Article

Ethical Principles and School Challenges: A Deweyan Analysis

Douglas J. Simpson and Donal M. Sacken

Abstract

In this study, we examine Dewey's understanding of ethical principles by identifying a number of his primary emphases, including how he thought principles may be reconstructed and employed in schools. We do this by (a) explicating how he understood the reconstruction of general, universal, and absolute ethical claims; (b) anticipating how some detractors of his view of practical certainty may question its serviceability; and (c) demonstrating how his ideas may be employed to address a problematic high school situation. In addition, we episodically embed in these primary emphases thoughts about how ethical principles play a part in Dewey's more comprehensive ethical theory and illustrate how the principles may be used in specific problematic microsituations.

John Dewey (1859–1952) is a well-known proponent of certain aspects of progressive education, including the idea that students and teachers should be reflective co-inquirers, not just acquirers of information.[1] Among his many other educational ideas are the continuing need to reconstruct school conditions and environments, pedagogical thinking and practice, curricular planning and development, and educational activities and outcomes.[2] In the field of education, however, his ideas of ethical inquiry, thinking, and decision-making are not as widely known as his views of teaching and learning. Moreover, some advocates and critics of his ideas often confuse or blur his ethical deliberations.[3] Since we think his ethical thought is both insightful and useful, our purpose is to clarify one facet of his theory for P–12 educators, teacher educators, and others: the role of ethical principles in making practical decisions in schools. Our thesis is that by understanding his thinking about ethical principles, school personnel will be better prepared to nurture desirable school behavior and address problematic school situations. To this end, we address the question: what did Dewey say about ethical principles that educators and others can profitably use? Our answer falls under three major headings: Reconstruction of Ethical Principles, Practical Doubts about Practical Certainty, and Analysis of a High School Situation. Although we analyze and utilize Dewey's

principles under these separate headings, his views are also represented as integrated and holistic. Of course, Dewey saw a continuity between social and school activities as well as between the utilization of his ideas in the broader society and in schools.[4]

Our study is a philosophical one that focuses on the nature, role, and value of ethical principles as explicated by Dewey. The study involves an analysis of a problematic situation that is an amalgam of several events. The unification of events was employed both to ensure anonymity and to illustrate the applicability of Dewey's thought. The described school scandal involves claims about practices that are usually considered unacceptable methods of helping students perform well on tests. A personnel problem emerges as the testing scandal unfolds. The anonymization of the situation was achieved by employing pseudonyms, creating a composite figure, and placing the events in an amended context. Our examination of the problematic situation is rooted in Dewey's reconstructed ethical principles and embedded in the process and report of the school district's organizational consultant. Before analyzing the testing scandal, however, we explain Dewey's thoughts about reconstructed ethical principles.

Reconstruction of Ethical Principles

To better clarify Dewey's idea of reconstructed ethical principles, they are examined under three headers: General Ethical Claims, Universal Ethical Claims, and Absolute Ethical Claims. Dewey himself often blended these thoughts.

General Ethical Claims

Dewey argued that often people have misunderstood ethical principles, incorrectly depicting them as (a) independent rules to follow; (b) discrete criteria for determining right and wrong behavior; (c) theoretical statements of supreme values; (d) universal standards applicable to everyone, regardless of time and place; and/or (e) unqualified prescriptions and proscriptions for all peoples, places, times, and situations. Dewey rejected these assertions as traditionally understood as he, Williams James (1842–1910), and Charles Peirce (1839–1914) constructed a new philosophy known as pragmatism, instrumentalism, or experimentalism.[5] He reasoned that warranted or well-supported ethical principles, or "empirical generalizations,"[6] are "tool[s] for analyzing" problematic situations.[7] Dewey and Tufts maintained that as tools, they (a) inform ethical thinking and judgment as practical issues are scrutinized; (b) serve as "the final methods" in evaluating potential solutions to ethical problems; and (c) function as hypotheses for further inquiry and testing.[8]

As a naturalist, Dewey concluded that ethical principles are nontranscendental, intellectual instruments that can enhance thinking reflectively about and addressing challenging ethical or practical situations.[9] Warranted principles, therefore, can provide insight into issues so that one's thinking and judgments are enhanced, but they do not single-handedly resolve ethical perplexities.[10] His transformation of the meaning of both universal and absolute principles as customarily

understood further clarifies his views. But, as will be seen below, his reconstruction of their meanings and usefulness did not lead to a simplistic ethical subjectivism, relativism, or contextualism as some assume.[11] In fact, Dewey objected to the conclusion that ethical thinking is reducible to personal whims, cultural traditions, or insulated contexts. He argued, too, that unless people are willing to "surrender to chance, to caprice, to prejudice, they must have some general moral principles by which to guide themselves."[12] The question for him was not whether principles should inform ethical decision-making, but which specific principles should and in what particular ways. His abridged rationale for an interest in ethics and ethical principles was comparable to probing the question, "Why live?"[13]

Universal Ethical Claims

Reading Dewey casually may lead to the conclusion that he opposed any hint of universal or absolute ethical claims.[14] While this misreading is not rare, his viewpoint is decidedly more complex. Unmistakably, Dewey did object to universal ethical principles as traditionally understood: as inflexible rules, divine instructions, and decontextualized assertions.[15] Yet, he also indicated that when so-called universal claims emerge in deliberations, one should not ipso facto dismiss them. Instead, some claims might merit reconstruction and utilization. In school, for example, the axiom "Cheating is wrong and, therefore, forbidden" might be reconstructed into an explanatory statement that assumes a principle of honesty:[16] "Dishonesty can be harmful in a number of ways, including (a) lessening the likelihood of learning worthwhile skills, ideas, attitudes and dispositions; (b) undermining the validity of grades, honors, scholarships and credentials for students, staff and community; and (c) creating doubt about the integrity and credibility of schools for employers and universities." Thus, using the term principle in ethical deliberations rather than the word rule was important to Dewey.[17] He thought the latter word usually conveys the idea of following an inflexible prescription, and the former word denotes the idea of using a flexible instrument to gain insight into a concept or situation. For example, the idea above may be stated thusly: honesty is usually a crucial value in personal, social, institutional, governmental, and international relationships.[18] Honesty, too, is embedded in "the ethical principle upon which [democracy] . . . rests."[19] That is to say, if inquirers are not guided by a desire to find and understand the facts and data regarding an issue, the point of undertaking nearly any form of inquiry is undermined, and a reasoned way of governing and living is more easily eclipsed.[20] Dewey's emphasis on iterative, fallible, and self-correcting research, therefore, is a critical element in improving schools and society.[21] Growth in knowledge is an ongoing inquiry that identifies both unwarranted and warranted claims.

