Educating for Democracy:
The Vision and Legacy of Ralph Mosher

F. Clark Power
University of Notre Dame

Ralph Mosher succeeds John Dewey as a major spokesperson for democratic education. His passion for democratic high schools seems out of tune, however, in the wake of Columbine. Shaken by the violence of Columbine, teachers and administrators are attempting to exert increasingly greater control over student behavior, through dress codes, for example. These well-meaning attempts may succeed in bringing about outward conformity, but they are sorely limited in that they do not give students an active roll in addressing serious problems in their schools. Drawing on his experience as a consultant to School-Within-A-School, a democratic alternative high school, Mosher urged that teachers and administrators give their students a significant role in making decisions that effect the life and discipline of their schools. He advocated particpatory democracy as a way of promoting students' moral and civic development and as a way of building community. A challenge to the traditional understanding of the role of the teacher, Mosher's vision of the democratic high school will require a new approach to teacher education, one in which the teachers not only learn about but experience participatory decision-making.

The great problem of the adult ... is how to see, and to feel deeply as well as merely to see intellectually, the forces that are moving in the young ... To see them as possibilities, as signs and promises. Nor does the task end there. It is bound up with the further problem of devising the conditions, the materials, both physical ... and moral and social, which will ... bring about transformation in desired direction (John Dewey, as cited in Mosher, Kenny, & Garrod, 1994, p. 29).

Ralph Mosher has earned a special place in the history of developmental psychology and counseling education. Mosher, more so than any of his contemporaries, placed the everyday activities that make up the complex process of education in their widest social and political context. A true successor of John Dewey, Mosher argued forcefully that democracy is the aim of education and that counselors and teachers have a decisive role to play in this process. Mosher's groundbreaking work in, and reflections upon, democratic high schools are his enduring legacy. A prophet, who tirelessly confronted the indifference of practitioners and researchers, he persisted to the end of his life calling for schools to become democratic communities nurturing the development of responsible citizens.

Mosher, like Lawrence Kohlberg, was committed to the educational principle that the best way to prepare students for democracy was to have them practice it. The commitment led Mosher (1978) to the School-Within-A-School in Brookline High School where he served as a consultant and observer until he retired. Although Mosher (1979, 1980) and Kohlberg took somewhat divergent paths in their consulting with democratic schools, their differences were more in emphasis than in substance. These differences are, nonetheless, worth exploring because they can lead us to new educational insights not only about democratic education, but also about the social structures that promote adolescent development.

Preventing Another Columbine

Mosher's impassioned advocacy of democracy in high schools seems oddly out of touch in the prevailing post-Columbine climate. Only months after the tragedy, state legislatures and school administrators across the country have issued a variety of edicts aimed at preventing future incidents. Gun checks and drug testing abound. Strict dress codes and uniforms have been introduced. The Louisiana legislature went as far as mandating that children address school employees as "ma'ams and sirs." All across America, frightened school administrators are asserting their power and authority in a panicky effort to control their adolescent charges.

How do adolescents perceive the post-Columbine regulations, many of which were decided upon over their summer vacation? Daniel, a seventeen year-old junior with a beard and long pony tail but without his now illicit black outfit remarked, "The new dress code is for the parents not for the kids. They [the administrators] really don't care about what we think or what is going to make this a better place for us. It's just a show and its not going to change anything." Daniel is engaged in the academic, athletic, and social life of his school. He readily defends the "outcasts" whom the popular students reject and taunt. After several run-ins with teachers in his first year, he has become well-liked by the faculty, counselors, and administrators. He, nevertheless, characterized the dress code as a way of "showing how powerful they [administrators and teachers] are. They think that by getting all the kids to look the same, they can get them to conform to all the rules, which isn't going to happen."

Jim, a sixteen year-old sophomore whose long black cape and painted nails once identified him as a Goth, remarked that administrators are using the dress code "to get us to conform by making us look the same. They want to make this a better school, but they don't want to face up to the real problems." Jim is an unusually bright student, who reads philosophy on his own and his a wonderful sense of humor. Unlike Daniel, he is not involved in athletics or in extra curricular activities and his relationships with teachers and peers are often strained.

