

CHAPTER FOUR

Common Goals, Deweyan Community, and the Resolution of Freire's Teacher–Student Contradiction

Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction by reconciling the roles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers *and* students.

Paulo Freire (1970/1997, p. 53)

In our studies of Neha Shah and Ellen Williams we saw clearly the cultural and linguistic chasm that frequently separates teacher and underprepared student. Put differently, we came to see that Fishman's struggles with Neha and Ellen were as much about overcoming a cultural, class, and/or ethnic barrier as about reconciling different educational goals and aspirations. Thus, we were determined that when another underprepared writer enrolled in one of Fishman's classes we would pay close attention to the chasm between instructor and pupil: a disjunction that Freire calls the teacher-student contradiction. Indeed, such a student, Andre Steadman, did appear the following semester in Steve's advanced class, Philosophy of Education. In this chapter we tell Andre's story, and, employing Freirian lenses, we probe the impact of Fishman's Deweyan pedagogy on the contradictions that initially separated this student and Steve.

As we show in chapters 2 and 3, Neha Shah and Ellen Williams made progress in philosophy despite their lack of interest in the subject matter and despite having goals that conflicted with those of their teacher. They did this by drawing upon a variety of instructional supports that were available in Fishman's classroom. Andre Steadman, the 21-year-old, African American student and novice

writer on whom we focus in this chapter, also made progress. However, Andre's gains were only partially attributable to instructional supports available to all of Fishman's students. Instead, because Andre and Steve were able to find, amongst their many differences, a number of common goals, they developed a cooperative, tutorial relationship that became the foundation of Andre's achievements. In this chapter, then, we explore an instructional dynamic—a weekly one-on-one tutorial, an extra help session between teacher and student—that is quite different from the whole-class interactions we featured in our accounts of Neha and Ellen. Whereas in the tutorial there is the obvious advantage of a teacher focusing exclusively on one individual's needs, there is also the disadvantage of no opportunity for the sort of productive interaction among students that played such a large role in Neha's and Ellen's cases.

Although the instructional dynamic between Andre and Steve was different from what it was with Neha or Ellen, Andre's experiences in philosophy, like these women's, were shaped by the particular array of resources—social, academic, and linguistic—he brought with him. With regard to academic capital, Andre fit somewhere between Neha and Ellen. Although he did not have Neha's past record of scholastic achievement, he had been making steady progress toward his bachelor's degree since he graduated from high school three years earlier. Although he was employed 40 hours a week in a 4:00-to-midnight job monitoring software at a local bank, he, unlike both Neha and Ellen, saw himself as a full-time student. Also, unlike Neha and Ellen, Andre told Fishman he was happy to be at UNC Charlotte.

Even more important than Andre's history of continuous schooling and positive attitude toward the University was the particular approach he adopted toward Fishman's course. Because of this posture, as we will show, it took Andre and Steve only two weeks to shape the cooperative relationship that it took Steve and Ellen almost a year and a half to develop and that totally eluded Steve and Neha.

Our story of Andre is divided, like those we tell of Neha and Ellen, into three parts. In Part One, Fishman presents the Deweyan-Freirian theory behind his tutorial arrangement with Andre. That is,

Steve outlines the way he uses Dewey's ideas about democratic community to ameliorate the chasm, or contradiction, between Andre and himself. In doing so, Fishman further develops the discussion he began in chapter 2 about the different strategies Dewey and Freire suggest for fashioning equitable school relations. Specifically, Steve fills out his explanation of why—despite his deep respect for Freire's radical vision of a transformed society—he adopts a Deweyan pedagogy and a gradualist approach toward social reform.

In Part Two, Fishman and McCarthy describe Andre's challenges and successes in *Philosophy of Education* as well as in his courses in three subsequent semesters. In this part, we individually author alternate sections, detailing Andre's experiences from both the teacher's and student's point of view.

Finally, we conclude this chapter, as we have the preceding two, with a coda in which we once more bring into the open our disagreements. This time, our differences focus on McCarthy's charge that Fishman, in his responses to Andre, underappreciated the depth of America's history of radical politics and the dangers of our present capitalist and consumerist culture. She claims that, as a result, Fishman missed important chances to work for increased social and economic justice.



Part One

Linking Dewey's Community and Freire's Liberatory Classroom

STEVE FISHMAN

As we said in chapter 1, the task of explicating, comparing, and applying Dewey and Freire is a challenging one given the vast corpus of these theorists' work and the complex strands of thought woven into their politics and pedagogies. As we also said, we believe our characterizations of them—Dewey as gradualist social reformer and Freire as radical transformer—are justifiable, although the richness

of their philosophies means they can be read and characterized in different ways.

Therefore, as I began my work with Andre Steadman in spring 1999, I relied on our characterizations, and I hoped that by enacting Dewey's conception of democratic community¹ I could succeed in softening the teacher-student contradiction that Freire deplors. Attempting to carry out Deweyan theory to achieve Freirian ends may seem surprising because Dewey's political orientation and approach to the classroom is, as I have noted, quite different from Freire's. Despite the fact that they share the same goal—extension of democracy from the political to the economic and civic spheres—their analysis of human history, and, thus, their means of achieving this goal are diverse.

Dewey understands history as a series of clashes between inherited social institutions and contemporary developments. He sees the challenge for both the individual and society at large as setting aside or altering habits developed in an earlier time that, in present conditions, are no longer appropriate. For example, he (1935/1991) explains the inequitable distribution of wealth in capitalism as the result of outdated institutions—in particular, the legal property system that allows industrial entrepreneurs “to reap out of all proportion to what they sow”—frustrating the potential of modern science and technology to better the lives of all (p. 53). Dewey's solution to this inequity rests on expanding the democratic aspects of capitalism—that is, reforming outdated legal codes and moral attitudes through the application of scientific method or “organized intelligence” (p. 56; 1934, pp. 73–79; 1936/1987, p. 132, 141–45).

By contrast, Freire (1970/1997) views history as a continuous conflict between social classes. He understands economic inequities to be the result of deliberate subjugation of one class by another and sees little positive in capitalism upon which to build social reform. Given that, for Freire, class conflict is the key to historic change, and proletarian struggle, rather than application of scientific method, is history's primary liberalizing force, his hope for increased social justice lies in freeing, or “humanizing,” the oppressed.

Although Freire (1994) does not altogether discount the possibility of a “broadening of democratic spaces” within capitalism, spaces where the bourgeoisie and the proletariat can negotiate (p. 92), he is steadfast in his claim that workers and the dominant class are caught in serious contradiction. He tells us that while there are exceptional situations in which the oppressed and oppressor classes may act in concert, we must never forget that “when the emergency which united them is past, they will return to the contradiction which defines their existence and never really disappears” (1970/1997, p. 125). Since Freire (1994) believes that capitalists are, by nature, “dehumanizers” who cannot participate in liberating the oppressed, he argues that they will always impede the human “ontological vocation” of increased equity and justice (pp. 98–99). In short, as I read Freire, the only time real harmony between different social classes will occur is when the bourgeoisie disappears and a classless society emerges. (For further discussion of Freire’s views of class polarizations, see Taylor, 1993.)

Because Dewey’s approach involves less class polarizing than Freire’s, I believed it offered me, in the current North American climate, a practicable way of softening Freire’s teacher-student contradiction. That is, the gradualist approach underlying Dewey’s pedagogy—his view that there are democratic and progressive forces within capitalism on which to base class reconciliation—made his classroom orientation more useful to me than Freire’s. This is because Dewey’s theory can account for my students’ and my own complex and often overlapping mixtures of opposition and accommodation to the values of the dominant elite. In *Liberalism and Social Action*, Dewey (1935/1991) explicitly warns against the use of static and polarized class affiliations. He writes,

In spite of the existence of class conflicts, amounting at times to veiled civil war, any one habituated to the use of the method of science will view with considerable suspicion the erection of actual human beings into fixed entities called classes, having no overlapping interests and so internally unified and externally separated that they are made the protagonists of history . . .” (p. 56; see also Eastman, 1959, p. 292).

In sum, I believed that, applied to my classroom, Dewey's analysis of class relations within capitalism—his conception that classes are dynamic and overlapping rather than static and mutually exclusive—provided me with a practicable basis for reducing Freire's teacher-student contradiction. Put another way, Dewey's analysis is less vulnerable to the postmodern charge that has been leveled at Freire's conception, namely, that it neglects the ambiguous and shifting social spaces that North American teachers and students actually occupy (Glass, 2001; McCarthy, 1988; Taylor, 1993; Weiler, 1994, 1996. For more general criticism of conceptions of worker and owner classes as distinct and monolithic, see Gottlieb, 1992, pp. 141–145.)

Freire's Approach to the Teacher-Student Contradiction

According to my reading, Freire (1970/1997) wants liberatory teachers to focus on the way capitalists have foisted distorted pictures of reality onto the working class in order to maintain their power. Freire (Shor & Freire, 1987) also wants teachers to learn from their working class students how these students see the world and to become sensitive to “the beauty of their language and wisdom” (p. 30; Freire, 1994, pp. 68–85). This is in line with his belief, shared by Dewey, that teachers should become learners and learners should become teachers (1970/1997, pp. 53, 61; 1970/2000, p. 27; Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 33; see also Dewey, 1916/1967, p. 160). Unfortunately, Freire finds that in most schools teachers assume they have all the knowledge and students none. In other words, he finds teachers attempting to fill their students with information as if they were bank accounts designed for receiving knowledge deposits. He (1970/1997) calls this sort of banking approach a “contradiction” (p. 53).

However, Freire obviously does not mean that teachers are involved in a logical contradiction when they encourage student docility. Rather, building on Gramsci (1971), he sees education as a site of conflict, one in which teachers, consciously or unwittingly, serve the dominant class by transmitting capitalist values as transcendent truths. In other words, Freire extends Marx's (1932/1978)

analysis of class antagonism to cultural institutions like public schools. Traditional teachers in capitalism, Freire (1970/1997) suggests, serve the same oppressive function regarding proletarian children that police and soldiers serve regarding colonized natives. He writes, "A careful analysis of the teacher-student relationship at any level, inside or outside the school, reveals . . . a narrating Subject [the teacher] and patient, listening objects [the students]" (p. 52). Freire adds that this sort of banking pedagogy is not just an innocent mistake but an effort by the oppressor class to render students passive so they can more easily be dominated (p. 55). In a political and human sense, then, as opposed to a narrowly logical sense, teachers and students are, for Freire, in contradiction. The continued existence of the teacher means the dehumanization of the student. Freire states his radical means for reforming this situation most starkly when he suggests that if teachers are to overcome the teacher-student contradiction they must "die" to their middle-classness (p. 114). (I note that, in later work, Freire [Shor & Freire, 1987] suggests that the teacher-student contradiction can work in converse fashion: students who want to maintain the status quo resisting the transformative ideology of their "revolutionary" teachers [p. 69]).