Moving from honesty to justice, Dewey claimed that when the concept is viewed as a principle and not as a rule, it "signifies the will to *examine* specific institutions and measures so as to find out how they operate with the view of introducing greater

impartiality and equity into the consequences they produce."[22] This statement about justice also identifies eight (but not all) of the crucial characteristics of his comprehensive ethical theory: inquiry ("find out how"), intention ("with the view of"), attitude ("will to examine"), context ("specific institutions"), evaluation indicators ("measures"), degrees of growth ("greater"), virtues ("impartiality and equity"), and outcomes ("consequences").[23] It also implies how he understood the process of nurturing people who come to utilize (a) a set of ethical principles, (b) a set of interconnected virtues, and (c) a set of procedural practices. With his theoretical viewpoint, Dewey indicated how schools characterized by understanding ethical thinking, procedures, and practices could better themselves and, thereby, society. The inclusion of these eight characteristics in a school culture is a decided plus for students and staff.

Conversely, Dewey added that through sustained inquiry and testing of ethical hypotheses, *relational universal* or widespread general claims may be affirmed.[24] For example, he maintained that general agreement concerning specific relational universal values, processes, or aims are possible:[25] governments and schools in Guerrero, California, and Quebec are morally obligated to ensure the safety of their students and staff as well as to foster the intellectual honesty of students and staff. Differences on many particulars are also likely, including appropriate ways to phrase and enact laws and policies. Thus, he concluded that when relational universal claims are constructed and warranted, ethical principles must be applied to specific temporal and spatial contexts where some shared good is affirmed.[26] In support of his thinking, Dewey argued that scientific ethical inquiry and deliberation may extend to concerns beyond local settings to include particular situations in transnational contexts.[27] Garrison, Neubert, and Reich captured the tenor of his thinking behind this thought when they described the process of reconstructing principles or empirical generalizations as "a process that transcends generations."[28] Gouinlock, while recognizing that Dewey's thought focused on addressing particular problematic situations, maintained that Dewey integrated in his ethics a concern for "*universalizing democratic habits of thought and action*."[29] Nonetheless, for Dewey, any epistemic claim is contextualized and open to revision.

Absolute Ethical Claims

Dewey also sought to overhaul conventional absolutist theorizing. To begin, he stated that advocates of absolutes often ignore the realities of a dynamic universe, developing forms of inquiry, unfinished bodies of knowledge, and emerging logical arguments when making their claims.[30] These frequently disregarded realities ought to be entertained, he advocated, before people reach theoretical and epistemic conclusions. Nevertheless, while there are no traditional absolutes, societies can arrive at some reasonable and secure ethical ideas that might be either relational universal or, as described below, practical certainty claims.[31] This possibility exists for at least two reasons. First, bodies of knowledge and ethical arguments are characterized by

degrees of warrant or support; some assertions are entirely speculative while others have a high degree of warrant. Second, ethical knowledge grows as more ethical and scientific hypotheses are tested and, at times, confirmed.[32]

Dewey decided, therefore, that "we are justified in using" repeatedly verified truth claims "*as if* they were absolutely true" but cautioned that each *as if* absolute claim is a provisional claim "subject to being corrected by . . . future consequences."[33] That is to say, truths repeatedly verified over time "may have practical or moral certainty, but . . . never lose a hypothetic quality."[34] Consequently, he emphasized the possibility of practical certainty in making real-world choices, but not theoretical or epistemic certainty.[35] Elsewhere, he claimed that an experimental approach to ethics enables inquirers to arrive at "relative certainty, or tested probability."[36] As a result, he noted that principles with a long constructive history are important to retain and "no more to be lightly discarded than are scientific principles worked out in the past."[37]

Stating that "[we] are sure that the *attitude* of personal kindliness, of sincerity and fairness, will make our judgment of the effects of a proposed action on the good of others infinitely more likely to be correct than will those of hate, hypocrisy, and self-seeking," Dewey was consistent with his relational universal and his practical certainty observations.[38] The phrase "infinitely more likely" affirms a probable, not absolute, outcome and implies widespread applicability. This claim illustrates his opinion that when consequences in a particular case are unclear, deference should be given to the tendency of dispositions or habits "in the long run."[39] His ideas seem to suggest that schools in pluralistic societies need to work toward a warranted level of ethical security, stability, and reasonableness or practical certainty, neither more nor less.

Practical Doubts about Practical Certainty

Teachers, parents, and coaches may wonder what a relational universal or practical certainty looks like in the charged atmosphere of public schools in diverse communities. Administrators, too, are likely interested in learning more about principles that should not be "lightly discarded."[40] Dewey's response to doubts in general was to indicate that, in part, it is a person's responsibility—usually with others—"to discover *what* principles *are* relevant to . . . [her or his] own social [and school] estate."[41] This idea—that each person should ask which ethical principles are related to an immediate context or particular situations—is necessary when analyzing educational controversies, because no ethical recipes or panaceas exist. Hence, each person needs to think independently, deliberate interdependently, and act sympathetically in the interests of everyone.[42]

Collective Responsibility

Thinking reflectively and acting sympathetically, however, did not lead to an individualistic ethic for Dewey. Actually, he criticized a naive relativism that often stymies thinking: it is "stupid to suppose that . . . all moral principles are so relative

to a particular state of society that they have no binding force in any social condition."[43] Positively, he asserted that quests for clarification of values and principles may be aided by "social forces" that "create and reinforce search for the principles which are truly relevant in our own day."[44] Among influences across recent decades, social forces have helped schools and societies understand that the principles of respect and regard for persons includes children with special needs, children of new immigrants, GLBT students, bilingual students, and children of various racial backgrounds and religious traditions.

A person who remains skeptical of Dewey's reasoning may reject it, claiming that he should have known that educators are so occupied with school responsibilities that they do not have the theoretician's luxury of reconstructing ethical principles. But Dewey did not anticipate that teachers and administrators would do their ethical thinking and work in isolation: there is a collective professional and social responsibility to think about ethical responsibilities. For as Garrison, Neubert, and Reich have argued, the reconstruction of ethical principles is a multigeneration and multientity endeavor.[45] Hence, history—the critically evaluated behaviors and experiences of generations of diverse peoples—is a type of "moral telescope" that informs educators and students.[46] Studies of moral and societal development by ethicists and scientists can continue to contribute to a growing body of knowledge about enhancing personal and social wellbeing.