Carol, a sixteen year-old junior, who travels in one of the more popular crowds of honor students, is a member of Amnesty International, and volunteers weekly as a childcare worker at a homeless shelter, did not find that the dress code radically altered her "preppie" style of dressing. Although she agreed with Daniel and Jim that the dress code took attention away from serious problems in the school, she thought that the code helped students to de-emphasize the way they dressed and to feel part of a the same group:

> I didn't like the dress code when it was announced. They just said, "Here it is; now follow it." They seem to think that how we look is going to make this a better place, but they don't want to talk about the real problems around here, like drugs, and drinking, and kids picking on other other kids. Now I think the dress code isn't so bad. I don't have to decide what to wear every day. The dress code also seems to help the kids feel a little more together because we all look more the same. I mean the rich kids can't show off as much as they used to.

Carol's observation that the dress code "seems to help the kids feel a little more together" is consistent with the claims of advocates of school uniforms, who point out that uniforms can contribute to a sense of solidarity (Cohn, 1996).

The pros and cons of school uniform policies were recently reviewed by Thompson (1999), who concluded that violence had become such a threat to schools that uniform policies deserved a try. She cautioned, however, that a uniform policy should not be seen as a "panacea" for combating violence and promoting academic achievement but should be considered as part of a more comprehensive solution. Brunsma and Rockquemore (1998) were more skeptical. Analyzing data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1998, they found that wearing uniforms had no effect on student behavior and a negative effect on academic achievement. Their results contradict reports, the most famous of which is from Long Beach Unified School District in California, that uniform policies have reduced violence and misbehavior in schools (Thompson, 1999). Brunsma and Rockquemore (1998) note, however, that attributing lowered violence and vandalism to the institution of a uniform policy may be an oversimplification. The Long Beach Unified School district implemented a variety of reforms alongside mandating school uniforms.

The adoption of a school uniform policy generally signifies adults' desire to promote a more positive, communal school atmosphere. Daniel, Jim, and Carol all acknowledged that the adoption of a dress code in their school was at the very least a well-intentioned effort to improve their school. They are not opposed to the ideas of uniforms *per se*. Daniel took great pride in wearing his school's soccer uniform and felt strongly that those wearing that uniform had a duty to represent the school's ideals. On the other hand, Daniel, Jim, and Carol objected to what they regarded as a naive and unilateral approach to dealing with very serious issues in their school. They believed that administrators had to involve students in discussing and addressing the problems that plagued their school. They longed for a community that went past uniforms to students hearts and minds. Such involvement would require, however, a radical reorganization of student participation in school governance.

Shortly after the Columbine incident, Daniel ran for class officer. He and the other candidates campaigned for several weeks displaying posters and giving a speech at a class assembly. Students approached the election as a popularity contest that could be swayed by a candidate's sense of humor and cleverness. Nathan, a previous class president, had been elected almost entirely on his demonstrative enthusiasm for the job. He campaigned on the slogan, "You'd better recognize." He never explained what he wanted his voters to recognize, but that did not seem to matter to anyone. Daniel was not as successful as Nathan, although Daniel appeared to have been the frontrunner the day of the election. As Daniel learned of his defeat, he also heard a number of students complaining that the election had been "rigged" by the winners' supporters, who had stuffed the ballot boxes. Daniel protested to the teacher supervising the election without success. Carol reported that one of her friends had seen a student filling out several ballots and that "everyone knew that the election was a fraud."

49

She added that another friend of hers did not vote because there were not enough ballots. When asked whether she intended to do something about the situation, she shrugged her shoulders and said, "What can I do? The teachers don't take the election seriously and many kids think that the election is just a popularity contest. Besides, being a class officer really doesn't mean much."