I find three specific pedagogical features of traditional, banking education at the center of Freire's charge that teacher and student are caught in a contradictory relationship. The first is that teachers fail to promote active problem-posing and critical consciousness among their students (1970/1997). Second, teachers lack respect for pupil competencies that lie outside orthodox school measures (1993, 1994). And, finally, teachers distrust students' judgment and discount students' ability to orchestrate their own liberation (1970/1997, 1994; Shor & Freire, 1987).

Freire's (1983) solution to the traditional teacher-student antinomy starts with problem-posing education, helping students use "their reading and writing of the world" to "read and write the word" (p. 7). In other words, Freire (1970/1997) says that teachers should help students see their social environments as laced with exploitive relationships, and they should make these inequities the subject

matter of their literacy instruction. It is Freire's hope, as I interpret him, that as teachers adopt a problem-posing pedagogy they will begin the process of "dying" to their bourgeois values and being "reborn" in solidarity with their working class pupils (pp. 113–14; see also 1996, p. 163).

Dewey's Approach to Teacher-Student Tensions in Contrast to Freire's

I believe that Dewey would not deny the importance of Freire's starting point: his problem-posing approach. To the contrary, as I have said, Dewey (1916/1967), very much like Freire, wants students to become teachers and teachers to become students in the classroom (p. 160). Although Dewey, like Freire, decries docility in students, he sees banking education not as a nefarious political plot but simply as the result of teachers having an inadequate grasp of learning theory. As a consequence, instead of Freire's radical call for the dissolution of teacher's bourgeois loyalties, Dewey (1935/1991) urges teachers to help pupils employ "the method of intelligence" in collaborative projects and inquiry. In fact, Dewey says that the scientific method—"the method of cooperative experimental intelligence"—should be enacted in every branch and detail of school learning (p.35). The upshot is that whereas Freire's vision of the role instructors might play in resolving our present social dilemmas focuses on their unveiling the realities behind the oppression of the proletariat, Dewey's vision focuses primarily on teachers encouraging student use of "organized intelligence" in the context of cooperative, democratic classrooms.

This analysis, by Dewey, of what teachers might do to prepare students to liberalize American society undergirded my decision to begin my tutorial with Andre Steadman by attempting to fashion a democratic community with him, one in which we might practice Dewey's notion of intelligent, collaborative thinking. Before turning to the details of Andre's and my experiences in *Philosophy of Education*, I offer a brief exposition of Dewey's conception of democratic community.

Dewey's Conception of Democratic Community

Dewey (1927/1988a) tells us that the cure for the problems of American democracy is more democracy. And by "democracy" he does not just mean popularly elected officials, rule by law, and due process. Rather, for Dewey (1916/1967), democracy is "a mode of associated living," a way of working together that depends upon mutual consent and respect for the aims, emotions, and habitual responses of those with whom we associate (p. 87, 5). In fact, community and democracy are so closely tied in Dewey's view that he calls democracy "the idea of community life itself" (1927/1988a, p. 148).

In describing a desirable community, Dewey specifies three interwoven and recursive features: (1) common purpose and goals, (2) likemindedness, and (3) mutual care. By *common purpose*, Dewey (1916/1967) means more than just people's achieving shared goals by using one another, as is the case, for example, with many employers and employees. Instead, he envisions individuals working toward common ends who also respect one another's "emotional and intellectual dispositions" and seek one another's consent (p. 5). By *likemindedness*, Dewey refers to people's having enough common experiences to understand the meaning of each other's words and diverse perspectives. And by *mutual care*, Dewey envisions individuals encouraging the development of each other's unique abilities for the benefit of the whole. Mutually caring communities are those in which each person has "an equitable opportunity" to give to and receive from others, and, thus, what counts as progress for one has genuine value for all (p. 84; 1927a/1988, p. 149).

Essential to the development of common purpose, likemindedness, and mutual care, according to Dewey, is successful communication. Dewey's (1925/1989) example of such communication is one person, A, beckoning to another person, B, to bring a flower. To understand each other, says Dewey, person B must learn to see the world as person A sees it and vice-versa. He writes,

The characteristic thing about B's understanding of A's movement and sounds is that he responds to the thing from the standpoint of A.

He perceives the thing as it may function in A's experience, instead of just ego-centrally. Similarly, A in making the request conceives the thing not only in its direct relationship to himself, but as a thing capable of being grasped and handled by B (p. 148).

Put differently, people who communicate successfully are, to use a popular expression, on the same wave length. They respond in sufficiently similar ways to social events, requirements, and expectations that they are able to form communities that carry out common projects. Applied to the classroom, such communities engage in cooperatively organized inquiry and are akin to Pratt's (1991) "safe houses." However, in contrast to Pratt's safe houses which are homogeneous, with members sharing ethnicity, gender, race, or class, Dewey (1916/1967) wants to create communities of comfort that are transethnic. He wants the sort of "intermingling in the school . . . of different races, differing religions and unlike customs" that will create "a new and broader environment" (p. 21). That is, Dewey seeks to develop shared language and common cause while, at the same time, promoting exchanges among the variety of cultural and racial traditions represented by America's "hyphenated" citizenry (1916/1976a, 1916/1976b). In sum, Dewey believes that we can use our differences to expand the number of safe houses to which we belong.

In speaking of Deweyan community as a promising way of ameliorating Freire's teacher-student contradiction, I do not underestimate the obstacles to even modest liberalization of American schools and society. However, given the absence of any deeply rooted, radical tradition in the U.S.—as well as the hybrid aspirations and overlapping social locations of most teachers and students—the progressive movement within which Dewey writes seems to me a more realistic and hopeful basis for school reform than Freire's emphasis upon class conflict. That is, without denigrating the radical vision of proletarian triumph behind Freire's work, I believe Dewey's (1935/1991) gradualism, his trust in the further development of organized intelligence and democratic institutions within capitalism, offers a more practicable basis for classroom liberalization (p. 59).

As applied to my work with Andre Steadman in spring 1999, my hope was that by fashioning democratic community with Andre, I

would have a reasonable chance of softening the classroom contradictions Freire describes, a reasonable chance to better promote Andre's active learning, recognize and build on his competencies, and take seriously his own aspirations. I also believed that, if I succeeded, I would be taking a small step toward the reform which will, in Dewey's (1916/1967) words, "produce in schools a projection in type of the society we should like to realize, and by forming minds in accord with it gradually modify the larger and more recalcitrant features of adult society" (p. 317).

In the section immediately following, I set the stage for McCarthy's and my study of this third novice writer by reiterating my specific classroom objectives and, then, articulating the ideology, or political orientation, that underlies them.

OBJECTIVES FOR ADVANCED PHILOSOPHY STUDENTS AND THE IDEOLOGY UNDERLYING THEM

My goals for advanced students are much the same as for my Intro students. First, I want my advanced students to read texts carefully, identifying authors' stances and their defenses of them (argument extraction). Second, I want students to practice critical reflection, to assess an author's position by looking at it from a distanced or analytic perspective (argument evaluation). Third, I would like students to contextualize their views (intellectual reconstruction), and, fourth, I urge them to use philosophy to reconceptualize their experiences (application of philosophy). Finally, I expect pupils to display mastery of academic composition in Standard American English (coherent writing).

These five objectives reflect my view of the defining features of philosophic literacy, the rules and conventions which I see as governing philosophic meaning-making. However, my approach is hardly ideologically neutral. Rather, the way I introduce students to philosophy of education is located within broader political goals that are more my own than universal features of my discipline.

The ideology undergirding my classroom approach echoes Dewey's gradualism as I have described it above. That is, I share

Dewey's faith that American democracy can be extended by further developing the forces of liberalism and collaborative inquiry that already exist in our society. I adopt this ideology for two reasons. First, both my students and I, despite the overwhelming grip of the dominant class, occupy ambiguous and overlapping social spaces, ones that provide chances, albeit limited and narrow, to resist as well as accommodate mainstream life. That is, based on considerable anecdotal data, my students are, by and large, critical of American racism, sexism, and classism and, at the same time, hell-bent on using the exchange value of their anticipated diplomas to maximize their economic wealth. Thus, "to launch a politics of refusal" with my students, as some critical pedagogists advise, by focusing primarily on the ways schools "reproduce the discourses, values, and privileges of existing elites" would be to do a couple of things I am disinclined to do (McLaren, 1994, p. 197). It would force me to either ignore my students' expressed desire for further entry into the mainstream or to dismiss their aspirations as "false consciousness," a case of the oppressed appropriating the ideology of the oppressor. (For the dangers of false consciousness, see Freire, 1970/1997; Williams, 1977).

Second, my gradualist ideology not only allows me to take my students' mainstream aspirations seriously it also allows me to present them with some realistic visions of social change. Given the conservative nature of our society's history and current political trajectory, I am not sure how students and I can construct radical alternatives to capitalist America that would not invite ridicule or seem impossibly difficult to achieve. I fear that for me to make untenable claims about the sort of political transformations my students, colleagues, and I can actually accomplish might lead to the very despair that Freire (1970/1997) himself wants to overcome (pp. 43–48; see also Giroux, 1992, p. 105). This is not to deny the importance of radical visions for those who, like myself, advocate more piecemeal reform. Such visions are essential for keeping us from complacency, for keeping our more centrist inclinations from blinding us to our society's terrible inequities. However, at this moment, from our present situation within advanced capitalism, I believe our best chance for an improved future rests upon gradualism: a steady

expansion of the progressive, cooperative forces in our society that lead to reforms in education leading to a more liberalized culture leading to more reforms in education and on and on in a continuing liberalizing cycle (see Dewey, 1916/1967, pp. 91, 317).

In sum, when I combine my students' aims—their intended writing of the world, to borrow from Freire (1983)—with my own reading of America's political climate, I find myself unwilling to make radical transformation the primary focus of my pedagogy. I say this with sadness because of my own longings and my deep respect for visions of a society in which all people can “control the social and economic forces that determine their existence” (Giroux, 1991, p. 5). However, since the success of a radical political movement in America—one that effects a transfer of power from owners to laborers—does not seem a live possibility in the foreseeable future, I take a more gradualist, Deweyan approach. I attempt to develop in students those skills that will give them at least modestly increased chances of collaboratively shaping and controlling their destinies.



Part Two

Dewey's Communal Ideals as Applied to Teacher–Student Relations

STEVE FISHMAN AND LUCILLE McCARTHY

Because we believe that the relationship between college teachers and their underprepared students is important to these students' success in particular courses as well as over the long haul of their college careers, we now explore, in a series of single-authored sections, the relationship that Steve Fishman and his pupil, Andre Steadman, developed in Steve's advanced philosophy course. Our aim is to discover the extent to which Fishman's effort to establish Deweyan community with Andre succeeded in softening Freire's teacher-student contradiction.

