ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN SCHOOLS

This work investigates the complexity of ethics as a field of inquiry and practice across a principal's career. Fully contextualized, and thus carrying the contradictions and requirements of any school, the issues realistically do not usually lead to a single, beat-all answer, as any solution will likely have positive and negative consequences. Drawn from the authors' experiences and studies of schools over decades, the central figure is a fictional principal of a magnet school, whose dilemmas reflect the questions educators must be prepared for. Each decision takes into account the principal's and staff's identities and values because they are all humans and their opinions influence the outcomes. The work injects analytic, virtue, feminist, care, deontological, and critical theory insights as Deweyan ethics provides a lens for examining dilemmas. This accessible work blends reflective theory, the ordinary worlds of schools, and engaging pedagogical practice to guide those planning to enter the education sector.

DOUGLAS J. SIMPSON is Associated Professor in the College of Education at Texas Christian University, and Helen DeVitt Jones Chair in Teacher Education Emeritus at Texas Tech University. He is a past president of the Canadian Philosophy of Education Society and the American Educational Studies Association.

DONAL M. SACKEN is Professor Emeritus of Education in the College of Education at Texas Christian University. He has taught at all levels, mostly in the areas of administration and educational foundations. He has served as a legal consultant for school districts, and now is chair of the board at a local charter school.

ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN SCHOOLS

Collaborative Inquiry, Decision-Making and Action

DOUGLAS J. SIMPSON
Texas Christian University

DONAL M. SACKEN
Texas Christian University

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108491471
DOI: 10.1017/9781108868853

First published 2021

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
NAMES: Simpson, Douglas J., 1940– author. | Sacken, Donal M., 1948– author.
TITLE: Ethical dilemmas in schools : collaborative inquiry, decision-making, and action / Douglas J. Simpson, College of Education, Texas Christian University (2013-P) and Emeritus, Helen Devitt Jones Chair in Teacher Education (1213-P), College of Education Texas Tech University, Donal M. Sacken, Texas Christian University.
DESCRIPTION: New York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2021. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2020019671 (print) | LCCN 2020019672 (ebook) | ISBN 9781108491471 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108798334 (paperback) | ISBN 9781108868853 (epub)
SUBJECTS: LCSH: Moral education. | Teachers–Professional ethics.
CLASSIFICATION: LCC LC268 .S56 2021 (print) | LCC LC268 (ebook) | DDC 370.11/4–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020019671
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020019672

ISBN 978-1-108-49147-1 Hardback
ISBN 978-1-108-79833-4 Paperback

Contents

Figures

Foreword

Casuistry is probably not a word you employ in your everyday vocabulary. But I suspect that the practice of casuistry is nonetheless part of your ethical repertoire. What I mean to suggest is, you make use of actual cases of shared experience to generate ethical principles of care, justice, and responsibility *and* you apply already available ethical principles to new cases as they arise in an infinite and perhaps imperceptible cycle. This is a practice John Dewey learned from Aristotle and one that Doug Simpson and Mike Sacken learned from Dewey. It is a practice deeply woven into the fabric of *Ethical Dilemmas in Schools: A Collaborative Approach to Inquiry, Decision-Making, and Action.*

In fact, Simpson and Sacken have, in a sense, written two books here. The first is captured in the subtitle, "A Collaborative Approach to Inquiry, Decision-Making, and Action." This is a careful and complete academic exegesis of Dewey's ethical theory. Key concepts like habit, experience, value, inquiry, and responsibility are analyzed and represented in a pragmatist vein and then brought together in a vision of ethics that focuses on responsibility to one's self and one's community rather than focusing on liability and blame.

The second is a detailed rendering of the professional and ethical life of the hypothetical but clearly experience-grounded principal Maria De La Garza, her colleagues, her students, and other constituents. The essence of this effort is captured in the main title, "Ethical Dilemmas in Schools." What Simpson and Sacken call "in-text vignettes" are much more than that. They are seemingly discrete cases interspersed with relevant Deweyan theory but woven together to capture De La Garza's professional and ethical practice and the dilemmas that challenge her. Those cases prompt us to imagine ideals, values, and principles – but we are also prompted by the discussion of Dewey's ethical theory to analyze and weigh the range of possibilities for right action that each case presents.