The following Fall, Carol was asked again about the election and whether she was upset that it had been rigged. She mused: "I am still shocked that this happened. I am not really surprised by the people who did it (stuffed the ballot boxes), but I do think that an election is something special, almost sacred. I mean our society is a democracy and we should care that our elections are fair." Carol explained that she was studying the founding documents of the United States as part of her American History course and had come to a new appreciation of her democratic heritage. With that appreciation, she had become more disappointed in the election fraud than she was the previous Spring. She had also become more puzzled by the indifference of her teachers and fellow students. If democracy is key to the identity of the United States, why did so few people care that her class elections had been compromised? Mosher would urge us to ask further questions: Why schools extol the virtues of democracy in social studies classes and yet operate as autocracies? Why do school administrators respond to peer group conflict, violence, and student alienation with dress codes instead of dialogue? Why are students, like Carol, praised for their community service participation but not trusted for participation in school governance?

The Value of Democratic Participation

Mosher, Kenny, and Garrod (1994) speculated that the emphasis on conformity and the lack of meaningful participation in decision-making in high schools contribute to a lack of voter participation among the young in the United States. Daniel and Carol's comments suggest that American high schools may actually promote cynicism toward democracy. Schools, of course, are not entirely to blame. Election campaigns, like the one Nathan successfully waged, mirror the cult of the personality and use of meaningless sound bites in adult political life. Students, moreover, recognize that there is little at stake in the class elections. Their officers are entrusted with few significant responsibilities. Mosher (1978) recognized this, but argued that schools should reform, not reflect the ills of society. He saw democratic participation in high schools as a small but not insignificant step toward this end.

Mosher's (1978,1979, 1980) arguments on behalf of student participation in high school governance were informed by the many years in which he served as a participant-observer in School-Within-A-School (S.W.S.). S.W.S., along with Cluster and Scarsdale Alternative High School (S.A.S.), was one of the original alternative high schools in which the just community approach to moral education

through direct participatory democracy was first formulated and tested (Power, Higgins, and Kohlberg, 1987). All of these schools had a weekly meeting, which in S.W.S. was called a town meeting and in Cluster and S.A.S. a community meeting. At these meetings, students and faculty gathered to discuss and decide matters of school life and discipline. These meetings were not bull sessions or opportunities for faculty to lecture students. The teachers and students brought up genuine problems and really believed that they could work productively together to resolve them. Mosher often described himself as a "Town Meeting groupie." He rarely missed an S.W.S. town meeting and attended many community meetings at Cluster as well. Mosher once described these meetings as a kind of soap opera with each meeting a drama unto itself but also leading into the next, as a narrative of the development of a democratic school enfolded (Power, personal communication, 1976).

In contrast to Carol's disappointing experience, students in the just community schools took democracy seriously. Power and Power (1992) illustrate this in a discussion of the Y.E.S. (Your Educational Success) Program, a just community school-within-a-school for at risk students. Y.E.S. was structured so that students elected officers each quarter. This practice was introduced to make it possible for many students to get elected and to encourage students to reflect on how responsible their officers had discharged their duties. Power and Power (1992) found that the Y.E.S. students originally approached elections as Nathan did in the example above. The Y.E.S. student candidates made empty promises and indulged in hollow rhetoric. The most popular students were the winners. By the third quarter, however, many students began to lose patience with officers that failed to meet their obligations to the community consistently, and they removed their treasurer from office. The last quarter, those running for office gave serious speeches detailing their qualifications and making realistic promises. The students most devoted to Y.E.S. defeated the most popular.

The experience of Y.E.S. supports Mosher's contention that democratic schools can succeed if given the opportunity. Yet if anything has been learned through observations in these schools, it is that the democratic approach requires time and patience. Groups, like individuals, need time to develop. The mere existence of participative structures does not in and of itself lead to a flourishing community. This was immediately apparent in all of the democratic experiments. When the students in the Y.E.S. Program were informed that they were going to participate in the governance of their program, they were simply bewildered. They had no inkling of what to expect, no sense of what their participation in decision-making might mean for them, no faith that democracy might make their schools better places for study and social interaction.

The students in the Y.E.S. Program are typical of most high schools insofar as they are accustomed to having teach-

ers and administrators make all the decisions that matter in schools. Periodically high school students ask for and even demand a greater voice in the affairs of their schools, but rarely do they succeed in changing the governance structures of their schools. School administrators and teachers generally believe that they would be acting irresponsibly if they empowered students to make significant decisions. Teachers and administrators rightly guard control over the curriculum. Students are simply not prepared to determine what should be taught and how. In fact, teachers and administrators may have conceded too much curricular choice to individual students by providing such a wide array of electives in the "shopping mall" high school. On the other hand, students, like Daniel, Jim, and Carol, may be best judges of the social problems that plague their schools and how these might be addressed.