At the outset of our study, in spring 1999, Fishman worked alone, collecting data in his own classroom: student texts; class observation

notes; and transcripts of his and Andre's ten, hour-long work sessions. However, since Steve was Andre's teacher, a situation in which Andre may well have felt constrained, we believed we needed additional information to crosscheck and augment the data Steve gathered. So when the semester ended, McCarthy asked Andre if he wanted to continue reflecting, in interviews with her, about his learning and writing at the University. He readily agreed, and McCarthy spoke with Andre bi-monthly from May 1999 until his graduation in December 2000.

Fishman begins our account by showing the importance of a positive initial encounter between teacher and novice writer. This is essential, we have found, if they are to find common goals and alter orthodox teacher-student relations. Thus, Fishman's first approach to Andre was conducted with caution, and in it we see a necessary ingredient for ameliorating Freire's teacher-student contradiction: the teacher must respect student aspirations and competencies. When Fishman first spoke to Andre about his writing, he sought his cooperation and carefully avoided suggesting that Andre's difficulties with the dominant code were a mark against his capabilities or that his existing skills were unworthy. Rather, Fishman wanted to convey this message: "Andre, I suspect you are in some ways under-prepared for my course, but instead of my urging you to drop, we can, despite the limitations imposed by our school situation, find spaces to converse, develop common goals, and help one another."

DEVELOPING SHARED GOALS: THE TEACHER'S PERSPECTIVE

Steve Fishman

In my spring 1999, "writing intensive" section of Philosophy of Education, when I read my 25 students' initial homework assignments and in-class freewrites, Andre Steadman's work stood out. (For the writing assignments in this course, see appendix D.) That is, in Andre's compositions were so many rhetorical and mechanical mismanagements that I was uncertain I was correctly following his thinking.

The fifth session of my Philosophy of Education course was on a Thursday, and at the close of the period, I motioned to Andre as the other students were leaving. He waited by my desk for a moment while I gathered my papers, and then we left the room together. In the hallway just outside—and sensitive to Freire’s warnings about middle class teachers and their hegemonic roles—I said softly, “I think you’ve got a problem with your writing.” Andre and I are about the same height—6’ 2”—and our shoulders almost touched as we walked slowly beside one another down the corridor. I had no idea how he would respond, and, despite my authority, I felt vulnerable, like I had just asked a new neighbor to my house party. I was presenting an invitation to someone I did not know, someone who was, in obvious ways, very different from me. At the time, Andre was 21 and I was 60. He is from the South; I am from the North. He is Black; I am White. He is a computer science major; I have trouble accessing my department’s web site. And on and on.

However, I was implicitly asking Andre to build upon our differences, to agree that if we could be open with one another—I admitting that, as a philosopher, I was no expert in teaching novice readers and writers and he being candid about his inexperience with academic composing—we had a decent chance to resist the typical teacher-student relationship. Instead of just keeping the normal, college instructor distance from Andre, I hoped I could convince him to join me in shaping a shared, albeit two-sided goal: improved philosophic thinking and writing for him and improved teaching for me. These were goals I believed neither of us could achieve without the other’s help.

Out of the corner of my eye, I searched Andre’s face and body language for reactions, but his demeanor told me little. After a few more steps, and still looking straight ahead, he finally nodded. Relieved, but still feeling unsure, I found myself saying, “I’d like to talk with you about it. Would you be willing to meet this Friday at 2:30?” Andre matched my slow pace for a few more steps, and then, without change of expression—and just before speeding up to go his own way—he nodded a second time.

As I have indicated, when Andre and I left the classroom together,

as strange as it may seem, I felt vulnerable and fearful of rejection. Since I suspect that most novice writers at the college level lack confidence about their writing but, understandably, do not want to admit it to a teacher who must grade their work, I was heartened by Andre's first nod. It indicated to me that the news I had brought did not surprise him and that he was at least somewhat open to me. When Andre nodded a second time, indicating his willingness to meet with me, I took it to mean he wanted to work on his writing and was willing to spend time on it despite what I suspected was a busy schedule. With these initial gestures, Andre and I made our first start toward a community of common purpose. That is, we had, I believed, with a minimum of words, tentatively shaped a shared project and negotiated a joint activity for achieving it.

But what was Andre thinking? How did he describe the first beginnings of the community he and I were forging? Lucille McCarthy reports on Andre's perspective.

DEVELOPING SHARED GOALS: REPORTING THE STUDENT'S PERSPECTIVE

Lucille McCarthy

Fishman saw his relationship with Andre progressing cautiously toward shared goals, and, according to what Andre told me in post-semester interviews, he agreed. In his comments, however, he focused less on Steve's respect for his aspirations and competencies than on another element that must be present, according to Freire, if the teacher-student contradiction is to be altered: a problem-posing approach.

In Andre's initial conversation with me, in May 1999, he explained that Fishman did not lecture but instead questioned students as they all sat in a circle. Despite being a quiet person, Andre said, he liked being asked for his opinion, liked expressing himself, and he found it interesting to hear his classmates' views as well. This was, he told me, at least part of why he accepted Fishman's invitation to meet with him. Andre explained,

I saw from the beginning that in class Steve wanted our opinions, and he helped students say their ideas. He asked us what *we* learned from the readings; it wasn't just "Read because you have to." He was trying to figure out what *we* got out of it. . . . And he called on me every day all semester! In my other schools teachers called on me, but this never happened here at UNCC.

In addition to the open dialogue Andre said he enjoyed in class discussions, several other factors shaped his decision to meet with Steve. There were Andre's own doubts about his writing as well as the positive comparison between Fishman and some teachers he had at the two small, historically Black colleges he attended before transferring to Fishman's large university. Andre told me,

I make a lot of errors with grammar. I use my own method of grammar rather than what I was taught in junior high and high school. I've gotten bad grades in other classes for my writing, so I've gotta get better, and I saw Steve wanted to help me out. Why not take his offer? Basically, it was free of charge. . . . I didn't expect that a teacher at UNCC would care about me like that. It's a big school, and most professors just lecture and don't care if you get it. He's more like teachers at my other schools. He wants me to learn.

Not only did I question Andre about why he agreed to meet individually with Steve, I also asked him why he signed up for Philosophy of Education in the first place. I assumed he did so to satisfy the university's writing intensive requirement—ninety per cent of the students who enroll do so for this reason—but I was wrong. Andre had other, less instrumentalist, more personal, goals in mind. His comments suggest that he wanted to expand his skills and interests, but he wanted to do this in a community of likemindedness, to use one of Dewey's categories. He told me that his friend, Craig Stock, a former student of Fishman who is, like Andre, African American, recommended the course because of its open collegiality. Andre explained,

I signed up for philosophy because all I took in high school was business and math and science. I didn't read much and would write only

a paragraph for homework maybe. And I used to talk only about money. But recently I have become interested in learning other ways of thinking about things. I know Craig Stock, and he had Steve's course last semester. On Saturdays, when Craig and I work together, he talked about Aristotle and other authors, and he said they also discussed race issues in this course, and he felt good about that.

With help from his friend, then, and with an eye for what was happening in class, Andre seemed to know more about Fishman during their initial exchanges than Steve knew about him. However, for both of them the germ of successful community—common purpose—had been planted. Fishman's respect for Andre's aspirations and competencies, his care not to suggest Andre's problems with academic literacy indicated deficiency, and Steve's problem-posing pedagogy had all set the stage for reshaping the teacher-student relationship. Steve now describes how his and Andre's relationship developed from this seed of common purpose.

DEVELOPING LIKEMINDEDNESS AND MUTUAL CARE

Steve Fishman

In our early meetings, I found that Andre's and my common goal was helping us gradually generate a community of likemindedness and mutual care, one built, in Dewey's (1916/1967) terms, on the "intellectual and emotional dispositions" we were able to share in our conversations (p. 5). This went a long way toward allowing us to communicate sympathetically and learn more about our locations on the oppressor-oppressed continuum. Despite my respect for Freire's analysis of teacher-student oppositions, I found that the places Andre and I occupied were less contradictory than Freire's analysis might lead us to believe.

For example, as Andre and I conversed, we learned about the places where our lives overlapped. Given that I am the grandson of non-English-speaking, lower class Jewish immigrants, a child born at the outset of World War II—a particularly anti-semitic period—who grew up in a dominantly Jewish section of the Bronx, and that

Andre is the son of a working class, African American family and grew up in a dominantly black section of Columbia, South Carolina, there were ways in which I identified with Andre as an outsider to mainstream American life. In saying this, I do not want to neglect the important distinction, following Ogbu (1988), between voluntary and involuntary immigrants to America. Nor do I intend to ignore Freire's insights about oppressor-oppressed conflicts. On the other hand, I do not want to go in the opposite direction and deny the importance of Andre's and my commonalities.

This ambiguity about our social locations was evident in Andre's post-semester interviews as well when he too seemed to refer to that place where our outsidersness overlapped. When McCarthy asked Andre about the consequences for his and my relationship of his being considered Black and my being considered White, Andre seemed surprised McCarthy called me White. Andre told her that he knew that I grew up in the Bronx, and, therefore, he assumed I was Italian. "In my mind," Andre said, "Italians and Asians aren't White."

As I have indicated, the specific intention of my early meetings with Andre was not just to discover where our lives overlapped but also to learn more about his background so I could better step into his shoes and understand his aspirations and goals. We therefore spent considerable time talking about his previous school experiences, especially his college writing courses. In Freire's terms, these conversations enabled me to learn how Andre was reading the world and, thus, avoid imposing my own reading of it on him. In Dewey's terms, they were helping me see things from Andre's point of view so I could promote likemindedness.

Andre explained that he took two semesters of composition at Morris College in Sumter, South Carolina. Mrs. Hunter, his first semester comp teacher, combined explicit grammar lessons with a variety of assigned essays, including "declarative and descriptive" ones.

During our first meeting Andre talked so softly and in such clipped sentences that, although we sat almost knee-to-knee, I had to lean forward to hear him.

"Mrs. Hunter cared," Andre told me.

"What do you mean?" I asked.

“She wouldn’t go on unless everybody got it. She was like you. She wanted us to learn. In other classes I just cared about grades but, with her, I cared about learning.”

Andre told me that although he had trouble with “sentence structure” in that class, he ultimately received a B.

In those early meetings, I also asked Andre several times how he felt about mastering the writing conventions of Standard American English. I told him I worried that stress on these conventions (“cultural arbitrariness,” as Bourdieu and Passeron [1977] put it) might ruin his chance to compose the way he wanted, to express his ideas in his own fashion, in a literacy different from the one prescribed by the dominant class. (For more on such worries, see Gilyard, 1991; Giroux, 1991; Goldblatt, 1995; Horner & Lu, 1999; Smitherman, 1977, 1999.)

I explained to Andre, “A lot of educational researchers say that for some students learning the standard code is a betrayal, a rejection of their own culture’s way of speaking and telling stories. Are you sure I’m not pressuring you into this?”