Reconstructed Principles

A person may probe further to ask which ethical principles, when reconstructed, Dewey himself thought may be worthy of use in particular situations in multiple cultures and locations. While he may or may not, if alive, hesitate to delineate even a short list of reconstructed principles, his writings appear to identify empirical generalizations that either did or can serve as principles and help identify virtues. If a person thinks back to Dewey's remarks, she or he recalls Dewey's interest in "honesty,"[47] "justice . . . impartiality and equity,"[48] "personal kindliness . . . sincerity and fairness," "the good of others," and his rejection of "hate, hypocrisy, and self-seeking."[49] Recalling Gouinlock, one thinks of Dewey's concern for universal democratic habits that can be reflected upon and reconstructed into ethical principles.[50]

While Dewey's thoughts about ethical virtues and vices might be extended, those already noted—honesty, justice, equity, impartiality, democratic habits, concern for the good of others, kindliness, sincerity, and fairness—are suggestive of principles that may be thoughtfully reconsidered for possible use today. Dewey's rejection of the vices of "hate, hypocrisy, and self-seeking"—not to mention others—are also instructive as educators seek to establish relatively secure and stable ethical cultures in schools.[51] Not yielding to the temptation to "surrender to chance, to caprice, to prejudice," one may agree with Dewey that it is defensible to use warranted principles and to establish democratic ethical cultures in schools.[52] To foster

reflective, ethical cultures, Dewey might claim today that the aforementioned concepts and their meanings have to be reexamined, reinterpreted, and reapplied in the light of particular ethical school situations as other variables are also considered (e.g., intentions, desires, agency, and responsibility).[53] Furthermore, he may stress the importance of making qualitative judgments about an experience or "situation as a whole,"[54] apprehending the "nature of any act" by its consequences,[55] for thinking is "regulated by qualitative considerations."[56] Of course, later analysis may "confirm or . . . lead to rejection" of an initial judgment.[57] Immediate apprehension, persistent inquiry, and sustained reflection, nonetheless, are complementary activities and critical companions in Deweyan ethical decision-making.[58]

As attention turns to a school scandal, new Deweyan ideas are employed along with ones previously noted. All names were created to recontextualize the situation and to ensure anonymity.

Analysis of a High School Situation

Before illustrating in more detail how Dewey's thought may be beneficial to educators, it is worthwhile to summarize briefly some previous emphases: there is the probable need of (a) employing some widespread relational universal and provisional absolute ethical principles; (b) using a set of ethical principles based on practical certainty; (c) inquiring into each ethical situation to determine the facts of the matter; (d) determining the hermeneutic significance of the virtues of honesty, justice, equity, and other values; (e) assessing the explanatory significance of the vices of hate, hypocrisy, and self-seeking; and (f) using qualitative judgments to gain immediate insight into the meaning of acts and entire situations. These six ethical lenses are used below in the analysis of the school situation. The school story develops under the subheadings of the Saida School Context, Suspicion and Suspension, Colleagues and Students, Specialist's Report, Organizational Consultant, and Consultant's Report.

Saida School Context

Although many details of the school context are noted below, certain specifics are shared at this point. The context of the problematic situation was a town of almost 60,000 people close to a metropolitan area. The high school had approximately 1,000 students and a suitable number of teachers, aides, counselors, and administrators. The staff demographics largely mirrored those of the student body with one significant discrepancy—socioeconomic backgrounds. The scarcity of teachers from working class backgrounds was widely believed to be the result of employment practices that gave preference to applicants who were spouses or partners of petroleum engineers, sustainable energy experts, and university professors.

The aforementioned circumstances and imbalance periodically led to school tensions, including strains based on a perceived or genuine lack of school support for students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. These factors influenced some

parents and students to believe that the traditional hurdles to involvement in student leadership positions were exclusionary. Compounding this viewpoint were the hidden costs associated with participating in honors courses, arts programs, sport activities, and travel opportunities. Most data regarding family poverty rates and relevant student voluntary participation indicators supported parents' perceptions. These data, combined with lower math and reading proficiency rates, resulted in the high school receiving an underachieving classification.

Suspicion and Suspension

In the school situation, it remains unclear exactly how the scandal started, but a part of the explanation is apparent: high-stakes testing coupled with related school tensions. Even with widespread national school cheating scandals drawing attention, and with local rumors of cheating in their high school swirling, the Saida school community was shocked when Superintendent Sabra Sebastian announced, via school and public media, that Mr. Ife Matthews, a popular fifth-year mathematics teacher, was suspended with pay. Sebastian noted that she could not provide details on the matter except to say that her decision was based on information provided by pertinent parties, legal advisors, and union leaders.

Matthews' suspension fueled speculation that he probably played a role in a rumored testing scandal. The focus of the alleged cheating was a tutorial program Matthews and his mathematics colleagues designed and delivered for students who seemed at risk on the impending standardized tests. Whether any other teachers were under investigation remained unclear. Principal R. J. Blackstone commented to reporters that he could neither discuss the investigation nor the suspension since they involved personnel matters. Blackstone noted that he had offered a contract to an assessment expert, Jen Arum, to conduct an inquiry into the alleged testing irregularities. Selecting Arum generated additional rumors, as some believed she had a longstanding friendship with Assistant Principal Alex Larsen, and her contract had been quickly approved without any apparent consideration of other qualified consultants.

Regardless of the facts, some speculated about the allegations and Matthew's potential motivation to go beyond policy to help students. He had criticized publicly the state assessment system for treating ESL and underserved students as if they were immersed in the English-speaking culture of the country. He had also encouraged school and district leaders, as well as members of the board, to negotiate a release from the state's testing mandate for an alternative evaluation system. Should these negotiations fail, he advocated completely boycotting the mandatory testing. All the same, he had always prepared his students to do well on the mathematics portion of the test. As a result, his students performed so well on the test that he gained the attention of some administrators, board members, and policymakers. None had fully expressed support for Matthews's proposal for alternative

methods of performance evaluation, including the use of data to design and deliver differentiated curricula and enhancing life and career options for students. Rather, his highly publicized and controversial criticism of the testing system had earned him some enemies in the district, with many assuming his detractors included Principal Blackstone.

The question remained as to why a devoted educator like Matthews would jeopardize his career by providing indefensible assistance to students. Many expressed confidence that he would not do so. Others claimed that everyone has weaknesses. These critics argued that no one could know what Matthews was capable of doing if he was frustrated with what he deemed administrative inaction on an equity issue. Additionally, his empathetic stance might cause him to act unreasonably given what he described as a "present-day semi-slave school system." Others noted that not a fragment of public evidence supported the claim that Matthews had acted unprofessionally. Matthews's supporters rightfully asked whether suspicion should be replaced with inquiry.

Colleagues and Students

Matthews' mathematics colleagues and the students who participated in the tutorial program were at first puzzled. During the investigation, each person denied participating in, facilitating, observing, or even hearing, until recently, about ethical breaches before, during, or even after the test administration. During the ensuing investigation, the bewilderment of teachers turned to anger, as they realized that some of Arum's questions also implicated them in the testing scandal. It seemed as if they were under suspicion of employing prohibited means of helping students on the tests, protecting others who did, or being willfully indifferent to what had happened. Students, especially those stereotyped as having inadequately developed mathematics abilities, also felt as if they were presumed guilty of cheating and profiting from unethical teacher behavior. The flow of insinuations emerging during the investigation was disturbing. By the time Arum was composing her report, the scope and intensity of these circumstances, real and rumored, had deeply disrupted and divided the school and its community.