There is no reason, however, to assume that involving students in discussion and decision-making will necessarily lead to substantively better decisions or to greater solidarity. Students may well take advantage of a democracy by throwing off the shackles of any restrictions. For example, Power, Higgins, and Kohlberg (1987) reported that Cluster School's first community meeting ended with a student proposal to make afternoon classes optional; and Mosher (1978) noted that he met with considerable resistence when he tried to get S.W.S. students to agree to an attendance policy at their weekly Town Meeting. Students unaccustomed to the responsibilities of democratic citizenship are initially likely to act as their elders feared, a demonstration of the self-fulling prophecy. Yet when their elders hold out high expectations and trust in democracy, students do respond constructively and collaboratively, as the research on democratic schools has shown (Mosher, Kenny & Garrod, 1994; Power, Higgins & Kohlberg, 1987; Power & Power, 1992).

Mosher's (1979) view that democratic experience plays a significant role in promoting development runs contrary to popular opinion that students do not have sufficient knowledge or maturity for democratic participation. Most educators assume, moreover, that students can be adequately prepared for democratic citizenship without practicing it. Mosher was keenly aware of students' lack of knowledge and immaturity, yet he believed that students could most readily acquire the skills of democratic participation through democratic participation. Mosher elaborated on Dewey's observation that democracy is a way of life. As a way of life, democracy demands that individuals relate with sensitivity and openness to others and adopt inclusive responses to challenges and problems. A democratic way of life thus requires more than knowledge about particular democratic procedures or the origins and history of a particular nation's democratic government. A democratic way of life involves a pattern of interaction, a pattern formed through practice or habituation in the Aristotlean sense. High schools' disciplinary codes give students endless opportunities to conform and to obey, and high schools' curricula give students opportunities to make choices based on their individual goals

and interests. Yet, outside of the extra curriculum and limited cooperative learning projects, high schools provide few if any systematic opportunities for students to learn how to deliberate together.

Moral Development and Democratic Education

Traditionalist critics of Mosher and Kohlberg's particpatory approach to moral education, such as Ryan (1996) and Wynne (1989) mistakenly regard the practice of democracy in schools as undermining teachers' moral authority and as pandering to students' whims. They fail to appreciate that the approach that Mosher and Kohlberg have taken to democracy significantly differs from a civil libertarian concern to protect individual rights and interests or from a purely procedural concern to involve students in democratic processes. Mosher and Kohlberg may have inadvertently contributed to their critics' misunderstanding by underestimating the role that they, as consultants, played in setting a moral agenda for the schools in which they worked. Along with introducing democratic structures to S.W.S.'s students and faculty, Mosher proposed that the building of a moral community be the overarching goal of the process. Mosher's (1978) account of the early years of S.W.S. makes clear that without his insistence, the S.W.S.'s weekly Town Meetings would not have engaged students in making and enforcing rules about school discipline and community participation. Mosher gently but effectively challenged students to set aside at least some of their preoccupation with self-expression and personal freedom for the greater good of the group.

After several years of consulting in S.W.S., Mosher (1980) expressed some reservations about viewing moral development, understood in terms of Kohlberg's stages, as the sole or even primary end of democratic education. Furthermore, Mosher worried that Kohlberg's focus on moral issues in the just community approach unnecessarily limited the effectiveness of the democratic approach. Referring to this focus as "reductionistic," Mosher (1980) noted that morality was only one of many areas of concern to adolescents. Mosher, Kenny, and Garrod (1994) further argued that the democratic approach fostered human development, which included but was not limited to Kohlberg and Gilligan's perspectives on moral development.