By fully developing each of these two phases of their work and by weaving the two together, Simpson and Sacken are "doing Dewey"; that is, they are living and thinking the reality that theory and practice are dialectically connected. They are two sides of the same coin, two views of the same reality. Thus, the authors avoid both the criticism of casuistry as relativistic and narrowly focused and the criticism of theory as absolutist and abstract. They invite, no, they *compel* us to come to the dilemmas that arise in our lives as educators with a theorist's eye *and* a practitioner's heart. Principles matter, but so too do consequences. Justice is required, but so too is caring. The habits that constitute ethical virtues will carry us, but just so far. When the situation demands more than our virtues easily allow, we must shift into full-blown ethical inquiry, and in the process, reconstruct new, more adequate virtues, principles, and habits.

As Simpson and Sacken tell us,

> only by engaging in ethical investigation, reflection, and action as a complete person is one enabled to avoid what Dewey terms "the great moral tragedy" that separates "warm emotion and cool intelligence" (MW 14, 177). Emotions and intelligence, not scorching passions or arid reasoning, are especially useful in collaboratively discussing polarizing school issues. Appreciating the affectional ties of participants facing ethical quandaries may surface reasons for students' and colleagues' choices and actions.

This is Dewey's "pragmatic experimentalism," an approach that emphasizes deliberation about "viable choices and actions, a scientific approach to ethical inquiry and development, and an evaluation of the likely and actual consequences of moral decisions and actions" (LW 7; Martin 2002). The "good and bad, right and wrong, virtue and vice, and prudence and imprudence" (LW 5, 279–88) all come into play.

That this is a book for educators, present and future, is clear from the opening bell. The title proclaims it, the structure marks it, and the thread of cases highlight it. Simpson and Sacken show their cards clearly when they tell us that "addressing ethical concerns is an intrinsic, not intrusive, part of being a teacher and leader." They lead us from expectations to empathy, from principles through care and on to specific problematic situations, and finally, to the ethical educators who navigate those problems within the confines of good schools (and too often, not so good schools). In the process, we come to understand that educators' basic ethical responsibility requires the capacity to recognize when an issue is ethical and to examine such problematic situations thoroughly – always

doing so in the face of doubt, conflict, disequilibrium, and complexity. Rushing to judgment is unethical; it leads to misdiagnosed situations and unwarranted conclusions and outcomes. Instead,

> inquiry is [to be] exacted: observation of the detailed makeup of the situation; analysis, into its diverse factors; clarification of what is obscure; discounting of the more insistent and vivid traits; tracing the consequences of the various modes of action that suggest themselves; regarding the decision reached as hypothetical and tentative until the anticipated or supposed consequences which led to its adoption have been squared with actual consequences. (MW 12, 173)

This is intellectually difficult and demanding. It calls on and calls out our inquisitiveness, our ethical imagination, and our creative deliberation. It requires that we confront what Dewey calls "the prevalence of prejudice" (LW 5, 397).

It is also emotionally difficult and demanding. Simpson and Sacken clearly convey what interpreters of Dewey sometimes miss: thinking well is as much an affective as a cognitive endeavor. As they remind us: "To ignore the emotional aspect of ethical inquirers and participants, for Dewey, was to disregard a vital part of the human personality and ethical inquiry. In the end, such neglect is similar to disregarding acts or outcomes: unthinkable." Empathy and sympathy are not merely prosocial feelings; they are the affective markers of our capacity to rightly understand students' and colleagues' emotions, thoughts, values, and challenges. They provide a window into personal and cultural narratives.

A hidden strength of the Simpson and Sacken collaboration is the book's direct engagement with matters of ethical absolutism and ethical relativism. In my experience, this is the issue that divides well-intentioned persons of all cultural and political stripes. Some of us want, need, and are committed to answers that are absolute and uncompromising; others of us tolerate, welcome, even wallow in ethical ambiguity. Some of us believe that there is no ethics if there are no inviolable rules; others of us are painfully aware of the subtle difference that context and conditions make even in similar situations and wonder if rules are not made to be broken. It is hard to make sense of the reality that while having rules is clearly better than not having any, sometimes following the rules does substantial harm.

