these critiques.

[24]See, for example, Herbert Kohl's otherwise excellent work, Basic Skills (New York: Bantam Books, 1982).

[25]Eliot Wigginton, Sometimes A Shining Moment: The Foxfire Experience (New York: Doubleday, 1985).