Kohlberg and his colleagues (myself included) had indeed seen the just community approach primarily as a form of moral education. We thus originally limited our psychological assessment of the first three just community schools (Cluster, S.W.S., and S.A.S.) to moral stage development (Power, Higgins, and Kohlberg 1987). Although we found modest but significant moral judgment development among students in Cluster School and the Scarsdale Alternative School (S.A.S.), we did not find significant change among those in School-Within-A-School. We attributed the lack of significant moral judgment development in S.W.S. to the fact the S.W.S. faculty did not encourage

51

the students to focus their Town Meeting discussions on moral issues and making disciplinary rules to the extent that the faculty in Cluster and S.A.S. did (Power, Higgins, and Kohlberg 1987). Although Mosher urged the S.W.S. faculty and students to move in the direction established in Cluster and later in S.A.S., Mosher found that the S.W.S. faculty and students were far more independent than those in Cluster or S.A.S. Mosher was also a less directive consultant than Kohlberg. For example, Kohlberg insisted that student attendance at the weekly community meetings in Cluster and S.A.S. be mandatory. Mosher, on the other hand, simply recommended that S.W.S. members consider an attendance policy.

Mosher purposely restrained himself as a consultant to S.W.S. in order to allow the S.W.S. democracy to evolve at its own pace:

> Democratic groups must decide their own destinies within certain broad principles. Consultants, especially those who believe they know the shape of that destiny, need to permit the pooled intelligence and experience of the democratic group to operate and to grow, even to make "mistakes" (Mosher, 1980, p. 292).

Mosher, as noted earlier, did not hesitate to challenge the S.W.S. group to become more of a community by establishing shared norms and rules. Having made his point, however, he stepped back and observed how the group responded. Mosher found that faculty and students pursued a wide variety of issues that had little to do with morality or with a normative sense of community. Mosher generally trusted the intuitions of faculty and students about the needs of their community and witnessed the slow but organic growth of the S.W.S. group. To his credit, S.W.S. never became dependent on his advice or support and to this day is independent and self-sufficient.

Those of us working in Cluster came to appreciate the wisdom of Mosher's patient and flexible approach to consulting, and in subsequent interventions we became less directive and more attentive to the teachers' and students' concerns. We have also become more open in our assessments of the effectiveness of these schools (e.g., Power, Higgins & Kohlberg, 1987; Power & Power, 1994; Higgins, 1995; Power, Khmelkov & Power, 1997). Although we are still concerned about promoting moral judgment development, we have begun to explore other dimensions of student development, such as students' self-understanding and self-worth. As noted earlier, we are also recognizing that achieving a democratic way of life entails more than cognitive moral development and the acquisition of social skills. The democratic way of life involves adopting special habits of interaction, deliberation, and cooperation.

By his example as well as his warnings of moral reductionism, Mosher has made us aware that preparing students for a democratic way of life cannot be encapsulated in a particular intervention strategy or set of strategies. Those of us who worked with Kohlberg on the just community approach emphasized the role of consultants and teachers as advocates of the ideals and norms of community. We were skeptical the alternative schools would spontaneously evolve as communities because of students' developmental immaturity and because a culture of privatism pervades most schools. We discovered that we were ill-prepared as consultants to bridge the gap between the ought and the is in the just community schools. We advocated and exhorted, but we did not provide nor did we know how to provide concrete ways in which students could overcome the obstacles to living up to such norms as racial integration, and class participation. Mosher's writings on democratic education remind us that the teachers and students who participate in democratic schools have diverse needs and interests and that if we are to succeed, we must engage those needs and interests, both moral and non-moral.

Teacher Education

Mosher learned through his consulting experience that the teachers played a crucial role in the establishment and growth of democratic schools. As a counseling psychologist, Mosher expected all teachers to take a personal interest in students; and he understood the effectiveness of taking such an interest. Yet Mosher also recognized that few teachers are prepared to accept the challenges of participating in decision-making with students. Surprisingly little systematic research has been done on teachers' role in moral or democratic education. This should not come as too great a surprise because until recently very little research had been done on teachers themselves, on how their beliefs, commitments, and values influence their teaching. The ideal of designing "teacher proof curricula" and behavioral management approaches is giving way to an acknowledgment that success in the classroom ultimately depends on the qualities of the teacher.