Simpson and Sacken do not back away from this conundrum. They speak the pragmatist "truth": principles are not rules. The fact that particular rules are not inviolable does *not* mean anything goes. They quote Dewey:

> Rules are practical; they are habitual ways of doing things. But principles are intellectual; they are the final methods used in judging suggested courses of action. . . . [T]he object of moral principles is to supply standpoints and methods which will enable the individual to make for [her]himself an analysis of the elements of good and evil in the particular situation in which [s]he finds [her]himself. (LW 7, 280)

There is no substitute for ethical judgment. Unlike rules which are followed or applied – often unthinkingly – principles are a powerful tool for judgment in problematic situations. We use them to help us "think about attitudes, acts, and consequences." But no act can be judged based on principles alone. We need situational variables, ethical continuities, and prospective consequences to flesh out our judgments. Moreover, principles are not "given." They are "constructed, discovered, justified, and used when thinking and deciding."

I bring this up at this juncture because some argue that casuistry – using cases not just to illustrate or apply rules but also to generate principles as new habits of thought, feeling, and behavior – is specious and unhelpful. Their position is that relying on cases opens you up to the dangers of relativism. However, this need not be the case, as Albert Jonsen and Stephen Toulmin demonstrated in their 1988 book *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning*. Using cases to develop and ground principles is the one approach that can dissolve what appears to be a contradiction between moral absolutism and moral relativism.

Deweyan pragmatism acknowledges that "we are justified in using" repeatedly verified truth claims "as if they were absolutely true" but cautions that each as if absolute claim is a provisional claim "subject to being corrected by future consequences" and new research (LW 2, 12). There *are* "relational universals" (that is, claims that everybody – across cultures and political chasms – takes for granted). There are "practical certainties" (that is, claims of all kinds that function as useful "rules to live by."). They work to get us through the day. They should not be lightly discarded. At the same time, as we have known since Hume first posited the problem of induction, they are likely to be true, but never certain – and each could be undercut with the next wave of experience.

Dewey's willingness to take cases seriously – and to resolve those cases by "working collaboratively, thinking empathetically, deciding deliberatively, and acting reflectively" – does not lead to a simplistic relativistic ethic. It leads to an ethic of constancy *and* flexibility. It leads to the possibility of living as an authentic self in community.

In the face of conflicting desires, obligations, and virtues, we are called by Dewey to *investigate* first and foremost. That investigation is an embodied experience, thought, felt, and enacted. The challenge is to take on as a new habit of ethical reasoning "a rhythm of seeking and finding, of reaching out for a tenable conclusion, and coming to what is at least a tentative one" (LW 10, 183). In the light of each tentative, tenable conclusion, we act – and test our conclusions over and over and over again, reframing new principles, new virtues, new habits in what will always be a multigenerational, multi-entity, and multinational endeavor (Garrison, Neubert, and Reich 2012, 103).

Like Maria De La Garza, each of us is regularly asked to take stock of "the ethical forum" of our own minds. We are required to face the forces that influence us and to recognize and acknowledge how those forces limit the ethical possibilities of another. We are prompted to make choices, and "the cumulative force of [serious and] trivial choices" determines who each of us is and who we are all together becoming.

For those of us who call ourselves educators, we ask only this: that our understandings, affections, and choices are in the process of being transformed into "habits of refined moral sensitivity, discernment, and perception – habits analogous to those of an artist" (Fesmire 1995, 592). If these habits take hold, then, in Dewey's words,

> the school becomes . . . a form of social life, a miniature community and one in close interaction with modes of associated experience beyond school walls. All education which develops power to share effectively in social life is moral. It forms a character which not only deems the particular deed socially necessary but one which is interested in that continuous readjustment which is essential to growth. Interest in learning from all contacts of life is the essential moral interest. (MW 9, 370)

We can all be indebted to Doug Simpson and Mike Sacken for reminding us of this principle so central to the pursuit of our work as educators.