Andre’s answer surprised me. He said that although he is a computer science major, he really hopes to become an entrepreneur. He needs to write better because he wants to own small businesses, like car washes and grocery stores, something he frequently reads about in a magazine he gets in his hometown, Columbia, South Carolina.

Just as I tried in our early meetings to understand Andre’s views of school writing and his motives for wanting to move his compositions closer to Standard American English, so I tried to grasp his views of my course texts. He wanted to know these, he told me, because he did not want to be narrow in his thinking, and he saw reading authors like Plato (1997), Locke (1693/1997), Dewey (1902/1997a, 1916/1997b, 1938/1997c), Freire (1970/1997a), Kozol (1992), Delpit (1995), Baldwin (1963/1988), and Oakes (1985) as an opportunity to learn about other people’s ideas.

From these early conversations with Andre, then, I sensed that he had had good experiences with some of his teachers and had developed communities of mutual care with them. It was especially significant, I thought, that he saw similarities between Mrs. Hunter, his

first semester English teacher at Morris College, and me. In my class, like hers, Andre said, he focused more on learning than on grades. This made it easier for him and me to approach his writing from a similar perspective. Our common focus on learning—as opposed to a teacher-student debate about test scores and evaluations—meant that Andre could talk honestly with me about how much time he was putting into his homework, and I could talk honestly with him—without worry about making him defensive—about my reactions to his papers. This growing likemindedness made it easier for us to have the type of communication which Dewey (1916/1967) sees as central to fruitful community, a communication open enough to stimulate a “widening of the area of shared concerns,” a breaking down of barriers so Andre and I could better understand the consequences of our exchanges upon each other (p. 87). Further, as Andre’s and my growing likemindedness allowed us to develop the widened communication that Dewey wants, we were also forging something like the solidarity that Freire wants. However, I felt that it was not only I who was developing care for and solidarity with Andre. I felt Andre was also developing care for and solidarity with me.

Alternatively put, I thought our softening of the teacher-student contradiction was less a case of my dying to my class identification and being reborn to Andre’s than of both Andre’s and my doing some travelling from our home territories. Just as I was crossing my own boundaries to enter into Andre’s student world, so Andre was making similar efforts to travel into my teacherly world. I thought his care for and increasing solidarity with me could be seen in the wordless manner in which he made clear he appreciated my working with him. This was evidenced by his perfect class attendance, by his willingness, despite being shy, to accept my daily calls upon him in class, and by the sincere effort I believe he made with every reading and writing assignment. I speak of mutual care and travel, because, put bluntly, I thought that Andre was trying to help me out, or care for me, by holding up his end of the implicit understanding between teacher and student about classroom attendance, preparation, and participation. In addition, Andre was always on time for our weekly meetings, and he was, I believe, candid in his answers to my

(and later McCarthy's) questions about his learning and writing. Finally, there was the easy laughter between Andre and me, something I took as a sign of our willingness to be vulnerable with one another, to create spaces which defied the institutionally prescribed ones.

It is possible that Freire might see Andre's stepping into my teacherly world as cooption, as my doing him a disservice by altering his ways of thinking and speaking and, thus, modifying his identity. Yet, in light of the ambiguous spaces Andre occupies, his position as both inside and outside mainstream culture, it is not surprising to me that our conversations would result in a mutual movement of this sort. In other words, I am not ashamed of Andre's moving into my world because I believe it reflected some of his own genuine aspirations rather than ones that I imposed on him.

Freirian Problem-Posing in a Deweyan Community: Learner as Teacher, Teacher as Learner

In our ten, hour-long, Friday afternoon meetings, as Andre and I worked toward a Deweyan community of common purpose, like-mindedness, and mutual care, we were also employing a Freire-like, problem-posing, learner-as-teacher, teacher-as-learner method for exploring his writing concerns. Particularly important in helping Andre and me become co-investigators was a research tool I call "dialogic think-aloud protocols." I wanted to use these protocols to understand the logic behind Andre's writing, so I started each of our Friday afternoon sessions by having him read his homework papers outloud. I was recording these sessions, and I believed that the transcripts of Andre's reading his own work and "thinking aloud" about it would give me useful information about his linguistic code. In thus trying to understand the logic behind Andre's writing, I was building on Shaughnessy's (1977) and Bartholomae's (1980) contention that to help students bridge successfully to the target language, teachers need insight into the rules students are employing rather than assuming them to be *tabulae rasae* upon which to impose the dominant forms.

Although I originally saw these protocols only as investigatory tools for my use, they quickly became powerful investigatory tools for Andre as well. This is because, instead of just recording data for a researcher to analyze later on, Andre began to actively participate with me in interpreting the data he generated during his think-alouds. Together, he and I posed questions about what he had said, and we collaboratively theorized about his thinking and writing processes. Because neither of us had anything like a clear understanding of what was going on, we genuinely needed one another and the very different perspectives we brought to our inquiry. It was this problem-posing collaboration that enabled Andre and me to discover three competencies that even Andre himself did not know he had. These were his abilities (1) to use the dominant code, (2) to summarize texts in his own words, and (3) to elaborate on his understanding of philosophic issues and theories.

Bringing Forward Student Competencies Regarding the Dominant Code

What Andre and I discovered was that often he could orally edit his own compositions as he read them aloud, reading correctly—despite errors on the page—what he intended to say. This showed us that Andre knew more about the writing mechanics of Standard American English than his papers indicated. (This pattern is noted by a number of writing researchers, including Bartholomae, 1980; Butler, 1980; Lu, 1994/1999b; Leki, 1992; Perl, 1980; Shaughnessy, 1977, pp. 172–75; Shor, 1987, p. 112.)

An example of Andre's and my collaborative, problem-posing inquiry occurred in mid-February when he read aloud his two-paragraph homework paper about an article titled, "Women's Ways of Going to School" (Holland & Eisenhart, 1988). Early in his homework, Andre writes: "Personally I am in college *somethat* I can learn more about the computer science industry to enhance my capable in this field" (emphasis mine). On Andre's first read through—one he did without stopping to edit—he rendered the words, "I am in college *somethat* I can . . ." exactly as he had written them. However, on his second rendering, he orally corrected himself and read, "I am in college *so that* I can . . ." I then recommended to Andre that he read aloud more slowly, urging him to read exactly what he had

typed. Yet, twice more he rendered “somewhat” as “so that,” even after I pointed my finger at the word “somewhat” to make sure Andre was focusing on it. Finally, I suggested to Andre that if I were doing the reading, I would not render “somewhat” as “so that.” To this comment, Andre responded, “Oops, my mistake.”

At this point, I explained to Andre that I was perplexed by his ability to make oral corrections—in the case of “somewhat” in three of four readings—without knowing he had made them, and I asked him how he would account for it. He was, at first, as puzzled as I was. After thinking about it a while, he explained that he really had “so that” in mind while composing but, as he read, he was totally focused on his meaning and, therefore, did not see the discrepancy between what he intended and what he wrote. Unfortunately, this meant he did not realize that what he had just spoken would be, if written, a valuable improvement, and, in this case—although not always—it was left unchanged.

Although, in the course of the semester, Andre and I were never able to fully tap into his ability to make oral corrections to help him edit his papers, I believe this portion of our work was worthwhile. The dialogic think-alouds helped us develop some shared language for discussing and theorizing about his writing concerns. They also showed Andre that if he paid close attention to his compositions, he could find discrepancies between what he intended to write and what he actually wrote. Put another way, although we did not have immediate results in terms of papers with dramatically improved surface features, our collaborative inquiry helped Andre see his own strengths, and this was something he was able, gradually, to build on in my course and in others in subsequent semesters.

*Bringing Forward Student Competencies Regarding Argument
Extraction and Use of One’s Own Words*

Just as the dialogic think-alouds helped Andre and me discover that he knew more about standard writing mechanics than his compositions showed, so our discussions also helped us realize that when he summarized texts he could rely less on the language of the assigned readings and more on his own. To show his development in this area, I present excerpts from three of our early-semester meetings in February and March. In the homework papers we

investigated together in these sessions, Andre increasingly risked using his own words and, thus, writing outside the dominant code rather than presenting more correct prose that he lifted straight from the assigned reading. A superficial look at these three homework papers might suggest that Andre's writing is deteriorating across time rather than getting better. However, a closer look reveals a student attempting to understand and summarize difficult theoretical material in his own voice.

February 5: Borrowing Author Language for Argument Extraction. Early in February, I assigned a selection from Freire's *Pedagogy of The Oppressed* (1970/1997a). The homework prompt—designed to encourage argument extraction and argument evaluation (my classroom objectives 1 and 2)—asks students to explain what they have learned by reading this selection and to conclude with a question they would be willing to present to the class as a discussion leader.

Andre's response is three paragraphs long: a short introduction and brief conclusion framing a seven-sentence main paragraph in which he relates what he understands about Freire. I reproduce it just as he typed it.

Paul Freire's, "Pedagogy of the Oppressed", is an article that argues for the liberation of the teacher/student manifestation. In doing this Freire argues against the banking concept of education and for the liberation of students and in many cases teachers.

Freire's denounces the banking concept of education in that he sees the students as the oppressed and the teacher as the oppressor. He argues in this concept that knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. In this model, the teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence. In so doing this, the students are alienated, and forced to accept their ignorance. However, although Freire denounces such a system, he also gives a solution or what he feels would "liberate" the students capabilities. He argues that education must begin with the solution of the teacher/student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students. He believes the solution is not to integrate them into the structure of oppression, but to transform that structure as they can become

beings for themselves. Such a transformation would undermine the oppressor's purposes, thus undermining the banking system.

After reading the article, I agree in many ways that the banking system is such a system of oppression and further more I agree with Friere's solution to change the banking system. However, the question that I pose is, how do we actually go about changing a system that has dominated the classrooms for so many years?

The question Andre poses at the end of his homework about how to change long-established, oppressive systems is clearly a good one, and I praise him for it in my marginal comments. I realized that if we used it in class, it could bring our discussion from a theoretical to a more practical level. The question also suggested to me that Andre had not only read the piece but had responded to it in a serious way. However, what disappointed me was that, in his main paragraph, five of his seven sentences contain extensive unacknowledged quotes from Freire. The language is so obviously not Andre's that the problem was evident to me at my first reading.

Andre and I met to talk about this homework paper on Friday, February 5th, and we began, as usual, with Andre's reading his work aloud to me in a dialogic think-aloud protocol. The tone of Andre's and my conversation was, in this, our third session, no different from that in our earlier ones, and in no way was I upset with him because I trusted that he was making a good faith effort and doing the best he could. That is, I began our conversation with no desire to criticize him for using unacknowledged quotes. In fact, in a later meeting, Andre himself introduced the word "plagiarism" to describe what he sometimes did, but this is a pejorative word I would never have thought to use in this situation. In other words, it never occurred to me that Andre was trying to trick me or pretend that someone else's writing was his own. Rather, my disposition as Andre and I investigated his writing in our February 5th meeting was one of curiosity, a desire to find out what Andre was thinking as he completed his Freire homework.