When he began consulting at S.W.S., Mosher noted that the teachers were interested in but ambivalent about the work that he and Kohlberg had undertaken in moral education. One influential male teacher openly expressed reservations about what he called "creeping moral developmentalism" in the school (Mosher, Kenney & Garrod, 1994, p. 64). Mosher's interactions with the S.W.S. faculty indicated that proponents of democratic moral education would not only have to prepare teachers for new tasks but also persuade them to take on new commitments. Khmelkov, Power, and Power (in press) have begun to study how teachers conceive of their responsibilities to their students and how well-equipped they judge themselves to be to undertake these responsibilities. Preliminary findings with beginning teachers suggests that teachers vary considerably in their view of their role as teacher and in their sense of self-efficacy. New high school teachers in particular are

particularly concerned about how effective they will be in their subject area (e.g., history) and in maintaining order in the classroom. They generally receive considerable preparation in their subject area and in methods of teaching in their area and far less instruction in classroom management. In spite of what they are taught in classroom management, new teachers are likely to feel anxious about their competence to maintain sufficient control. New teachers are thus likely to anticipate success as subject area teachers and to focus their energies in this area.

High schools are organized to accentuate the role of the teacher as an expert in a particular subject area. With few exceptions, subjects, such as science, English, and mathematics, are taught in complete isolation from each other. Although teachers may have an interest in interdisciplinary collaboration, they are unlikely to find much of an opportunity to do so. Not only is scheduling difficult, but also teachers themselves are segregated into disciplinary departments, similar to those at the college level. The effect of such segregation is to divert teachers attention and commitment away from the student as a whole person and the school as a community to the particular subject that they are teaching. In this respect, the high school teacher and the early elementary school teacher are almost polar opposites. The early elementary school teachers are responsible for all of the subject areas. They are also responsible for discipline throughout the day and for consoling children in times of distress. The elementary classroom is thus a school-within-a-school, which is under the direction of a single teacher, who integrates teaching, discipline, and counseling.

Although elementary and high school teachers may enter their profession for many of the same reasons, differences in the organization of elementary and high schools channels their commitments and preparation in very different directions. As noted, elementary school teachers necessarily assume multiple roles. They must attend to the moral and social development of their students as well as to their intellectual development. High school teachers may feel committed to promoting students' moral and social development, but they are likely to find themselves constrained by the demands of the curriculum. They are also constrained by the organization of high schools, which delegates responsibility for discipline (beyond the walls of the classroom) and counseling to specialists.

Teachers who feel deeply committed to promoting students' social and moral development are likely to be found moderating an activity or coaching a sport. The extra curriculum offers teachers an opportunity to relate to students outside of the formal, hierarchical structure of the curriculum. In the extra curriculum, students are generally treated as responsible participants, whether they are elected representatives to student government, reporters for the school paper, or players on the soccer team. Teachers who become moderators and coaches find that they can relate on a far more personal and equal level to their students.

In a comprehensive longitudinal study of high school students, Power (1999) found that moderators and coaches played an important role in giving students both encouragement to continue their education beyond high school and concrete assistance in planning and preparing for post-secondary education. Power's findings reveal that the extra curriculum was at least as powerful if not more powerful than the curriculum in making teachers available as resources to students. Power's research calls attention not only to the potential of the extra curriculum but also to the limitations of the curriculum. Why is the extra curriculum so successful in fostering students' sense of belonging to the school and identification with the school's educational aims? What is lacking in the curriculum that students, particularly those in the middle and lower track courses, often feel estranged from the school organization and distant from their teachers?

The need for an extra curriculum was recognized by those who first proposed the comprehensive high school. They foresaw that the comprehensive high school would divide students by age, ability level, and social class; and they looked to the extra curriculum as a way of overcoming this social fragmentation and of building solidarity for the sake of the civic society. Unfortunately, the extra curriculum has not received adequate attention from either educational researchers or policy-makers. The extra curriculum has all too often been the first item to be cut in order to balance the budget; and students are increasingly trading involvement in an after school activity for a part-time job. Power's research suggests that neglect and abandonment of the extra curriculum will only exacerbate the gap between the haves and have nots in schools. Her research, moreover, suggests that researchers and policy-makers look to the extra curriculum for new and more effective approaches to the curriculum.