Barbara S. Stengel
Professor Emerita
George Peabody College
Vanderbilt University

Preface

> Democracy is belief in the ability of human experience to generate the aims and methods by which further experience will grow in ordered richness. Every other form of moral and social faith rests upon the idea that experience must be subjected at some point or other to some form of external control; to some "authority" alleged to exist outside the processes of experience. Democracy is the faith that the process of experience is more important than any special result attained, so that special results achieved are of ultimate value only as they are used to enrich and order the ongoing process. Since the process of experience is capable of being educative, faith in democracy is all one with faith in experience and education.
> —John Dewey, "Creative Democracy – The Task Before Us" (LW 14, 229)

In order to clarify the focus of *Ethical Dilemmas in Schools*: *A Collaborative Approach to Inquiry, Decision-Making, and Action*, it is useful to explain that it is, foremost, an introduction to democratic ethical inquiry and reflection and is designed for professors in educator preparation programs and, thereby, for their students, especially K–12 administrators, teachers, and related staff. But policymakers, parents, and guardians should find the work beneficial too. In fact, the work may be more beneficial than one initially assumes. While our focus is on John Dewey's understanding of ethics and his approach to addressing ethical dilemmas and issues, we suggest readings that enrich, question, and diverge from his orientation. We raise questions and engage other ethical theories, especially, but not exclusively, those that are often familiar to professors and educators, e.g., deontology, care ethic, consequentialism, and virtue theory. We did this because Dewey himself examined features of many theories and culled from them ideas that he found insightful and warranted. But he went further too, assessing and reconstructing aspects of other theories to incorporate into his own philosophy. His views, therefore, represent at least a partial appreciation and critique of a variety of

ethical theories. Likewise, his ideas are sometimes precursors to aspects of other ethical theories, especially those that have emerged more recently, e.g., contemporary care, feminist, and, if one focuses on social justice, critical theories. Understanding well the distinctiveness of Dewey's ethical theory and its implications for educational leaders, whether classroom teachers or school administrators, then, means understanding certain features of the theories he examined and anticipated. Interestingly, Dewey (LW 7, 337–9) states that the teacher is an "intellectual leader" of classrooms and students. By virtue of her or his professional and experiential knowledge, she or he should be welcomed into nearly any ethical discussion of educational issues.

A general goal, then, is to present Dewey's ideas selectively, concisely, and, on occasion, comparatively without offering either a complete historical contextualization or a sustained evaluation of them. Happily, implicit critique of his views from different viewpoints is found herein and explicit criticism is found elsewhere in a plethora of works. In addition, systematic contextualizations of his ethical views are provided by many scholars, including Robert B. Westbrook's *John Dewey and American Democracy* (1991) and Gregory F. Pappas's *John Dewey's Ethics*: *Democracy as Experience* (2008). In short, then, we introduce aspects of Dewey's ethical views, illustrate them, and encourage readers to discuss and test his ideas by analyzing and applying them to actual and imagined professional ethical challenges. Our hope is that many education preparation scholars, moral educators, and educational researchers will also examine Dewey's ideas so that their specific interests are informed by his thought. In turn, their evaluation of Dewey's ethical thinking – scientifically, experientially, and philosophically – can strengthen the field of ethics and education and, thereby, the areas of moral development and education. In addition, researchers can test Dewey's hypotheses in order to clarify which aspects of his thinking can be confirmed, which ones need reconsideration, and which merit rejection.

A second clarification concerns the structure of *Ethical Dilemmas in Schools*. We use several methods to advance an understanding of the chapters' themes and, thereby, ethical reflection and action. Securing a finer grasp of a Deweyan-informed ethic involves engaging in ethical deliberations and problem-solving, analyses that deal with the problems of societies, schools, educators, and students. The methods employed in each chapter include: (a) an epigraph to introduce chapter topics; (b) in-text vignettes to demonstrate the relevance of Dewey's ideas; (c) "Stop and Think" pauses to stimulate thinking and, if desired,

discussions; (d) graphic illustrations to enhance understanding of strategic concepts; and (e) a set of end-of-chapter materials (discussion questions, related readings, and case studies) to foster broader thinking.