After Andre had read his composition aloud, I asked him about two of the five unacknowledged quotes he incorporates into his own sentences, quotes taken almost verbatim from Freire's text. These are

[Freire] argues that education must begin with a solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously students and teachers. He believes the solution is not to integrate them into the structure of oppression, but to transform that structure as they can become beings for themselves.

Attempting to learn what Andre understood of Freire, I asked him what he meant by saying that the poles of the teacher-student contradiction must be reconciled. Andre was unable to say much, so I briefly discussed Freire with him, recalling our class discussions of the previous week in an effort to be helpful. We talked about the ways students and teachers are unequal in the classroom, and, ultimately, we agreed that teachers and students reconcile their differences when they face problems together in a cooperative and trusting environment.

I then asked Andre several more questions about his homework. In particular, I wanted to know if it seemed different to him from his previous papers in my class. He responded, “Do you mean the grammar?” I said, “No, I’m thinking of the tone, the sound of it,” and he answered, “I guess it doesn’t sound much like me.” I agreed and asked why he stuck so closely to Freire’s language. He said, “I didn’t understand him. Rather than make a mistake, I said it the way he does.”

I appreciated Andre’s honesty, and I hastened to assure him that other students—and even I myself—have difficulty reading Freire. I then offered him specific advice about how he might work to understand texts and bring forward his own voice as he summarizes them. “In philosophy,” I said,

a failure to understand is a good starting point. If there are sentences you can’t figure out, start your paper with them and then offer a number of interpretations, but put them in your own words. I’ll bet you’ll get a lot closer to the author’s meaning than you think you can.

I also suggested that he use the triple-entry notetaking technique I had introduced in class (see appendix E) and reminded him that this

technique would help him be a more active reader and give him chances to come up with alternative interpretations of the text.

Andre responded in his usual quiet way. He said, yes, he would try the triple-entry technique on his next homework. He also told me he would try to write more in his own voice.

February 19: Trying to Summarize the Text in One's Own Words. Andre's next paper that I discuss, an assignment focusing on a selection from Dewey's *Child and Curriculum* (1902/1997a), provides insight into Andre's nascent efforts to summarize texts in his own language. My homework prompt asked students to write a letter to a designated classmate with answers to two questions. It read:

Dewey divides educators into two groups: those who emphasize subject matter and those who emphasize student growth.

1. Which of these, subject matter or student growth, has been dominant in your own schooling?
2. How does Dewey suggest we reconcile these different approaches?

At the start of the next class session, students exchanged their letters with their partners and responded in writing to one another. In this assignment, I was trying to encourage my pupils, first, to apply philosophy to their own lives and, second, to summarize Dewey's argument from his text (my objectives 4 and 1, respectively). I now reproduce the letter Andre typed for his classmate, Melissa, a letter in which he offers a paragraph-long answer to each of my questions. (The emphases are mine.) Andre writes,

Dear Melissa,

Subject matter has been a dominated force in my educational process. I've been taught from day one to separate subjects into different groups. I've been taught math separate from science and so forth. Although, I feel when you grow older you automatically learn more and at a faster beat. I also feel you understand different things if their are broken into different categorizes. You consume and focus more on one subject at a time, whether than two or more subjects. I feel that a lot of subjects need to be separate from one another because they can be confusing.

Dewey's suggest we reconcile education *life-terms* instead of present-terms. He argues learning should be a connection between the student and what is being taught. It should be a *purely formal and symbolic* of the child. Secondly, he feels it should be a motivating change. He has a strong belief in interaction with the student and what they are tiring to learn. Thirdly, he feels presentation should be *external*. His opinion is the lessons are water down by the time they get to the student. The faculty should eliminate some of the authority in the designing process of its curriculum. Finally, he feels the mind and spiritual aspects should have connections in the learning process. These suggestions would bring interest into the minds of the children's who are capable of learning at any level.

Thanks for reading.
Andre Steadman

When I read the second of Andre's two paragraphs, his summary of Dewey's solution to the student-curriculum dichotomy, I was puzzled. At times, I believed Andre really understood Dewey. For example, he says, correctly, in his second sentence, that Dewey believes there "should be a connection between the student and what is being taught." In the fourth, he says there should be a "motivating change," and, in the fifth, that there should be "interaction with the students and what they are tiring [sic] to learn." All this sounded like Andre had grasped some of Dewey's central themes. Granted, he had not directly answered the question about how Dewey resolves the student-curriculum dichotomy, but he appeared to understand at least something of Dewey's argument.

By contrast, the other sentences in Andre's second paragraph made me uneasy. In the first, he says Dewey wants to "reconcile education life-terms instead of present-terms." Although there is a resonance of Dewey in this sentence—Dewey frequently speaks about the need for continuity in experience, for finding connections between present, past, and future—I was not really sure what Andre meant. Does he, I asked myself, understand this point in Dewey but is simply unable to express it clearly? Has he worked hard on this paper, coming to grips with difficult ideas upon which, at this point, he has only a shaky handle? If so, I certainly wanted to credit and praise him for such effort. But I was not sure.

Similar uncertainties accompanied my efforts to understand what Andre meant by his third sentence, “It should be a purely formal and symbolic of the child.” I interpreted Andre’s “It” to refer to education itself. But why in the world he believed Dewey wants education to be “purely formal and symbolic of the child,” I did not know. That is, I could not figure out what in Dewey’s text would lead Andre to make this claim.

Because of my confusion about Andre’s letter, I was looking forward to our discussion of it on February 19th. I wanted to learn how Andre viewed his work, how he explained his written product and the process he followed to achieve it. At the beginning of our session, before he read his paper aloud, I asked Andre about this process. He explained that he spent about an hour reading the text and approximately 30 minutes writing his response. In addition to doing triple-entry notetaking, he said he underlined phrases he thought he might be able to use in his answer.

Andre then read his piece and, after we had discussed several features of it, I spoke about my own puzzlement. “Andre,” I said, “I had some trouble figuring out what you were trying to say in a couple of places. For example, I couldn’t understand what you meant by ‘life-terms’ and ‘present-terms,’ ‘formal and symbolic,’ and ‘motivating change.’” Andre responded by assuring me that he had “gotten his ideas from the book.” When I heard this, I replied, “Well, why don’t we both take a close look at Dewey’s text?”

The two of us read silently for a while, each looking at our own copy of Dewey, when Andre suddenly hit pay dirt and pointed at Dewey’s phrases, “life-terms” and “purely formal and symbolic” (1902/1997a, p. 285). He also pointed out that, on the same page, Dewey talks about the educational evils of “lack of motivation” and teacher presentations conducted in “external, ready-made fashion.” This cleared up the opacity of Andre’s writing for both him and me because we realized that Andre, in an effort to use his own language, was still borrowing from the text, but this time only a few phrases that he wove together with his own words, not whole sentences as he had done earlier. His attempt to use his own voice, while still using some of the author’s phrases, meant that his Dewey homework, on

the surface, seemed less accomplished than his Freire paper. However, Andre and I knew better, and we were both pleased with his effort.

In addition, we were satisfied with our collaborative investigation of it. Throughout our February 19th conversation, Andre and I seemed to share the view that figuring out his writing was our joint challenge, and when he orchestrated our moment of clarification, we celebrated together. In short, the dialogic think-alouds and our collaborative problem posing about Andre's texts allowed us to abandon our designated roles as teacher and student and take on the less contradictory identities of problem-posing co-investigators.

At the close of our February 19th meeting, I asked Andre what else besides the triple entry technique he might do to get more of his own voice into his work. He immediately spoke about starting his papers earlier so he could spend more time on them. He said that by waiting to write his papers until the night before they were due he had too little time to digest the material so he could say it in his own way. Naturally, I applauded this idea and reminded him about acknowledging what he does not understand and then using that as a focus for his writing. I also asked him to read his next homework response to a friend to see if it sounded like him.

March 5: Continuing to Employ One's Own Voice in Argument Extraction. The next meeting I describe took place two weeks later, on March 5th, and centered on an assignment from Dewey's *Experience and Education* (1938/1997c). When Andre and I met to discuss it, he told me in considerable detail about his girlfriend's reading of his draft, how she pointed out sentences which did not sound like him and how he revised in an effort to explain his ideas better in his own words. I was excited about this because Andre seemed to be taking more control over his writing.

My homework prompt asked students to choose a paragraph from the Dewey selection and discuss its significance for them: again a request for argument extraction and application of philosophic theory (my objectives 1 and 4). Andre chose a paragraph from *Experience and Education* in which Dewey describes "miseducative

experiences.” Although Andre never explains why he found this concept personally significant, I could see that he had tried hard to distinguish Dewey’s voice from his own. I now reproduce Andre’s homework response.

While reading Dewey, the second paragraph on page 330 caught my interest. It basically talk about the indirect experience of education and he argues how some experiences are not educational. However, Dewey starts this paragraph by saying, “the belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative.” I feel Dewey is saying all experiences have purpose, but some are mis-educated. Uneducational experiences may affect one’s future and their thought process. One’s experience may not connect or service a purpose and may even discourage one’s progress. Uneducated habits will inability one to control its future experiences. To overcome mis-educated experiences, one must initialize self-control and have an purpose in society.

As Andre and I talked about this piece, I praised his effort. I said he had put into his own words a couple of core Deweyan concepts. In fact, I told him that his third to last sentence—“One’s experience may not connect or service a purpose and may even discourage one’s progress.”—was so good that “it made me dance.”

However, I do not want to give the impression that Andre’s ability to summarize a difficult text in his own language was a straight-line process. When he and I discussed his second to last sentence, the one following the sentence I had just praised, we realized he had returned to his earlier practice of piecing together the author’s words with his own. Specifically, Andre takes Dewey’s sentence, “The consequences of formation of such habits is *inability to control future experiences*” (p. 331, emphasis mine) and turns it into “Uneducated habits will inability one to control its future experience.” Although this might seem like a setback, I took it as a developmental error, one to be expected as Andre, a computer science major and underprepared writer, struggled to expand his academic literacy. (For more on students’ “interlanguage” as they move toward the target language, see Kutz, 1986.)

Of course Andre's progress in understanding and summarizing texts did not result only from our time together on 10 Friday afternoons. It was also the consequence of numerous other factors, including his willingness to try out new ways of reading and composing. For example, regarding his *Experience and Education* assignment, he told me that he "slowed down" and "started earlier," did triple-entry notetaking, and had a reader look at and question him about his draft.

Bringing Forward Student Competencies Regarding Elaborating on Philosophic Subject Matter

Andre's and my dialogic think-alouds helped us not only discover that he knew more about standard writing mechanics than he thought and set the stage for practicing argument extraction in his own voice, our discussions also revealed that Andre often knew more about philosophic subject matter than his texts indicated. I believe this also impressed him. It showed him another strength he possessed which he was underutilizing, and, as Andre explained to McCarthy in one of their post-semester interviews, he left my course determined to put down on paper more of what he now realized he could say.