Specialist's Report

Suddenly, a copy of Arum's incomplete report was leaked to the local media, which published it for the public. A key finding in her preliminary account included a statistical analysis of the test scores and a review of the test forms. Irregularities were revealed, which were likely attributable only to non-test taker action. One sentence in the unfinished report reverberated through the community: "It appears that as few as one or two people may be responsible for the assessment aberrations." According to the leaked report, actions that accounted for similar test anomalies in prior schools' investigations included teachers or administrators: (a) advising

some students to leave blank any item for which they did not know the correct answer, (b) reporting several lower-performing students absent the day of the test, and (c) completing the official test forms for various students after their unofficial answer forms were destroyed. Upon reading the unfinished report, the union's attorney immediately issued a denial that his client, Ife Matthews, was involved in the alleged but unproven misconduct. The attorney continued by vowing to fight the accusations and said that Arum and the superintendent, principal, and board would be held accountable for any involvement in leaking the libelous and slanderous preliminary findings to the public.

Organizational Consultant

At that juncture, Arum abruptly ended her work and left the community, and two days later, the superintendent announced that she had employed Park Lee, an organizational consultant, to complete the investigation. Lee was brought into an intensely divisive situation to investigate both original concerns and the explosive implications from the assessment specialist's leaked report. His first step was to meet with a number of school and district personnel and board members. He discussed his aims, answered questions, and assured all stakeholders that impartiality, fairness, and concern for everyone's well-being would characterize his work and outcomes. Moreover, he noted that whatever the factual findings, the personal status of parties involved (whether student or educator, exonerated or implicated), and the recommendations, everyone would receive procedural fairness and personal respect from the district and himself throughout the difficult situation. Once the investigation was completed, Lee said that the overriding focus would shift to creating ethical clarity and growth for students and staff. School staff, like students, would be respected and treated in a manner consistent with the state's code of ethics and the terms of their contracts. Appeal processes were also in place for students and staff if anyone felt the need to appeal a decision.

Lee also explained that he would approach the situation in much the same way listeners themselves might. He planned to begin with his immediate impressions or intuitions about the whole situation, and then evaluate his impressions by holding them up to the light of facts and the insights of others.[59] First, then, he would meticulously gather facts and interpretations of them and use this information to cross-examine his own developing impressions and thoughts.[60] Second, he would look first for the "best possibilities" of each potentially involved person to maintain open-mindedness and fairness.[61] Third, he would seek to determine what the dominant ethical qualities were in the situation so that the big picture could help inform the particulars.[62]

In a later meeting, Lee told school leadership and representative teachers how he thought understanding "the whole situation" would help unveil and interpret contextual details. He noted that he thought that consequences result from

human desires, dispositions, and habits, and indicate the ethical quality of the acts themselves.[63] In addition to the facts, he needed to understand the desires and dispositions that probably led to the alleged cheating, the suspicions, the report, the following emotional storm, and the resignation of Jen Arum.

To help him filter through the contextual desires and dispositions, he would use the gist of Dewey's incomplete lists of virtues (e.g., honesty, justice, equity, impartiality, concern for the good of others, kindliness, sincerity, and fairness) and vices (e.g., hate, hypocrisy, and self-seeking) to inform his analysis, interpretation, and judgment.[64] In essence, he planned to convert the virtues into principles and treat the vices as misanthropic impulses to provide interpretative accounts. Lee added: "Concisely stated, my duty is fivefold: (a) to collect all of the relevant facts and interpretations of them; (b) to safeguard impartiality and equity; (c) to demonstrate a sincere commitment to everyone; (d) to test my hypotheses with a number of people; and (e) to enumerate procedural steps and guideposts to help enhance academic and ethical equilibrium in the future."[65] He urged that confidentiality should be maintained throughout the process.

Consultant's Report

When Lee presented his final report to Superintendent Sebastian and district team members, he mentioned that his comments would focus on the executive summary, the conclusions, and the recommendations. Among the specific conclusions reached by Lee were the following, which are taken verbatim from his report:

1. Regarding school seniors: there was no credible evidence of student misconduct, including by the students who participated in the test taking and mathematics skills tutorials;
2. Regarding school teachers: there was no credible evidence of teacher misconduct, including by the teachers who taught in the test taking and mathematics skills tutorials;
3. Regarding Mr. Ife Matthews, the teacher suspected of cheating: there was no credible evidence to support the claim that he knew of, initiated, supported, or ignored alleged misconduct by any member of the school staff or student body;
4. Regarding school leadership: there was credible and conclusive evidence indicating that the now former assistant principal, Mr. Alex Larsen, acted alone when he created a cheating rumor, fabricated supporting information, wrote a threatening e-mail to himself that was attributed to Mr. Matthews, recommended a friend as an assessment specialist to study the contrived testing scandal, and engineered the covert release of the assessment specialist's incomplete report;
5. Regarding other possible school collaborators: there was no credible evidence that any other school employee, including Principal R. J.

Blackstone, was involved in the cheating controversy. Mr. Blackstone's out-of-town obligations, digital footprints, and personal remarks as well as Mr. Larsen's personal admissions and digital footprints clarify that Mr. Blackstone was demonstrably both uninvolved in and unaware of any aspect of the matter. Thus the suspicion about additional staff members, while faintly understandable in one respect, is completely unfounded. Although it was not possible to prove absolutely that still others were not involved, there is credible, cogent evidence to a practical certainty of their non-involvement. Any future nurturing of this unfounded rumor will only perpetuate misanthropic behavior; and

6. Regarding district leadership: there was no credible evidence to indicate that either Superintendent Sabra Sebastian or anyone on her staff was complicit in the accusations and fabrications related to the test cheating rumors and the nearly stealth employment of the assessment specialist.

Before concluding his opening remarks, Lee added that there was considerable evidence to support the idea that numerous community, district, and school stakeholders were invested emotionally in the problematic situation, and that their residual feelings would likely continue to influence interactions for a period of time. Having a district understanding that everyone will be treated with respect and regard is necessary for regaining and retaining both academic and ethical equilibrium. Having a commitment to fairness and freedom of thought is necessary for continuing an open learning environment and community. These understandings should be an integral part of the district's forthcoming plan to focus on intellectual, ethical, social, physical, and emotional growth in future years. The school and district also need to develop and implement a plan that addresses the uneven and inequitable student involvement and outcomes in every type of school- or district-sponsored and authorized undertaking.