The epigraphs offer a series of snapshots that reveal several key features of Dewey's ethical themes and deliberations. Building on the epigraphs and related ideas, the in-text case vignettes focus largely on Maria De La Garza's ethical challenges. Maria, a fictional character, is the principal of the Academy for Civic Responsibility, where our illustrations and vignettes are situated. Collectively, these vignettes constitute Maria's story. The illustrations illuminate Dewey's ideas as they are employed to clarify ethically challenging issues, which are found in many schools and communities. Maria's story, with its assorted permutations, is an implicit, oblique, and thin excursion into narrative ethics. The Stop and Think pauses are designed to slow one's reading of the material and to guide one's thinking about and discussions of pertinent issues. These pauses, in a sense, broadcast Dewey's call for reflective breaks when a person is facing ethical quandaries. In *How We Think*, Dewey claims that:

> The working over of a vague and more or less casual idea into coherent and definite form is impossible without a pause, without freedom from distraction. We say, "Stop and think"; well, all reflection involves, at some point, stopping external observations and reactions so that an idea may mature. Meditation, withdrawal or abstraction from clamorous assailants of the senses and from demands for overt action, is as necessary at the reasoning stage as are observation and experiment at other periods. The metaphors of digestion and assimilation, which so readily occur to mind in connection with rational elaboration, are highly instructive. *A silent, uninterrupted working-over of considerations by comparing and weighing alternative suggestions is indispensable for the development of coherent and compact conclusions.* Reasoning is no more akin to disputing or arguing or to the abrupt seizing and dropping of suggestions than digestion is to a noisy champing of the jaws. (LW 8, 335–6; emphasis added)

Stop and Think pauses, then, are not primarily intended to encourage dialogues. Dewey's intent is to cultivate times of reflection, digestion, and assimilation. He suggests at least an intellectual retreat to think about some ethical challenges. On the other hand, when a Stop and Think pause is used to stimulate class discussions, Dewey's claim about conflict is particularly relevant: "Conflict" – disagreement in the language of some – regarding ideas and opinions, especially if not emotionally dominated, "is the gadfly of thought" (MW 14, 207). In our case, then, his reflective device is used as a pedagogical device and is designed

to foster private and public understanding, reflection, and inquiry into everyday school and life affairs.

A third point we wish to note is that the end-of-chapter materials employ Dewey's and others' ideas as tools to analyze a case study. Additionally, we recommend his and others' writings for a broader and deeper look into ethical issues and paradigms. The related readings include pertinent material from Dewey's and other ethicists' writings that inform or challenge an emphasis of the chapter, sometimes giving alternative perspectives. The end-of-chapter cases, occasionally created by blending fragments of actual experiences with imaginary ones, are anonymized and designed to be provocative but not necessarily solvable problems. Dewey, in fact, believes that some problems cannot be solved because they and their situations are too complex and resources are too few. Even so, they need to be addressed and ameliorated in ways that are ethically feasible and warranted. Leaving complicated situations simply as they are encountered runs counter to the desire to at least better life for everyone. Besides, how can problems be deemed insolvable if they are not seriously examined and addressed through the lenses of different paradigms and experiments?

We encourage readers to anonymize and fictionalize their own experiences for ethical analysis. In this way, employing Dewey's analytical method of problem-solving can begin immediately. One's immersion in a personal past, present, or prospective problematic situation helps meet Dewey's ideal of engaging the whole person in problem-solving. For, only by engaging in ethical investigation, reflection, and action as a complete person is one enabled to avoid what Dewey terms "the great moral tragedy" that separates "warm emotion and cool intelligence" (MW 14, 177). Emotions and intelligence, not scorching passions or sterile reasoning, are especially useful in collaboratively discussing polarizing school issues. Appreciating the affectional ties of participants facing ethical quandaries may surface reasons for students' and colleagues' choices and actions.