The democratic approach that Mosher proposed is one way of extending the benefits of the extra curriculum to the curriculum. Teachers are, however, more likely to be more wary of interacting with students in a democratic school than they are of moderating an extracurricular activity. Although a teacher may be comfortable with granting students responsibility for composing a yearbook, for instance, that same teacher may worry about granting students responsibility for disciplinary rules. The difference, it can be argued, lies not in qualifications of the individual student or the judgment of the teacher but in the social organization of the school. The curriculum and extra curriculum engender very different expectations about the competencies of students and the structure of the student–teacher relationship.

Conventional classroom management practices, moreover, make it more difficult for teachers to consider democratic approaches to disciplinary problems. The very term "management" implies that students are at best passive and at worst unruly subjects in need of control. The key to most classroom management approaches is having clear and consistent expectations for student conduct. Some management approaches allow room for limited student involvement in setting rules and consequences. For example, Emmer, Evertson, Clements and Worsham (1994) note that

some teachers involve students in rule-making to order to "promote student ownership in rules and more student responsibility for their own behavior" (p. 23). They add that student involvement is usually confined to student representatives and that student involvement at the classroom level is cumbersome. Emmer et al. (1994) make it clear that student participation is not necessary: "It is important to note that many effective managers do not provide for student choice in rule setting. Instead, they clearly present their rules and procedures to students and provide explanations of the need for such rules" (p. 24). Emmer et al. (1994) assume that students have neither a right nor a responsibility to participate in setting the rules that will govern their everyday behavior, nor do they assume that students could make a genuine contribution to formulating rules. Although Emmer et al. (1994) acknowledge possible benefits from giving students limited choices in setting rules, they do not elaborate on these benefits from either a moral or a civic education point of view.

Emmer et al. (1994) ask teachers to be authoritative by striving to be reasonable and fair; and they reassure teachers that authoritative teachers who reinforce rules consistently "will find the great majority of students will abide by them" (p. 24). Emmer et al.'s conception of the authoritative teacher refers to Baumrind's (1973) distinction between authoritarian and authoritative styles of parenting. The authoritarian parent makes demands without attempting to explain them while the authoritative parent tries to explain the reasons for rules and expectations. The authoritative parent, however, is not necessarily a democratic parent because the authoritative parent does not necessarily have to involve the child in making decisions. Yet authoritative parents recognize that authority must be exercised in ways that elicit the cooperation of the child.

The free school movement of the 1970s, which gave birth to many alternative schools like S.W.S., endorsed a third, laissez-faire approach to discipline in which the teachers attempted to influence student behavior through their personal relationships with individual students rather than through traditional rules and punishments. The teachers attracted to alternative schools tolerated and often encouraged students to express their individuality in grooming and dress. The challenge for many alternative school teachers arose in the conventional domain, particularly in the area of attendance. These teachers expected faithful class attendance as did teachers in the conventional schools, but the alternative school teachers were reluctant to codify those expectations into rules and to punish violations. When students skipped several classes, teachers talked to them individually. These conferences were often successful because students had a genuine interest in pleasing their teachers and also recognized that going to class was important if they were to be successful in school.

If these alternative school teachers are to be characterized as laissez faire or permissive, it is not because they did not have expectations for students. These teachers struggled with the exercise of authority and attempted to sidestep problems, like skipping class and missing community meetings, by dealing with them in the context of interpersonal teacher-student relationships. This strategy avoided painful confrontations over discipline, but never really helped students to accept obligations arising from the membership in the school society.

Mosher challenged teachers with a democratic approach that avoids the extremes of authoritative and laissez-faire approaches and incorporates the strengths of the authoritative model. The distinction between the democratic and the authoritative approach is that the democratic approach locates authority in the group as a whole. Democratic rules arise out of a process of common reflection and deliberation, which in principle makes it easier for teachers and students to enforce their rules.