In assessing why Lee came to very different conclusions than Arum regarding this multilayered situation, we emphasize several thoughts about ethical principles, school challenges, and problem-solving. First, Dewey's highlighting the likelihood of enhancing ethical growth when everyday activities intersect with ethical or practical questions and inquiry is important, for this means that a person is more likely to complete a Deweyan learning cycle if she or he—whether educator or student—engages in philosophical inquiry and actual ethical problem-solving simultaneously.[66] That is, she or he is likely to go beyond mere information acquisition to inquiry learning, knowledge utilization, and behavioral change.[67] Educators, given their day-to-day involvement in district learning activities and construction of ethical knowledge, have amazingly rich contexts for promoting ethical development, for themselves and their students.[68] Kolb, although weak at times on critique of contemporary theories, has drawn from Dewey's learning theory to construct an experiential learning model that provides powerful insights for educators.[69]

Second, Dewey observed that ethical development in schools usually occurs in predominantly human environments.[70] As a result, as Howes observed, studying students in schools is highly important.[71] The relevance of this idea to adults is also evident, especially when the observer is a purposeful, expectant, and scientific observer.[72] To illustrate, we center on Jen Arum, Park Lee, and Alex Larsen. Each person illustrates Dewey's emphasis on the way individuals create themselves uniquely by their choices and habit formations, and how, as a result, they come to differ considerably in their desires, dispositions, and definitions of virtues and vices.[73] So, too, they constitute human conditions that considerably influence classroom, school, and district environments. Naturally, the qualities that Arum and Lee acquired and valued greatly affected how they proceeded as school consultants.[74] Their value-laden differences affected how they viewed their inquiry responsibilities, what they saw as the unique goods and evils of the situation, how they described the qualities of the participating people, and why their recommendations focused on some concerns and not on others.[75]

Lee's initial presentation of himself and his process imply that he probably listened attentively, observed carefully, spoke circumspectly, and questioned judiciously, for he realized that he was engaged in a highly sensitive inquiry. He likely probed gently but deeply as he encountered competing desires, contending accounts, and conflicting moral qualities in the situation. His senses, feelings, and thoughts—his entire person—were alive to the context and full situation as he attempted to apprehend and comprehend what had occurred in the school.[76] But on many occasions, an observer might not have observed Lee doing anything, except, perhaps, emitting sighs during reflection. When Lee concluded that Matthews was innocent of any professional misconduct after turning the "subject over in" his mind and giving "it serious and consecutive consideration," no one observed his recurrent reflection on facts, questions, arguments, emotions, qualities, impressions, and hypotheses.[77] Yet his internal deliberation identified him as a painstaking inquirer, an example of the type of consultant needed.

Lee obviously tested hypotheses about who might be misanthropic and who had the ill will, knowledge, and opportunity to create data that implicated Matthews. He gradually narrowed his list of potential candidates down to one. But his fact-finding, hypothesis testing, and dramatic rehearsal were not fully visible.[78] Likewise, Lee's mixed emotions about and careful search for the meaning of honesty, justice, kindness, and the good of all—including Assistant Principal Alex Larsen—were regularly unseen. His interest in a renewal of ethical equilibrium, however, may have surfaced in his questions about community, culture, and communication. His body language, too, may have revealed his puzzlement when he learned of the dissemination of the unfinished report. He may have wondered, who could have ensured premature access to Arum's report?

From the meager description provided of Arum, it is risky to draw too many conclusions, except, perhaps, that she was a psychometrician and a friend of Assistant

Principal Larsen. She may have created the opportunity for another person, most likely Larsen, to secure and disclose her unfinished report. Consequently, it seems reasonable to conclude that Larsen secretly made the report available to the public. Some information that Lee gathered supports the inference that Arum underestimated the sensitivity of the situation, misread students' reactions, or did not utilize the requisite skills and sensitivities needed for the assignment. From a Deweyan perspective, one could argue that she probably lacked both empathetic and sympathetic insight into the stakeholders.[79] Likewise, one might conclude that the depth of her regard for herself, others, and relevant groups was either insufficiently developed or inhibited by incongruent interests.[80] Her interest in "the welfare and integrity" of the students, staff, and families in the district seemed underdeveloped, too.[81] Stated otherwise, she lacked "the spiritual basis of democracy" or an integration of the motives of "affection, of social growth, and of scientific inquiry."[82] Perhaps the urgent situation at the high school and her desire to help a friend skewed her judgment. Therefore, one could conclude that she failed "to act upon the *principle of a course of action*" that was embedded in her professional responsibilities, and instead acted on "the *circumstances*" in a way believed to be required by amity.[83] Possibly, she acted, too, on an ill-conceived ethical principle of personal loyalty. If she had acted on the principle of serving her profession, her "animating aim and spirit" would have been to "care for" the students, teachers, parents, and administrators she was employed to serve.[84] We speculate that she may also have been manipulated, deceived, and betrayed by a longtime friend. Overall, Dewey's thoughts about the principle of continuity for the education profession seem to provide insight into how one should make practical decisions, even as the details of a situation do not provide unqualified clarity.[85]

The aforementioned facts, inferences, and deductions illustrate why Dewey claimed that the ethical principle on which democracy depends is "the responsibility and freedom of mind in discovery of proof."[86] Accordingly, whether one describes Dewey's ethic as democratic, scientific, qualitative, and/or sympathetic, it runs the risk of being misconstrued if it is not also underscored that it is incurably an ethic of inquiry, which has "a certain problem which focuses effort, which controls the collecting of facts that bear upon the question, the use of observation to get further data, the employing of memory to supply relevant facts, the calling into play of imagination, to yield fertile suggestion and construct possible solutions."[87]

For Dewey, a habit of utilizing ethical principles likely gave considerable priority to the principle of "freedom of inquiry and deliberation."[88] Without this principle, there seems to be less warrant for determining which additional principles are based on a reflective understanding of virtues and vices and are serviceable in educational situations. Parenthetically, Deweyan inquiry has the advantage of being antithetical to indoctrinating or brainwashing both students and staff and closing their minds to legitimate perspectives in discovery activities.[89] Hence, Dewey concluded that the inquiring, reflective, sympathetic, good person who is concerned

with consequences on affected parties is more likely to be a dependable judge of problematic situations, compared to those who can only provide sophisticated theoretical arguments about a situation.[90] Similarly, the "experienced practitioner," he implied, is more capable of addressing ethical questions in schools than the person "who has theoretical knowledge but no practical experience."[91]

Of course, our discussion of Arum and Lee neither concludes that the former is a completely unethical person, nor avers that the latter is perfectly ethical. Everyone, for Dewey, has a "speckled" character, some seriously and others less so.[92] But Arum's and Lee's decisions, like anyone's, strengthened their existing propensities and habits, thus enhancing or diminishing their and others' well-being. Seemingly, they were both responsible for their actions, and the continuity of their "quality of becoming" was where each person's virtues or vices lived.[93] Were they also responsible for understanding their strengths and weaknesses, and for undertaking a task requiring ethical and technical proficiency, of being aware of their capacities and appropriateness for the role?