A singularly important feature of the volume requires attention; for, we have done more than provide a series of ethical issues and dilemmas in the book. We provide a narrative for ethical analyses; our scenarios, examples, and cases are situated in a particular school, with details and circumstances that remain relevant throughout the volume. Thus, the principal, Maria De La Garza, is, first, an observer of and, now and then, a participant in, problematic situations, analyzing and responding to events in the Academy. But, for some, she may also be seen as a creator of problems. The problems situated in the Academy occurred during her twelve-year

principalship, although their presentation herein may leave the impression of being clustered in a shorter period. The ethical scenarios are not necessarily in chronological order. The Academy is a K–12 school of choice that draws its population from the Harbor School District. The Academy is a theme-based school: Academy for Civic Responsibility. The specialized focus of the curriculum is geared to nurture habits of ethical conduct and decision-making by students.

Among the Academy's distinctive curricular and pedagogical features are community service-based experiences, adult mentors, inter-age student collaboration in project-based learning, democratic decision-making experiences, social justice engagements, and a variety of intergenerational experiential learning activities across the entire curriculum. The social studies, history, and literature courses draw upon the realities of how many nations have been populated by waves of immigrants and repopulated by episodic migrations (MW 13, 295–305). To enhance these studies, the Academy, with parental alternatives, has third-grade DNA analyses to inform students of their ancestry.

The school is organized into ten vertically arranged or all-grade houses of equal size, each with vertical faculty. Co-curricular activities within the Academy are often based on the house as the unit of membership for teams or other representative activities apart from school- or district-wide activities, which are more typically based on age or other characteristics. Likewise, houses are intended to be an essential base for welcoming newcomers, nurturing community, facilitating friendships, and providing microgovernance and leadership experiences. Each house participates in academy-wide governance experiences too.

Students are drawn from applicants across the district and the demographics of the Academy are intended to more or less mirror those of the district as a whole. The Academy is one of two theme-based schools in the district, and the newest one to open. A majority of the district's secondary students now attend specialty middle and high schools, but the only other K–12 school is the Fine Arts Academy. Both schools are experimental and evaluated accordingly. The Academy for Civic Responsibility is capped at a total of 800 students, which is near the upper limit of small schools that are sometimes shown to be effective academically with an inclusive student population (Lee and Smith 1997). The school is centrally located in a refurbished high school near the city's center. The city's population is slightly over 100,000; the district's student population is around 12,500.

When the school was organized, its faculty and staff positions were opened to all eligible district employees and then positions were filled by

the newly appointed school administrative staff. After selecting 30 percent of the teaching staff, three teachers were added to the selection committee. The district sought to have a demographically diverse staff to fit the expected student body and families that joined the school. Like the district itself, the school's staff is disproportionately white and female but is diverse, particularly in the elementary and middle grades. And because this school was viewed by many faculty and staff as a new and attractive opportunity, the faculty and staff were skewed toward more experience than averages across the district. There is age diversity as well, with the elementary and middle school faculty younger and less experienced on average than the high school. In view of the Academy's organization, problematic ethical situations arise in classes, within houses, and across the entire school, not to mention before and after school and in the hallways, restrooms, cafeteria, and gymnasium.

When the school was planned, the Design Committee chose the idea of dividing the students and faculty into a set of houses. Given the impact of Hogwarts on the world at that time, the idea was pervasive and persuasive. Indeed, the first complex decision was what to name the houses once some members of the committee understood that the names of Hogwarts' houses belonged to J. K. Rowling and could not be appropriated. The alternative of using names of the country's early explorers and founders was unappealing due to the prospect of having nearly all houses named after white males. The eventual consensus was naming the houses after wild animals; to wit, houses were named after various breeds of big wild cats (in the Felidae family). In time, some lower grades of Academy houses pushed to have small- to medium-sized wild cats (in the Felinae subfamily) approved as names or co-names. In fact, it was the pre-eleven-year-old students in the Lions House that argued successfully that their house would better represent their interests if it were named the Black Footed Cats & Lions House, especially since all lion symbols to date had been roaring males. The group's first request for the name Rag Doll Cats and Lions House was denied because the Rag Doll is a domestic cat. By accident, then, the wild cats of the world instantly became collateral curriculum, leading to a better understanding of their animal and human neighbors and their ecologies.