A tutorial session in which Andre and I came to appreciate his greater understanding of course readings occurred on the second Friday in April as he and I discussed one of his final homework papers for Philosophy of Education. In this session we discovered hidden competencies in two additional areas I list as my objectives for student thinking and writing: argument evaluation (objective 2) and intellectual reconstruction or the ability to contextualize a position (objective 3).

In this mid-April session, Andre and I focused on his response to an assignment about Hansen's (1995) *The Call To Teach*. My prompt asked students to characterize the pedagogies of three inner city high school teachers, each of whom is described by Hansen in a chapter-length naturalistic account. I wrote, "Please present your own analysis of these instructors' teaching using any categories you find appropriate." Andre's homework consists of three typed paragraphs, one devoted to each teacher:

After reading Hansen's account of the three teachers and their classrooms, I find all three to have a unique style of teaching. To begin with my category for Mrs. Payne is "FOLLOW MY RULES IN MY CLASSROOM." She seems like the kind of teacher that state rules that each student must be governed by. Before the class day starts, she has an objective that must be completed during that class and no greater or less is accepted. I feel Mrs. Payne's classroom setting is very demanding because it is very procedural. Everything happens in a sequence format. You come into her classroom and you have to do A before you can B, etc. I feel that it would be very difficult to learn in her class because everything is predictable. There is no think process done other than following rules. I feel if she loosens up her rules, her class will be more beneficial than procedural.

My category for Mr. Peters is "WILLINGNESS." I picked this category for Mr. Peter because of the uneducated background and the course he is teaching. As we all know that Mr. Peter is not a certified teacher, but has the force to teach a religious course. Mr. Peter's classroom is more of a group and gives your own belief type of situation. He frequently asks students their opinions and he also gives his opinions on the topic at hand. I feel that his type of teaching has a future, it just needs some years and guidance. I feel that once he has more confidence in what he is doing and becomes even more open minded. He will be very successful in the future.

My category for Mr. James is "DETERMINATION." I feel under his conditions he is handling his job in a professional way. He seems well organized with the way he handles himself and his students. I analyze Mr. James has a determined and understanding individual. He is determined because he wants to give up on his student. I understand he has a person who believes that everyone can learn under any conditions. In the reading, we see that something in his class he has problems with behavior and attention. I feel with his years and experience with dealing with trouble students he held his ground. He handles each as a separate individual. He respects them and their situations better than the other teachers they have encountered, Mr. James gets the up most respect from me in the way he handles himself and the students he is involved with.

As usual, we began our meeting with Andre reading his work aloud. In his first paragraph, Andre categorizes one teacher as employing a pedagogy Andre calls "Follow My Rules In My Classroom." At the close of this paragraph, Andre claims that it would be very difficult to learn in such a classroom because "every-

thing is predictable. There is no think process done other than following rules. I feel if she loosens up her rules, her class will be more beneficial than procedural.” When I asked Andre about why he was critical of this teacher’s approach, he told me that if students do not figure things out on their own, they will not learn very much.

Andre’s answer pleased me, for it made clear that he had a strong grasp on what he had read and written (objective 1) and that he could reflect critically upon it (objective 2). By “reflect critically,” I mean that Andre was able to generalize about the details he had read, to step back and see them as representative of a certain pedagogical approach. Put differently, his act of characterizing Hansen’s first teacher as a “follow the rules” instructor showed he had generated what amounts to a “grounded theory” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), organizing Hansen’s data under a broad concept or idea.

As our meeting progressed, I continued to press Andre about his paper in hopes he would explain why being less strict about class procedures would benefit this teacher’s students. I asked, “If, as you suggest, the teacher that Hansen describes loosens her rules, how will that be beneficial?” Andre repeated,

Unless students do some thinking on their own, they will learn very little. This is because, if you don’t do things on your own, whatever you learn is worthless since it won’t stick with you. You won’t remember it.

At this point, I was delighted. Andre’s spoken elaborations not only revealed careful reading and critical thinking, they also reflected progress toward my third classroom goal for students: the ability to do synthetic, or contextualizing, work. Andre’s comments, I believed, were informed by his mid-February work with Dewey’s *Experience and Education* (1938/1997c). In written and oral discussions, with me and in class, Andre had focused on Dewey’s belief that lack of student involvement causes much school learning to be forgotten or stored in relatively inaccessible “watertight compartments.” Two months later, Andre’s analysis of the Hansen book echoed these earlier discussions about Dewey. This was especially

remarkable—and I pointed this out to Andre—since our meeting to discuss his Hansen paper did not occur until two weeks after he had turned it in. That is, Andre’s ability to remember his Hansen homework two weeks after he wrote it—and the Dewey principle a couple of months later—was a sign that he had significant understanding of both.

Appreciative of the critical and synthetic work behind Andre’s characterization of one of Hansen’s teachers, I asked Andre, “But why didn’t you put those comments in your paper? Look how much richer your answer could have been if you had just added a few sentences.” Andre nodded and smiled at me, “I know. I know,” he said. “I need to add more sentences. I need to elaborate more in my own words.”

Andre’s responses during our mid-April meeting thus showed both him and me that his underelaborated compositions sometimes cloaked hidden competencies, unarticulated understandings of course issues and methods. This realization that he knew more than he wrote in his homework was an important discovery for Andre, I believed, a possible confidence booster as he moved on to future academic work.

My intuition about Andre’s increasing self-confidence was on target, as McCarthy reports in the next section. In addition, she found another, equally important residue from Andre’s and my work together that I did not foresee. Andre was, in our late-semester discussion of the Hansen book starting to articulate his own Freire-like critique of banking pedagogy and student docility. Drawing upon Dewey and Freire—as well as his own student experiences—Andre was giving voice to his opposition to traditional teacher-student relations. It is a resistance that he further articulated—and enacted—in subsequent semesters. In sum, then, McCarthy will offer evidence that my approaching Andre as a learner myself, someone who genuinely needed Andre’s interpretations, allowed him not only to play teacher to me but also, in a way Freire would applaud, to use philosophy to probe his own opposition to traditional schooling.



Residue

STEVE FISHMAN AND LUCILLE MCCARTHY

We take the title of this section from Dewey (1938/1963a) who says that the test of any experience, including an educational one, is the residue or deposit it leaves with the individual. He writes, “Every experience lives on in further experiences. Hence the central problem of . . . education . . . is to select the kind of present experiences that live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences” (pp. 27–28). Similarly, Freire (1970/1997) is concerned with the outcomes of teacher-student interactions. He tells us, “Since it is [in] a concrete situation that the oppressor-oppressed contradiction is established, the resolution of this contradiction must be *objectively* verifiable” (p. 32, italics in original).

In this section, McCarthy analyzes the consequences or residue for Andre of Fishman’s and his work together. That is, she explores the impact on Andre’s academic literacy of their Freirian efforts to bring forward his competencies, honor his aspirations, and promote his active learning. Drawing upon her recorded interviews with Andre, McCarthy reports the ways in which Andre’s and Steve’s Deweyan community not only softened Freire’s teacher-student contradiction but also helped Andre achieve his own goals for Philosophy of Education and become more articulate about his schooling in subsequent semesters. Following McCarthy’s report of the residue Andre took from his sessions with Fishman, Steve discusses his own learning, the ways in which his pedagogy profited from his conversations with Andre. He then reflects on their collaboration’s implications for Freirian classroom reform.

RESOLVING THE FREIRIAN CONTRADICTION: SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE STUDENT

Lucille McCarthy

In interviews during the year and a half following Fishman’s class, Andre recalled for me his experiences in Philosophy of Education

and described events in subsequent courses. In evaluating his comments, I focus on two consequences of his and Fishman's efforts to resolve the teacher-student contradiction. First, I discuss how their discovery of Andre's hidden understandings of the dominant code helped Andre write in his subsequent courses. Second, I show how their appreciation of Andre's ability to understand and summarize pedagogical theory helped him become a more critical knower. This latter development was evident in his reflections on his schoolwork in the semesters following Fishman's course.

Building on Student Competencies: Improved Writing and Extension of Academic Literacy

As we have seen, early on in Fishman's class Andre expressed his desire to write more effectively in the dominant code. Steve's and Andre's collaboration helped Andre progress toward this end by boosting his confidence about what he already knew concerning Standard written English, knowledge he both underappreciated and underused. Their collaboration also gave Andre a sense that he could digest difficult texts and discuss them in his own voice. The semester following Fishman's course, Andre took a required, writing intensive class in his major, "Computer Science for Today's Society," and he told me about his continuing motivation to speak for himself and to write so his readers could understand him. In October 1999, he explained,

I'm trying to be aware of other people reading my writing and make it more clear what I'm trying to say, the point I'm trying to get across. Before [Steve and I worked together], I would just write down whatever came out of my head the morning before the paper was due. I didn't want to think about the mechanics of it. . . . [But] my meetings with him helped me see my writing better. . . and because he wanted to help me, I spent more time. . . . Now when I am writing, I think about the person who might read my paper.

I then asked Andre what techniques he was using to get his own points across, and he referred to several habits and attitudes he had developed in philosophy. "Basically, I'm still doing the same things I did in that class: reading my draft out loud, expressing the topic a

little more [elaborating], trying to stick to my topic, and getting help proofreading.”

A year later, in November 2000, when Andre and I met for our last interview before he graduated, I had followed his writing for three semesters, so I knew a good deal about it. However, I asked him for one final assessment. “Andre,” I said, “in two months you’ll be out of college and into a job. How do you feel about your writing now? Will you be okay writing in whatever job you take?” Andre smiled and replied:

Yeah, I’m getting there. I mean, pretty much, as long as I take my time, and I understand what my purpose of writing is and who I’m writing to. And I still ask someone to look it over for me. . . . But when I write now, it’s more about me getting a point across, where before, I was just getting a grade.

In short, Andre’s comments in the semesters following Fishman’s course indicate that, as a result of Steve’s and his work together, Andre was taking steps toward realizing his goal to express his thoughts better through his writing.

Building on Student Competencies: Thinking Critically about Teaching and Learning

As Steve pointed out, Andre’s and his conversations about Hansen’s (1995) *Call to Teach* was an important moment in helping Andre realize his own ability to reflect critically. As time passed, Andre became increasingly aware of oppressive teacher-student relationships and able to articulate his preference for active learning within a caring community. Freire would be pleased, I believe, that instead of blind opposition to the status quo, Andre was using ideas from philosophy to speak about his resistance with increasing insight. In our final interview, he explained,

Before Steve’s class, I didn’t know that you could look at how people teach kids and how kids grasp things and how environment affects that. I doubt I could be a teacher myself, but every once in a while I think of it. If I did, I would be more like Steve, teaching and learning

at the same time. In class, he heard all our opinions, and they didn't always match his. So he learned. . . . It's a better environment if there is more interaction, if the teacher asks the student to think.