Perhaps the most visible difference in the two consultants' interpretations of this situation regards the role of then Assistant Principal Alex Larsen in the scandal. In Arum's account, he is literally irrelevant to the accumulated actions and subsequent charges, but for Lee, Larsen was the central actor in terms of misrepresentations and distortions of events causing the scandal. In Lee's account, Larsen's resentment of Matthews's assertive argument for evaluation fairness and his description of Matthews's behavior as insubordinate were important clues that Lee attended to. Lee immediately recognized that Larsen's antipathy for Matthews's sexual orientation and identity indicated that his role merited foregrounding. Ultimately, if not for Larsen, the scandal would not have arisen. The gaps in his ethical development became obvious when Lee discovered and took account of Larsen's personal values and dispositions. Larsen not only concocted a string of pseudo-evidence against Matthews, but also destroyed his own career and jeopardized a friend's job. Moreover, he demolished the ethical ecology of the school and district, ruptured the ethical web tying the district and community together, and traumatized his family, friends, and students, not to mention the multiple ordeals he foisted upon Matthews and his family, friends, and students. His situation illustrates, perhaps, that while there is a need to shun moralistic tendencies, ongoing professional development is a common if not universal need given the dynamic nature of schools, cultures, and society. If not, the ripple effect of an individual's decisions can easily rupture a school ecology and undulate far beyond an office, classroom, school, and district. Understanding the organic, ecological, and systemic implications of Dewey's ethical theory becomes increasingly valuable.[94]

Conclusion

Given the myriad of explicit and implicit Deweyan ideas and implications sprinkled throughout both the predominately theoretical portions and the analytical sections of our study, we conclude that Dewey's reconstruction of ethical principles does

not automatically undermine their importance in democratic societies and schools. To the contrary, his reconstruction appears to promote a clarification of their roles and usefulness for many sensitive, reflective, experimentally oriented educators. Manifestly, his approach to ethical principles can supply educators and students with "standpoints and methods" that enable them to think for themselves about "the elements of good and evil" in school situations and to work with others—or at least to learn with those who are contrarians in thought and disposition—to reach conclusions that promote a common human flourishing.[95] Combined with Dewey's emphases on virtues, affections, intentions, choices, attitudes, actions, habits, and consequences, educators have an ethical option that both uses and goes beyond principles.[96] One can understand why Dewey utilized principles and concluded that "right or wrong . . . [is] determined by the situation in its entirety," including relevant desires, principles, facts, judgments, and so forth.[97] Thus, in an important sense, Dewey reenvisioned, reconstructed, decentered, and resituated ethical principles in his theory of ethics. The environment that is ethically empowered and empowering and enriched and enriching, if Dewey is correct, is characterized by more than thinking with ethical principles, and features an aesthetic beauty that possesses the qualities of "grace, rhythm, and harmony," not the ugly traits of "bleakness and harshness."[98] This ethical undertaking, in part the responsibility of schools, is not isolated but integrated into Dewey's tripartite "supreme task" of forming "good judgment or taste with respect to what is esthetically admirable, intellectually acceptable and morally approvable."[99] Paraphrasing Dewey's point about ethical principles, we conclude that his own ideas ought not be lightly regarded or discarded either.[100] Nevertheless, as Stengel suggests, "doing Dewey dynamically" is well advised.[101]

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to Eric Bredo, Nance Cunningham, Joe DeVitis, M. Francyne Huckaby, Jim Garrison, Michael J. B. Jackson, Brandy Quinn, Tammy Riemenschneider, David Snelgrove, and our anonymous reviewers for their invaluable feedback on our evolving reflections regarding Dewey's ethical theory. Their questions, suggestions, and criticisms importantly informed the work, enabling us to provide greater clarity, accuracy, depth, and balance in the treatment of the topics we discussed.

Notes

1. John Dewey, "Democracy and Education," in *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1923*, Vol. 9, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1980), 343–55; John Dewey, "How We Think," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, rev. ed., Vol. 8, 1933, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 125–39.

2. Jim Garrison, Stefan Neubert, and Kersten Reich, *John Dewey's Philosophy of Education: An Introduction and Recontextualization for Our Times* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Douglas J. Simpson, Michael J. B. Jackson, and Judy C. Aycock, *John Dewey and the Art of Teaching: Toward Reflective and Imaginative Practice* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2004).

3. See Thomas M. Alexander, "John Dewey and the Oral Imagination: Beyond Putnam and Rorty toward a Postmodern Ethics," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 29, no. 3(1993): 369–400; Henry T. Edmondson, *John Dewey and the Decline of American Education: How the Patron Saint of Schools Has Corrupted Teaching and Learning* (Wilimington, DE: ISI Books, 2006); and Richard S. Prawat, "Misreading Dewey: Reform, Projects, and the Language Game," *Educational Researcher* 24, no. 7 (1995): 13–22.

4. John Dewey, "Moral Principles in Education," in *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 4, 1907–1909, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977), 267–74.

5. See Jay Martin, *The Education of John Dewey: A Biography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

6. John Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," in *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 14, 1922, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983), 165.

7. John Dewey and James Hayden Tufts, "Ethics," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, rev. ed., Vol. 7, 1932, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985), 280. Since Dewey is the basic author of chapters 10–17, we only use his name in the text hereinafter, but employ the names of Dewey and Tufts throughout the Notes.

8. Ibid. See also Steven A. Fesmire, *Dewey* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 136–40.

9. Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct." See also Dewey's discussion of a naturalistic approach to ethics in John Dewey, *Unmodern Philosophy and Modern Philosophy*, ed. Philip Deen (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012), 93–98, 109–11, 148–62.

10. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 275–83.

11. See Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics;" Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct;" Gregory Fernando Pappas, *John Dewey's Ethics: Democracy as Experience* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 48. Pappas's discussion of contextualism, particularism, and situational ethics nicely distinguishes Dewey's views from other interpretations of these orientations.

12. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 320.

13. Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," 58.

14. Edmondson, *John Dewey and the Decline of American Education*.

15. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 275–83.

16. Ibid., 359.

17. Ibid., 279.

18. Ibid., 277, 359.

19. John Dewey, "Democracy in Education," in *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 3, 1903–1906, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977), 230.

20. Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," 170.

21. James Scott Johnston, *Inquiry and Education: John Dewey and the Quest for Democracy* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2006), 53–60.

22. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 279. Italics in the original.

23. Ibid., 279.

24. John Dewey, "Introduction: Reconstruction as Seen Twenty-Five Years Later," in *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 12, 1920, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), 262.