The houses were populated vertically, with members from every level assigned. Once a child enters the school, they are assigned to one of the houses and, apart from unexpected situations, remains in that house for their entire time at the Academy. The vertical configuration ensures younger students have mentors and role models to help socialize them

and allows students of all ages to participate in various civic programs and volunteer work. Also, within each house, students play a meaningful role in policy formation and governance with leadership operating in a horizontal manner for some issues and a vertical manner for others. The same process extrapolates out from the houses to an academy-wide governance process. Participation in decision-making is universal, albeit shaped by developmentally appropriate roles that coordinate with curriculum and co-curricular experiences.

Consistent with Dewey's thinking (EW 5, 84–95), the Academy does not prepare students for predictable, adult worlds. Instead, studies are essential parts of students' daily lives and their experiences and are designed to enhance student understanding of and participation in the life and dynamic work of society. Being engaged imaginatively and fruitfully in the present world is considered the best preparation for any future world. Hence, the Academy is forward-looking in its curricula. Obviously, a central component of student development is framed in both personal and social ethical growth. But this is readily pursued because Dewey (LW 2, 282–7) conceives of social and ethical development being practically identical.

The concerns of the Academy for Civic Responsibility are streamed throughout Chapters 1–7. Chapter 1, "What Can Educators Expect from Ethics?" provides a brief examination of some conflicting views of what many existing and aspiring educators may expect from a study of ethics as well as hints of how Dewey does or does not meet their expectancies. Dewey's thinking is injected into the expected discussion, sometimes with a dialogical flavor. In particular, the importance of Dewey's emphases on reflective experience, inquiry or investigation, the nature of problematic situations, the rhythm of seeking and finding pertinent data and arguments, and the development of tenable and tentative conclusions are introduced.

Chapters 2–7 provide more details about Dewey's thinking, especially how his emphases on the roles of sympathy and empathy (Chapter 2), the nature of ethical principles (Chapter 3), the principle of regard for people (Chapter 4), the nature of problematic situations (Chapter 5), the qualities of ethical educators (Chapter 6), and the characteristics of good schools (Chapter 7) fit together to help inform board members, superintendents, central office personnel, principals, teachers, support personnel, and parents about how to envision and make ethical decisions. Therefore, everyone needs to be involved when decisions are made about building ethical schools and districts and addressing ethical controversies. But more is

embedded in these chapters: We explore Dewey's thoughts about the importance of developing a comprehensive picture of a good, meaningful, satisfying, or flourishing life. We discuss this sphere of his thought because he argues that the ethical person is a stronger, more engaged, reflective, happy, and caring person than she or he would be otherwise if he or she unifies the multiple dimensions of one's self and life, including the aesthetic, social, emotional, vocational, scientific, natural, and spiritual. But as a social philosopher and public intellectual, Dewey was also interested in everyday life and ordinary people. Thus, he discusses how a good society is formed through ongoing contributions by people from all walks of life. Conversely, he rejects the idea of intimidating students, educators, and parents into ethical conformity.

The Epilogue is both a threadlike summary of the previous emphases of the chapters and a new infusion of Dewey's thoughts. In keeping with Dewey's philosophy, the conclusions he reaches are hypotheses that are subject to further research, experience, and deliberation.

Dewey (LW 7, xxxv) considers his ethical theory to be dynamic and subject to change, for it is tied to "the growth of knowledge." Thus, he (xxxv) encourages warranted revisions and improvements "as knowledge grows." His growth-of-knowledge orientation is an explicit feature of his thought.

Acknowledgments

As researchers understand well, they are deeply indebted to numerous people. Those who study John Dewey often thank Southern Illinois University Carbondale, its Special Collections Research Center of the Morris Library, the University Press, and the Center for Dewey Studies too. In particular, we thank the SIU Press for permission to quote from *The Collected Works of John Dewey* and *Unmodern Philosophy and Modern Philosophy.* Our indebtedness to the late Jo Ann Boydston for her masterful editorial work on the critical edition of *The Collected Works of John Dewey, 1882–1953* and to Larry A. Hickman for his superb editorial leadership on the electronic edition (2008) is also enormous – difficult to overstate. The recent work of Phillip Deen (2012) in identifying, editing, and securing the publication of Dewey's long-misplaced manuscript *Unmodern Philosophy and Modern Philosophy* is also appreciated. Moreover, without permission to quote frequently from Dewey's works, we would have been less able to stimulate readers with his own words and, thereby, entice them to read further, especially in his and Tufts' *Ethics* (1932 edition), and his *Democracy and Education* (1916), *Reconstruction in Philosophy and Essays* (1920), *Human Nature and Conduct* (1922), "Qualitative Thought" (1930), "Three Independent Factors in Morals" (1930), and *Art as Experience* (1934).