Andre applied this pedagogical standard to classes he took in the three semesters following Fishman's course. About his writing intensive computer science course in fall 1999, Andre commented, "It's okay. I'm learning something. But it's mostly listening. When the teacher [and student presenters] ask questions, they already have their opinion of the answer, so there's really no reason to speak." In addition, Andre must have decided there was little reason to attend. Although he did not mention it to me, when I spoke to the teacher of this course, I learned that, in contrast to Andre's perfect attendance in philosophy, he had missed a substantial number of these classes.

An even more striking lack of dialogue existed, according to Andre, between him and the director of his senior project in computer science in fall 2000. He felt totally alone in that class, he indicated, without community of any sort, without the kind of give-and-take between teacher and student that helps each learn about and from the other. Instead, according to Andre, that teacher was all "ego," seemingly interested only in displaying his own knowledge. "He cares about opinions all right," Andre said, "but only his own. . . . And he seems to think we should all live and breathe computer science like he does. But we don't, and it's hard for him to understand that." To provide further evidence of the gap between teacher and student, Andre explained that this instructor had not had the "respect" to return students' papers, "so I can't even get information about what I may be doing wrong."

By contrast to these courses, Andre spoke positively about the technical writing class he had taken in spring 2000. In that class, apparently, the teacher, like Steve, worked to overcome the teacher-student contradiction. Using a familiar phrase, Andre told me: she "wanted us to learn." Rather than maintaining her distance, according to Andre, as if she had all the knowledge and students none, she strove for classroom community and student participation. In particular, Andre explained, this teacher had students work in groups, and she tried to make the assigned audiences for their papers

come alive. At one point, she even brought in her 12-year-old son for whom students were to write operating instructions for a computer game. Andre and his group spoke with the child, and he, along with Andre's teacher, actually read and gave them feedback on their instruction manual. It was the sort of active learning within a community of inquirers that Andre had come to value.

In sum, as Andre developed his ability to reflect critically on his own education, his classes became, to use Freire's term, "codifications." As with the portrait of the teacher he criticized in Hansen's *Call to Teach*, Andre was able to step back and see his own classes as objects of analysis. Using theory he had learned in philosophy, he placed his experiences in a larger context, and, rather than just being oppositional, feeling angry and alienated, Andre could "read" these pictures of his own world in critically insightful ways.

RESOLVING THE FREIRIAN CONTRADICTION: SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE TEACHER

Steve Fishman

Lucille McCarthy has spoken about the consequences for Andre of his and my work together. I now speak from my perspective about the importance of our collaboration. At the outset, as I have indicated, he and I agreed upon a double goal: improving his ability to read and write in philosophy and improving my ability to work with novice writers. In addition, in the back of my mind, if not Andre's, was the desire to develop a Deweyan democratic community and soften the traditional teacher-student antinomy.

Regarding my goal of improved pedagogy for underprepared writers, the residue I take from Andre's and my collaboration is twofold: first, a set of ambitious, yet reasonable, expectations for novice writers who take my philosophy courses and, second, a sense of the common purposes and mutual care—the teacher-as-learner, student-as-teacher exchanges—needed to support and encourage such students. Of course, helping these students make progress toward my classroom objectives is important. However, efforts to do this will fall short, I believe, if there is little attention to the

community developed by student and teacher (see Grego and Thompson, 1996). That is, thanks to Andre, it has become clearer to me that helping novice writers develop increased self-confidence as students and better attitudes toward writing and learning is more important than bringing about, for example, immediate improvement in the surface features of their papers.

Regarding my more ambitious goal—using Deweyan community to resolve Freire’s teacher-student contradiction—I believe Andre and I also made progress. We did this by establishing a climate in which Andre could practice active and critical knowing. As McCarthy points out, in learning to place his own beliefs and experiences in a broader, philosophic context, Andre not only understood something about my discipline, he also experienced a Freirian critical “reading” of his own world.

This is not to claim that Andre and I acted, as Freire would ultimately wish, like political and cultural change-agents. That is, we did not succeed in significantly transforming my university or any other institution reproducing the values and practices of the dominant class. To the contrary, as I have already indicated, Andre, like myself, was an accommodator as well as resister of mainstream values. As evidence of this ambivalence in my case, I ask my Philosophy of Education students to read the work of contemporary critical educators like Freire, Kozol, and Delpit while, at the same time, continuing to assign Plato, Aristotle, and Locke. As for Andre, despite my occasional suggestions that he give up his goal of accumulating wealth and, instead, work with children as a coach, teacher, or a school principal—careers I was sure he would be good at—he remained adamant about what he wanted. Looking back, I acknowledge that I could have pressed more vigorously upon Andre the idea that we both had internalized too many of the values of the very class that has been for centuries our oppressors. However, I did not. To do so, I felt, would have been to diminish my respect for Andre’s aspirations and, thus, hurt my chances of achieving one of Freire’s other goals: helping students orchestrate their own destinies.

Just as Andre and I did not act as revolutionaries, neither did I answer Freire’s call to die to my own middle-class life in order to be

reborn in solidarity with the proletarian aspects of Andre's. However, as I hope is evident by now, it is not clear just what form such a rebirth would have taken since Andre and I occupy complex, shifting, and sometimes overlapping locations on the oppressor-oppressed spectrum. Andre's post-semester interviews with McCarthy underline the complexity of his allegiances and identity. Across time, as he was progressing toward his entrepreneurial goals, he was also deepening his understanding of America's injustices toward African Americans. He told McCarthy in their final interview that he was not only reading about computer science. He was now also studying Malcolm X and Frederick Douglass "to learn more about our dream."

I recognize that Andre's and my accomplishments might be dismissed as extremely modest. However, in terms of a gradualist ideology in the Deweyan mode, I believe our achievements are noteworthy. I say this because they are set in the context of realistic educational goals and are the result of a pedagogy for reform that is within the grasp of most teachers and set within an ideological framework deeply rooted in America's cultural history. This is not to diminish the importance of talking with our students about the radical transformations and proletarian victory envisioned by Marx, Gramsci, and Freire. Nor is it to denigrate the value of debating with students about alternatives to capitalism's exploitiveness, hierarchical relationships, and income inequities which many of them see as "natural." However, despite the importance of such radical perspectives, the proletarian victory these theorists envision seems out of reach. By contrast, Andre's and my collaboration is a problem-posing pedagogy that builds upon and seeks to expand the liberal, reforming forces of cooperative inquiry that already exist within capitalism. Given our current political climate, this approach in the classroom is, I believe, my best opportunity for promoting more equitable relations and institutions outside the classroom.

FOUR EVALUATIONS

Lucille McCarthy

As I have done in earlier chapters, I will now evaluate, with regard to Andre, the teaching and learning in Steve's classroom. I will do this from the perspectives of the theorists who have shaped and provided analytic distance on the student-teacher stories we tell in this book: the Critical Race Theorists and Whiteness studies scholars from chapter 3 as well as Dewey, Gramsci, and Freire, upon whom we draw throughout this book.

An Evaluation by Critical Race Theorists and Whiteness
Studies Scholars

From the Critical Race Theory point of view, I suspect these theorists would find it inexcusably negligent on Steve's part that, in a course on philosophy of education, he assigned no texts focusing on the Civil Rights movement and its effect on U.S. public education. From their standpoint, it is bad enough that Steve did not explore the implications of the 1954 *Brown* case but, even more surprising, given the location of Steve's university, that he omitted discussion of the 1971 *Swann v Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* decision.

However, these same theorists and scholars would, in my view, also make some entries on the ledger's positive side. First, Critical Race Theorists would be pleased that, as Andre noted, Steve welcomed students' opinions and stories in class discussion. In fact, this was, as I reported, a feature of Steve's Philosophy of Education course that appealed to Andre from the outset. Second, I believe both Critical Race Theorists and Whiteness studies scholars would applaud Steve's ability to use the texts of writers like Delpit, Hanson, and Kozol to bring issues of race and schooling to the center of his students' focus. In particular, Andre told me in our first post-semester interview that the Kozol text was especially rewarding because he

was able to use it to reconsider his own educational journey. In both his homework paper about Kozol and in class discussion, he was able to revisit his experiences in primarily White, well-funded schools (from first through third grades) as contrasted to his experiences in primarily Black, underfunded schools (from fourth grade through high school).

Given that Andre was the only African American in Steve's advanced class, I speculate that Critical Race Theorists and Whiteness studies scholars would find Andre's testimony noteworthy. Not only did Andre say that Steve's class was a safe place to productively consider race relations, he also reported that many of his White classmates were surprised to learn about the different levels of resources available to predominantly White and Black public schools. Following Andre's lead, they were beginning to acknowledge, at least in modest ways, that Whiteness is indeed a valuable property.

Gramscian Evaluation

Whereas I claimed that Gramsci would record mixed evaluations of Steve's work with Neha and Ellen, I believe he would be much more positive about Steve's time with Andre. True, Andre does not leave Steve's class as an organic intellectual or revolutionary intent on transforming civil society, but he seems far more committed to serious reading and critical reflection than do either Neha or Ellen. Steve can hardly take credit for the fact that Andre came to his class wanting to learn about philosophy and concerned to write more in line with the academic code. Nor can Steve claim that he directly influenced Andre, as he left his class, to read Frederick Douglass and Malcolm X in subsequent semesters. Nevertheless, I believe Gramsci would say that Steve's demanding syllabus, weekly writing assignments, high standards, and individual sessions with Andre encouraged his scholarly aspirations. In fact, in one of our last interviews, Andre mentioned that, despite his entrepreneurial ambitions, one of his primary goals was to become more of an "intellectual."

Freirian Evaluation

In Steve's part of the immediately preceding Residue section, he anticipates what I believe would be Freire's strongest criticism of his approach to Andre. Freire would lament Steve's failure to challenge Andre's stated desire to be a successful entrepreneur, an owner of multiple businesses. Although Fishman adopts a pedagogy that is much more in line with a problem-posing than a banking model, he does not help Andre, anymore than he helped Ellen, see the contradictions in his life caused by class conflict. In addition, Freire would be chagrined by the absence from Steve's reading list (except for pieces of Freire's own work) of radical educators, those who argue, for example, that America's schools are tools of social control, unjust sorting devices that help the bourgeoisie exploit worker and minority classes (see Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Karier, 1975; Katz, 1971).

Despite these shortcomings, however, I believe Freire would also see three important silver linings in Andre's experiences in philosophy, positives that balance, if not outweigh, the negatives. First, although Steve, admittedly, does not die to his middle-classness, he does try to get into Andre's shoes and develop solidarity with him. During their weekly conversations, they discover, in addition to their common concerns about Andre's class work, areas of shared interest outside academics—for example, sports—which add to their mutual understanding. Evidence of this is that long after Steve's Philosophy of Education course concluded, Andre continued to stop at Steve's office for informal chats, chances to share his own progress and check on Steve's.