25. John Dewey, "Reconstruction in Philosophy," in *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 12, 1920, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984), 197–98.

26. Ibid., 198.

27. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 371.

28. Garrison, Neubert, and Reich, *John Dewey's Philosophy of Education*, 103.

29. James Gouinlock, ed., *The Moral Writings of John Dewey* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1994), 181. Italics in the original.

30. Dewey, "Reconstruction in Philosophy;" Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct;" John Dewey, "The Quest for Certainty," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 4, 1929, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984).

31. Dewey, "Reconstruction in Philosophy;" Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct;"Dewey, "The Quest for Certainty."

32. John Dewey, "Logic: The Theory of Inquiry," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 12, 1938, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 481–505.

33. John Dewey, "The Development of American Pragmatism," in *the Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 2, 1925–1927, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984), 12. Italics added.

34. John Dewey, "Experience and Nature," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 1, 1925, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981), 123.

35. Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," 165–67.

36. Ibid., 167.

37. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 330.

38. Ibid., 242. Italics in the original.

39. Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," 37. See also Dewey, *Unmodern Philosophy and Modern Philosophy*, 266, for his thoughts regarding consequences that come after the lifetimes of decision makers.

40. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 330.

41. Ibid., 283. Italics in the original.

42. Dewey, "How We Think," 125–39; John Dewey, "American Education Past and Future," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 6, 1931–1932, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985), 98.

43. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 283.

44. Ibid.

45. Garrison, Neubert, and Reich, *John Dewey's Philosophy of Education*, 103.

46. John Dewey, "Educational Lectures before Brigham Young Academy," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 17, 1885–1953, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990), 318.

47. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 259.

48. Ibid., 279.

49. Ibid., 242.

50. Gouinlock, *The Moral Writings of John Dewey*, 181.

51. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 242.

52. Ibid., 320.

53. Ibid.

54. John Dewey, "Qualitative Thought," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1923–1953*, Vol. 5, 1929–1930, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985), 259.

55. Ibid., 252.

56. Ibid., 243.

57. Ibid., 259.

58. Victor Kestenbaum, preface to *Theory of the Moral Life*, ed. Arnold Isenberg (New York: Irvington Publishers, 1996), x–xvix. Although we agree with Kestenbaum's general emphasis on the qualitative, we have a few reservations about aspects of his thought, including the narrow role he appears to give to dramatic rehearsal and the delimited role he provides for principles. Certainly, dramatic rehearsal can or often should be a part of the full range of the extended process of ethical thought and action, and is or can be an ongoing activity in deliberation. But we think dramatic rehearsal need not be so prescribed. When people, for instance, are in the early stages of learning and attempting to use Dewey's thought processes, the experience of employing dramatic rehearsal can be a genuinely educative one as it can be in later stages when they have learned to use it more sensitively. Hence, the concept rehearsal appears to suggest an early and maturing educative role. Moreover, we in no way wish to deemphasize Dewey's interest in a moral science by calling attention to the qualitative dimensions of his thought. Kestenbaum's emphasis on the mutual informative and corrective rolls of principles and qualities in situations, however, is a tremendous contribution to understanding how problematic situations can be better understood and addressed. But stating that "the authorizing power" of ethical principles "occurs within the dramatic situation," while partially merited, seems unguarded and may contribute to misinterpreting Dewey's contextualism and particularism. That is, the comment may leave the impression that principles can be separated from the historical and scientific contexts and continuity that have developed, tested, revised, and warranted ethical claims—the only important factor about principles is the "authorizing" immediate situation. The role of principles in Dewey's writings also appears broader than described. See, for example, Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," 164–70. Conversely, it is clear that Dewey's approach to doing ethics, making decisions, and living ethically includes welcoming reflective insights from ordinary experience, immediate perceptions, dramatic rehearsal, deliberations, sympathetic-empathetic emotions, intuitive moments, scientific inquiry, qualitative judgments including aesthetic ones, as long as the claimed insights remain open to additional inquiry and feedback from a growing body of ethical understanding and meaning making. See, for instance, Dewey, "Qualitative Thought," 253, 259 and Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 262–75. Even so, we are confident that Kestenbaum could easily clarify his ideas and indicate where and why he agrees and disagrees with our interpretations and misinterpretations. We are deeply appreciative of his interest in and contributions to Deweyan thought.

59. Pappas, *John Dewey's Ethics*, 75–78.

60. Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," 164–67.

61. Jim Garrison, *Dewey and Eros: Wisdom and Desire in the Art of Teaching* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1997), 171.

62. Dewey, "Experience and Nature," 200.

63. Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," 33–35.

64. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 242.

65. John Dewey, "Moral Theory and Practice," in *The Early Works of John Dewey, 1882–1898*, Vol. 3, 1889–1892, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969), 106–107.

66. Dewey, "Educational Lectures before Brigham Young Academy," 213–25.

67. Simpson, Jackson, and Aycock, *John Dewey and the Art of Teaching,* 76–77.

68. Dewey, "Democracy and Education," 366.

69. David Kolb, *Experiential Learning* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984).

70. Dewey, "Experience and Education," 51–60.

71. Elaine V. Howes, "Educative Experiences and Early Childhood Education: A Deweyan Perspective on Learning to Observe," *Teaching and teacher Education* 24, no. 3 (2008): 536–49.

72. Dewey, "How We Think," 319–22.

73. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 285–309.

74. Ibid., 295, 302.

75. Ibid., 175–77.

76. Dewey, "Reconstruction in Philosophy," 174–77.

77. Dewey, "How We Think," 114.

78. Steven A. Fesmire, "Dramatic Rehearsal and the Moral Artist: A Deweyan Theory of Moral Understanding," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 31, no. 3 (1995): 568–97; Jennifer Welchman, *Dewey's Ethical Thought* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 168–73.

79. Simpson and Sacken, "The Sympathetic-Empathetic Teacher: A Deweyan Analysis," *Journal of Philosophy & History of Education* 64, no. 1 (2014): 1–20, specifically 2–4.

80. Simpson and Sacken, "The Ethical Principle of Regard for People: Using Dewey's Ideas in Schools," *International Journal of Progressive Education* 11, no. 1 (2015): 41–58, specifically 42–45.

81. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 299.

82. Dewey, "Democracy in Education," 239.

83. Dewey, "Democracy and Education," 363. Italics in the original.

84. Ibid., 363.

85. Ibid., or Dewey, "Democracy and Education," 17–30.

86. Dewey, "Democracy in Education," 230.

87. Ibid., 236.

88. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 320.

89. Johnston, *Inquiry and Education*, 154–56.

90. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 266–98.

91. Dewey, "Democracy and Education," 365.

92. Dewey, "Human Nature and Conduct," 36.

93. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 306.