We also acknowledge our depending on research that was originally published elsewhere: (1) "The Sympathetic-Empathetic Teacher: A Deweyan Analysis" (2014) in the *Journal of Philosophy & History of Education*; (2) "The Ethical Principle of Regard for People: Using Dewey's Ideas in Schools" (2015) in the *International Journal of Progressive Education*; and (3) "Ethical Principles and School Challenges: A Deweyan Analysis" (2016) in *Education and Culture*. The theoretical elements of these articles inform sections of this volume, particularly Chapters 2–4. Our thanks are extended to the editors and publishers of these works for granting permission to draw from them.

We are deeply indebted to Cecilia Silva in ways that would be stunning if we did not know her well as a colleague and friend. She first surprised us when she volunteered to read an early draft of the manuscript and to provide extensive feedback. She amazed us when she later offered to read and discuss the manuscript and to assist with concluding details. Our debt to her is beyond expression.

Importantly, we want to thank the students, colleagues, editors, and reviewers who provided feedback on earlier discussions, presentations, and manuscripts that deal with Dewey's ethical theorizing. Like current reviewers and editors, they appraised aspects of our work and helped us clarify Dewey's views. Simply expressing thanks to these people is manifestly inadequate, but not recognizing their generous influence seems incalculably worse. In addition, we cannot fail to thank a select group of people who read portions of earlier manuscripts that laid a foundation for this book. That is, we are immeasurably indebted to Eric Bredo, Nance Cunningham, Joe DeVitis, Jim Garrison, M. Francyne Huckaby, Michael J. B. Jackson, Bruce Maxwell, Brandy Quinn, David Snelgrove, and our anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments as this work evolved. Their suggestions significantly informed the work, enabling us to provide greater depth, balance, and relevance. Tammy Riemenschneider deserves a separate word of thanks for her contributions, including earlier feedback on two related publications, as well as for making suggestions for the incipient volume. Similarly, we thank Paige Tooley for her early editorial feedback and Jenny Moore for her graphic design suggestions.

Appreciation is extended to John P. Portelli, University of Toronto, for inviting the first author to serve as an external member of a dissertation committee on Charles Taylor's educational theory and to discuss the nascent scope of this project with a cadre of faculty and graduate students. The timing of the visit and discussions crucially shaped the direction of the project. In addition, William Hare and Cornell Thomas each devoted considerable time to examining in depth separate chapters of the book. We greatly appreciate Peggie Price's sharing of her time and research expertise with us. Molly Spain expertly oversaw the final editing and preparation of the manuscript before we forwarded it to our Cambridge University Press editors. Molly is a master editor and a major reason we completed the work. Finally, we wish to express our gratitude to Niranjana Harikrishnan, Penny Harper, Jessica Norman, David Repetto, and Emily Watton, who were enormously supportive of the work. Of course, we alone are responsible for the contents and infelicitous remarks in the work. Finally, we happily thank Barbara Stengel for contributing the Foreword to the book.

Her generous reading of the work often says more elegantly what we ourselves attempted to convey.

In closing, we want to express our appreciation to four extraordinary supporters. First, our indebtedness to Mary Patton, former dean of the College of Education, Texas Christian University, for her support is gladly acknowledged. Her unwavering encouragement of this project has been exceptional. Likewise, we appreciate the consistent encouragement of Nowell Donovan, former provost of Texas Christian University, who enabled us to complete the work. Judy and Nancy also have our sincere appreciation and unending admiration for their support, personally and professionally. We treasure their tolerance of our consumption of temporal and psychic resources.