Mosher, Kenney, and Garrod (1994) noted somewhat pessimistically that "many teachers are genuinely committed to the rhetoric of democracy but a significant core of their thinking is likely to center on authority, maintenance of rules, discipline, and order in the classroom" (p. 76). This led them to conclude that "probably not even a majority of teachers will be comfortable with school democracy" and that "education of teachers for projects in a school democracy" is important (p. 77).

The future of democratic education in the United States may well depend upon the extent to which teachers can be effectively prepared not only to participate in such schools but to establish them. Research on an innovative teacher education program at Notre Dame that places a high emphasis on moral education and community building (Khmelkov, Power, and Power (in press) suggests several ways of fostering commitment to and competence in democratic education. First, teacher preparation programs ought to emphasize that teaching is a form of public service and recruit idealistic young people who are concerned about building a just society. Such young people are likely to be receptive to the moral and democratic aims of education and willing to take risks. Second, teacher preparation curricula ought to include courses or significant sections of courses devoted to the core ideals, principles, and methods of moral and civic education. Idealistic young people, who wish to promote students' moral and civic development need to acquire the knowledge skills that will help them to be effective moral and democratic educators. Third, teacher preparation programs should offer internships and practice teaching in democratic schools, like S.W.S. New teachers need not only supervision by a master teacher but also actual experience in working in a democratic setting in order to develop the skills necessary to translate their newly acquired knowledge into effective practice. Fourth, teacher preparation programs should themselves operate as democratic communities. Understanding what it means to be a student member of a democratic academic community will enable future teachers to understand more completely the powerful role of democratic community in the lives of their future students and their responsibility for bringing such communities to life.

The teachers of tomorrow will find no better model of what is required of a democratic educator than Ralph Mosher. He saw, felt, and understood the many "forces moving in the young;" and he gave his life to showing how these forces could find their fullest expression and development in democratic schools.

References

Baumrind, D. (1973). The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A.D. Pick (Ed.), *Minnesota symposium on child psychology* (Vol. 7). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Brunsma, D.L. and Rockquemore, K. A. (1998). Effects of student uniforms on attendance, behavioral problems, substance use, and academic achievement. *The Journal of Educational Rresearch,* 92 (1), 53-62.

Cohn, C.A. (1996). Should students wear uniforms? Yes. *Learning,* 25 (2), 38.

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., Clements, B. S. & Worsham, M. E. (1994). *Classroom management for secondary teachers.* Boston: Allyn and BACON.

Higgins, A. (1995). Understanding the moral self: Research goals for the next five years. *Moral Education Forum, 20(2),* 30-37.

Vladimir T. Khmelkov, AnnMarie R. Power, and F. Clark Power. (In press). *Teacher candidates' incoming beliefs about teaching and the teaching Profession: Catholic service-learning and traditional programs compared. Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice.*

Mosher, R. L. (1978). A democratic high school: damn it, your feet are always in the water. In N. Sprinthall and R. Mosher (Eds.), Value development ... as an aim of education. Schenectady , N.Y.: Character Research Press.

Mosher, R. L. (1979). *Adolescents development and education: A Janus knot.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchin.

Mosher, R. L. (1980). A democratic school: Coming of age. In R. Mosher (Ed.), *Moral education: A first generation of research and development.* New York: Praeger.

Mosher, R., Kenny, R. A. & Garrod, A. (1994). *Preparing for citizenship: Teaching youth to live democratically.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Power, F. C., Higgins, A. & Kohlberg, L. (1989b). *Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education.* New York: Columbia University.

Power, A. M. & Khmelkov, V. (1996, August). *The effects of community service participation on high school students' sense of social responsibility.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York.

Power, F.C. & Power, A.M. R. (1992). A raft of hope: Democratic education and the challenge of pluralism. *Journal of Moral Education,* 21, 193-205.

Ryan, K. (1996). Character education in the United States: A status report. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education.* 2 (1), 75-84.

Thompson, M.-H. W. (1999) Revisiting School uniforms. *The Educational Forum* 63(4), 300-309.

Wynne, E. (1989).Transmitting traditional values in contemporary schools. In L. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral development and character education: A dialogue* (pp. 6-25). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.