94. Craig A. Cunningham, *Systems Theory for Pragmatic Schooling: Toward Principles of Democratic Education* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 44–60; Douglas J. Simpson, *John Dewey Primer* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 59–70; Douglas J. Simpson, "Neo-Deweyan Moral Education," in *Character and Moral Education*, ed. Joseph. L. Devitis and Tianlong Yu (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 220–24.

95. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 280.

96. See, for example, Elizabeth Anderson, "Dewey's Moral Philosophy," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta, accessed September 9,

2014, http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/dewey-moral; Raymond D. Bosivert, *John Dewey: Rethinking Our Time* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1988); Garrison, Neubert, and Reich, *John Dewey's Philosophy of Education*; Fesmire, *Dewey*; Johnston, *Inquiry and Education*; David T. Hansen, *Exploring the Moral Heart of Teaching: Toward a Teacher's Creed* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001); Pappas, *John Dewey's Ethics*; Melvin L. Rogers, *The Undiscovered Dewey: Religion, Morality, and the Ethos of Democracy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

97. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 280.

98. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 271.

99. Dewey, "The Quest for Certainty," 209.

100. Dewey and Tufts, "Ethics," 330; see also David T. Hansen, "Dewey's Book of the Moral Self," in *John Dewey and Our Educational Prospect: A Critical Engagement with Dewey's* Democracy and Education, ed. David T. Hansen (Albany: SUNY Press, 2006), 171–77.

101. Barbara S. Stengel, "More Than 'Mere Ideas': Deweyan Tools for the Contemporary Philosopher," *Education and Culture* 25, no. 2 (2009): 89–100, specifically 98.

Bibliography

Alexander, Thomas M. "John Dewey and the Moral Imagination: Beyond Putnam and Rorty toward a Postmodern Ethics." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 29, no. 3 (1993): 369–400.

Anderson, Elizabeth. "Dewey's Moral Philosophy." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta. Accessed September 9, 2014. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/dewey-moral.

Boisvert, Raymond D. *John Dewey: Rethinking Our Time*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1988.

Cunningham, Craig A. *Systems Theory for Pragmatic Schooling: Toward Principles of Democratic Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Dewey, John. "Moral Theory and Practice." In *The Early Works of John Dewey, 1882–1898*, Vol. 3, 1889–1892, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969.

———. "Democracy in Education." In *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 3, 1903–1906, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.

———. "Moral Principles in Education." In *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 4, 1907–1909, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.

———. "Democracy and Education." In *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 9, 1899–1924, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1980.

———. "Experience and Nature." In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 1, 1925, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981.

———. "Reconstruction in Philosophy." In *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 12, 1920, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982.

———. “Introduction: Reconstruction as Seen Twenty-Five Years Later.” In *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 12, 1920, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982.

———. “Human Nature and Conduct.” In *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 14, 1922, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.

———. “Logical Method and Law.” In *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. 15, 1923–1924, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.

———. “The Development of American Pragmatism.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 2, 1925–1927, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.

———. “The Quest for Certainty.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 4, 1929, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.

———. “Qualitative Thought.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 5, 1929–1930, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.

———. “American Education Past and Future.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 6, 1931–1932, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985.

———. “How We Think.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, rev. ed., Vol. 8, 1933, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986.

———. “Logic: The Theory of Inquiry.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 12, 1938, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986.

———. “Experience and Education.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 13, 1938–1939, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988.

———. “Educational Lectures before Brigham Young Academy.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, Vol. 17, 1885–1953, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990.

———. *Unmodern Philosophy and Modern Philosophy*, ed. Philip Deen. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012.

Dewey, John, and James Hayden Tufts. “Ethics.” In *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953*, rev. ed., Vol. 7, 1932, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985.

Edmonson, Henry T. *John Dewey and the Decline of American Education: How the Patron Saint of Schools Has Corrupted Teaching and Learning*. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2006.

Fesmire, Steven A. "Dramatic Rehearsal and the Moral Artist: A Deweyan Theory of Moral Understanding." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 31, no. 3 (1995): 568–97.

Fesmire, Steven A. *Dewey*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Garrison, Jim. *Dewey and Eros: Wisdom and Desire in the Art of Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1997.

Garrison, Jim, Stefan Neubert, and Kersten Reich. *John Dewey's Philosophy of Education: An Introduction and Recontextualization for Our Times*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Gouinlock, James, ed. *The Moral Writings of John Dewey*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1994.

Hansen, David T. *Exploring the Moral Heart of Teaching: Toward a Teacher's Creed*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2001.

———. "Dewey's Book of the Moral Self." In *John Dewey and Our Educational Prospect: A Critical Engagement with Dewey's* Democracy and Education, ed. David T. Hansen. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006.

Howes, Elaine V. "Educative Experiences and Early Childhood Science Education: A Deweyan Perspective on Learning to Observe." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24, no. 3 (2008): 536–49.

Johnston, James Scott. *Inquiry and Education: John Dewey and the Quest for Democracy*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006.

Kestenbaum, Victor. Preface to *Theory of the Moral Life*, ed. Arnold Isenberg, v–xx. New York: Irvington Publishers, 1996.

Kolb, David. *Experiential Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984.

Martin, Jay. *The Education of John Dewey: A Biography*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Pappas, Gregory Fernando. *John Dewey's Ethics: Democracy as Experience*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.

Prawat, Richard S. "Misreading Dewey: Reform, Projects, and the Language Game." *Educational Researcher* 24, no. 7 (1995): 13–22.

Rogers, Melvin L. *The Undiscovered Dewey: Religion, Morality, and the Ethos of Democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Simpson, Douglas J. *John Dewey Primer*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.

———. "Neo-Deweyan Moral Education." In *Character and Moral Education*, ed. Joseph L. Devitis and Tianlong Yu. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.

Simpson, Douglas J., Michael J. B. Jackson, and Judy C. Aycock. *John Dewey and the Art of Teaching: Toward Reflective and Imaginative Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2004.

Simpson, Douglas J., and Mike D. Sacken. "The Sympathetic-Empathetic Teacher: A Deweyan Analysis." *Journal of Philosophy & History of Education* 64, no. 1 (2014): 1–20.

———. "The Ethical Principle of Regard for People: Using Dewey's Ideas in Schools." *International Journal of Progressive Education* 11, no. 1 (2015): 41–58.
Stengel, Barbara S. "More Than 'Mere Ideas': Deweyan Tools for the Contemporary Philosopher." *Education and Culture* 25, no. 2 (2009): 89–100.
Welchman, Jennifer. *Dewey's Ethical Thought*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Douglas J. Simpson is an associated professor in the College of Education at Texas Christian University. Email: d.j.simpson@tcu.edu

Donal M. Sacken is a professor in the College of Education at Texas Christian University. Email: d.sacken@tcu.edu