Second, as I report in my part of the Residue section, Andre, as a result of taking philosophy, was able to reflect on his education in following semesters in Freirian ways. That is, after Steve's course, Andre was able to draw upon ideas from various texts he read in philosophy, especially those by Dewey and Freire, to transform his felt opposition to banking education into articulate, informed resistance. Finally, I believe Freire would be pleased with Steve's strenuous attempt to do what Freire himself sees as crucial for the liberatory

teacher's mission: honor student competencies and aspirations as well as apply a problem-posing approach to the study of academic subject matter.

Deweyan Evaluation

Earlier in this chapter, Steve quotes Dewey (1916/1967) to the effect that teachers should modify their "methods of teaching" to "retain all the youth under educational influences" until they have developed the ability to make intelligent decisions (p. 98). In Steve's effort to build democratic community with Andre—to find common purpose, likemindedness, and mutual care—and in his effort to establish a collaborative form of inquiry, I believe Dewey would see an honest attempt by a teacher to adjust his "methods of teaching" to meet a particular student's needs.

Dewey would also laud Steve's and Andre's tutorial for two additional reasons. Not only is it an illustration of a teacher modifying his pedagogy in an attempt to retain a student under "educational influences," it is also an example of a teacher and student communicating and finding likemindedness across class, ethnic, and generational lines. Further, I believe Dewey would see their collaboration as evidence that schools can be agencies of progress, helping to realize the democratic potential of U. S. society. That is, I believe Dewey would argue that Steve's and Andre's tutorial is evidence that within the school structure—a structure that radical theorists often describe negatively as an institution designed to control the poor and eliminate cultural diversity—there is space for teacher and student to nurture collaborative, critical thinking while working toward a more equitable distribution of our society's cultural, intellectual, and material goods.



Coda

The Researchers Continue to Converse

STEVE FISHMAN AND LUCILLE McCARTHY

Although we agreed that Andre Steadman enjoyed his tutorial with Steve and profitted from the course, McCarthy once again had reservations about Fishman's pedagogy. Whereas her questions about Fishman's teaching of Neha Shah and Ellen Williams centered on the inappropriateness of his curriculum, grading policies, and assignments, her criticisms of his work with Andre focused on Fishman's gradualist ideology and the way this affected his teaching.

To begin with, according to McCarthy, Fishman underestimated America's strong radical tradition, and this limited what he said to and did with his students. McCarthy disagreed with Steve's view that wholesale, dramatic political change is out of the question in America's future. Objecting to this claim, she pointed to the history of worker revolt in the United States, citing the Haymarket Square riot of 1886, the Homestead steelworkers battle with Pinkertons in 1892, and the two-month long strike of textile workers at Lawrence, Massachusetts in 1912. She also referred to well-known American journalists like Lincoln Steffens and John Reed who vigorously supported Bolshevism after the 1917 Revolution and Communists like Earl Browder and Theodore Brameld who, in the 1930s, promoted school focus on class struggle and class consciousness (see Draper, 1957; Karier, 1986).

In addition, she reminded Fishman that as early as 1828, Robert Dale Owen—whose Scottish father started the first kindergartens and co-ed schools in America—called for material as well as formal educational equality for all of America's youth. His demand was for campuses that would provide the same food, clothing, and shelter so that “the orphan boy should share the public care equally with the heir to a princely estate” (qtd. in Cremin, 1951, p. 41). According to

McCarthy, Owen's proposals, had they been adopted, would have profoundly altered the way children were raised and, ultimately, would have led to the abolition of American class differences.

Although McCarthy was upset that Fishman said nothing in *Philosophy of Education* about the possibility of dramatic social upheaval in America and failed to draw upon the tradition of Owen, Steffens, Browder, and Brameld, she was hardly surprised. Steve's gradualist liberalism, she thought, was consistent with what she understood as Dewey's notion of social reform, one that boiled down to individuals pursuing their own interests to the neglect of group solidarity. She reminded Fishman that for all of Dewey's talk about the possibility of reconciling individual goals and the larger social good, Dewey himself never took the personal risks necessary to truly shake the capitalist system. She told Fishman, "It's telling that despite Dewey's strong sympathy for Debs and the Pullman workers who were on strike the year he arrived at the University of Chicago, he never spoke out publicly in their defense. In fact," she said, "Dewey even urged his colleagues to remain quiet so as not to offend the capitalist nabobs who were funding the university."

McCarthy then directed a similar attack at Fishman himself. She told Steve that rather than risk his comfortable, tenured position by leading his students in protests on his own campus, he was, like Dewey, sitting on his hands and doing nothing publicly to confront social injustice. For example, McCarthy, invoking Robert Dale Owen's worry about material differences among students, pointed to the obvious discrepancies between the computer resources of rich and poor students on Steve's own campus. It was a classic case, she said, of the university's masking its sorting function as it reproduces America's class divisions. McCarthy suggested that the least Steve could have done was lead his students in seizing one of the few computer labs on campus to bring this inequity to the public's attention and force administrators to do something about it. (For examples of such activist pedagogy, see Hadden, 2000; Orner, 1992; Shor, 1992).

Taking McCarthy's charges seriously, Steve attempted to answer them in order. First, he acknowledged our nation's history of labor violence and the influence of the American Communist party.

However, while admitting that certain aspects of capitalism have had horrific consequences for countless people worldwide, he repeated that he saw no reasonable alternative to working for gradual reform from within the present American system.

Second, Steve addressed McCarthy's contention that Dewey was more concerned with saving his job than building solidarity with fellow workers. He confessed that, despite Dewey's overall record as a courageous public intellectual, he saw no way to justify Dewey's failure to support the Pullman strikers in the summer of 1894. However, Steve went on, even though Dewey denied that proletarian violence and triumph was the cornerstone of social reconstruction, he reminded McCarthy that Dewey sought the same ends as America's radicals. That is, Dewey (1935/1991) sought the extension of democracy from the political to the social and economic realms of life by urging the establishment of a "socialized economy" that would serve liberty and individual development (pp. 63–65). And, Steve added, "So do I."

Third, regarding his own unwillingness to lead his students in political confrontation, Steve said he had no simple response. He told McCarthy that he fully supported Robert Dale Owen's plea for more equitable student opportunities. He even quoted Dewey (1916/1967) as wanting something similar when Dewey advocated "such supplementation of family resources as will enable [all] youth to take advantage of [school facilities]" (p. 98). Nevertheless, and despite Fishman's own recoil at the ways in which his university reproduces current class inequities, he said he thought it inappropriate to make a computer lab sit-in a requirement in Philosophy of Education. To contextualize his position, Fishman offered a different gloss than McCarthy on the 1930s arguments about teachers and the appropriate politics of the classroom. According to Fishman, there were many, not just communists like Browder and Brameld, but also liberals like George Counts and John Childs, who believed teachers had a duty to develop student attitudes that favored a new world order based on international socialism. By contrast, there were also conservatives who thought school teachers were public servants with an obligation to encourage values that reflected the existing society

and the attitudes of the majority (see Violas, 1973). Fishman told McCarthy,

Although you have made clear that you would have sided with Browder and Brameld, I would have sided with those like Dewey, who wanted to avoid both extremes. Like him, I would have spoken out against efforts from both the left and the right that looked like student indoctrination. [See Dewey, 1934/1986b.]

Steve added that in the spirit of Dewey he took his first obligation as a teacher to be not the imposition of his own views but the encouragement of open classroom discussion with the aim of developing what Dewey (1934/1986b) calls “continuous inquiry” and “intelligent scepticism” (pp. 160–161; see also Bode, 1938).

Applying this principle of student deliberation to his Philosophy of Education classroom, Fishman said that asking for a computer lab sit-in would defeat the purpose of student give and take and be especially unfair to pupils who held conservative ideologies, those who, for example, see democracy as primarily about “negative liberties” and hands-off, *laissez-faire* government (see Berlin, 1970). But even if all his students did have radical orientations, he said, he would still be uneasy about exposing them to suspension or expulsion, not to mention jeopardizing his own career. Steve concluded by relating his ideology to his own life and career trajectory:

Political confrontation has just not been part of my own personal narrative. I’m afraid I have never seen myself as a revolutionary leader. I know this sounds like a cop-out, but I went into teaching because I felt that, given my personality, my best chance of working for a better society was to help students become more reflective, articulate, and intellectually aware about the world in which they find themselves. That is, despite schools being controlled by the dominant elite, I believed there was still enough loose play within them, at least in most North American situations, for students and teachers to develop critical consciousness.

In addition to McCarthy’s charge that Fishman’s gradualist ideology ignored the radical tradition that actually exists in America

and caused him to say and do too little in this regard with his students, she believed it hurt his teaching in a second way. McCarthy told Fishman that she thought he engaged in “teacher malpractice” when he refused to deconstruct Andre’s professed, capitalist aspirations. She said she was disturbed by his complacency in response to Andre’s entrepreneurial ambitions. “It may seem like a success story to you and Andre,” she said, “but in my view Andre is simply serving the interests of the ruling class, just another case of keeping the disempowered hopeful while reducing their appetite for revolt.” McCarthy explained to Steve that, in her view, he had an obligation as an educator to show Andre the ways he was being manipulated by capitalist interests, the ways in which his idea that money equals success is a mask for what is really going on: he is being trained by bourgeois culture to want goods that he does not need. McCarthy concluded: “Andre’s success is not going to change the sad fact that 10% of our richest citizens own 86% of our nation’s wealth” (see Spring, 1996, p. 4; West, 1993, pp. 10–11).

Attempting to answer this final criticism by McCarthy, Fishman began by acknowledging her condemnation of our capitalist and consumer culture. He said he too thinks it criminal that so few have so much while so many have so little. However, in an effort to defend his approach to Andre, he recalled for McCarthy that in various indirect ways—both in class and in one-on-one sessions—he had suggested to Andre as well as his classmates that, as college students, they were privileged and, thus, had an obligation to help those less well-off. He also argued once again that to push much harder against Andre’s goals was to disrespect Andre’s right to make his own decisions. Fishman said, “Even if I were absolutely certain that I knew what was best for Andre—which I am not—I would avoid intervening if I thought doing so might interfere with his independent judgment or injure his sense of self-worth.”

Steve then conceded, as he had when reflecting on his experiences with Neha and Ellen, that he had, no doubt, made many mistakes. For example, he agreed that in Philosophy of Education he should probably have assigned selections from radical educational historians as well as texts dealing with the school court cases initiated by the

Civil Rights movement. Yet, despite these and other shortcomings, he said, he remained positive about his collaboration with Andre. He told McCarthy he believed that by working in the spirit of Dewey, Freire, and Gramsci—encouraging Andre to become more critical, to inventory his ideas, and to work cooperatively with others—he had, in his own modest way, contributed to the extension of democracy and to social reform.