



BOLD VISIONS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Key Works in Critical Pedagogy

Joe L. Kincheloe

kecia hayes

Shirley R. Steinberg

Kenneth Tobin (Editors)

SensePublishers

Key Works in Critical Pedagogy

Bold Visions in Educational Research
Volume 32

Series Editor

Kenneth Tobin, *The Graduate Center, City University of New York, USA*

Tribute

Joe L. Kincheloe was the founding co-editor of the series. Long before we had the series Joe had the idea to have a Key Works feature and invited me to write such a book. It is fitting that Joe's Key Works is a part of the series that was primarily his idea. It is indeed an honor to publish Joe L. Kincheloe's Key Works because this collection of scholarly works and the associated commentaries will be essential reading for serious educational scholar researchers.

Scope

Bold Visions in Educational Research is international in scope and includes books from two areas: *teaching and learning to teach* and *research methods in education*. Each area contains multi-authored handbooks of approximately 200,000 words and monographs (authored and edited collections) of approximately 130,000 words. All books are scholarly, written to engage specified readers and catalyze changes in policies and practices. Defining characteristics of books in the series are their explicit uses of theory and associated methodologies to address important problems. We invite books from across a theoretical and methodological spectrum from scholars employing quantitative, statistical, experimental, ethnographic, semiotic, hermeneutic, historical, ethnomethodological, phenomenological, case studies, action, cultural studies, content analysis, rhetorical, deconstructive, critical, literary, aesthetic and other research methods.

Books on *teaching and learning to teach* focus on any of the curriculum areas (e.g., literacy, science, mathematics, social science), in and out of school settings, and points along the age continuum (pre K to adult). The purpose of books on *research methods in education* is **not** to present generalized and abstract procedures but to show how research is undertaken, highlighting the particulars that pertain to a study. Each book brings to the foreground those details that must be considered at every step on the way to doing a good study. The goal is **not** to show how generalizable methods are but to present rich descriptions to show how research is enacted. The books focus on methodology, within a context of substantive results so that methods, theory, and the processes leading to empirical analyses and outcomes are juxtaposed. In this way method is not reified, but is explored within well-described contexts and the emergent research outcomes. Three illustrative examples of books are those that allow proponents of particular perspectives to interact and debate, comprehensive handbooks where leading scholars explore particular genres of inquiry in detail, and introductory texts to particular educational research methods/issues of interest to novice researchers.

Key Works in Critical Pedagogy

Joe L. Kincheloe

Edited by

kecia hayes

Montclair State University

Shirley R. Steinberg

University of Calgary; University of Barcelona

Kenneth Tobin

City University of New York

Giuliana Cucinelli, cover artist is a professor of media and youth culture, and an independent artist and filmmaker. Giuliana was as close to Joe Kincheloe as a daughter and was with Joe and Shirley when he died. She was a source of love and strength. She can be reached at gcucinelli@gmail.com.

The royalties generated by sales of this volume will be paid to: The Friends of Joe L. Kincheloe Foundation for The Paulo and Nita Freire International Project for Critical Pedagogy (<http://freireproject.org>).



SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6091-395-2 (paperback)

ISBN: 978-94-6091-396-9 (hardback)

ISBN: 978-94-6091-397-6 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858,
3001 AW Rotterdam,
The Netherlands
www.sensepublishers.com

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved © 2011 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword: For My Next Trick, I'll Need a Volunteer	ix
<i>Shirley R. Steinberg</i>	
Learning from a Good Mate: An Introduction	xv
<i>Kenneth Tobin</i>	
1. Exposing the Technocratic Perversion of Education: The Death of the Democratic Philosophy of Schooling	1
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
Teachers Reversing the Cycle: Checking the Dangers of NCLB	21
<i>Connie Titone and Robert A. Duggan, Jr.</i>	
2. Willie Morris and the Southern Curriculum: Emancipating the Southern Ghosts.....	27
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
Goin' South	49
<i>Shirley R. Steinberg and Chaim M. Steinberg</i>	
3. A Tentative Description of Post-formal Thinking: The Critical Confrontation with Cognitive Thinking	53
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe and Shirley R. Steinberg</i>	
Reconceptualizing Educational Psychology: The Promotion of a Critical Consciousness.....	77
<i>Raymond A. Horn, Jr.</i>	
4. Meet Me Behind the Curtain: The Struggle for a Critical Postmodern Action Research.....	85
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
A Dialogic Encounter with Joe Kincheloe's "Meet Me Behind the Curtain": Catalyst for an Evolving Contemporary Critical Theory of Teachers' Work	101
<i>John Smyth</i>	
5. Schools Where Ronnie and Brandon Would Have Excelled: A Curriculum Theory of Academic and Vocational Education.....	107
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Reflections on Joe Kincheloe's Schools Where Ronnie and Brandon Would Have Excelled: A Curriculum Theory of Academic and Vocational Education	123
<i>Gene Fellner</i>	
6. The New Childhood: Home Alone as a Way of Life	129
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
Welcome to Shermerville	149
<i>Lee Gabay</i>	
7. McDonald's, Power, and Children: Ronald McDonald (Aka Ray Kroc) Does it All for You	155
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
The Corporate Paradise of a Subverted Urban Kinderculture	171
<i>kecia hayes</i>	
8. Describing the Bricolage: Conceptualizing a New Rigor in Qualitative Research.....	177
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
Kincheloe's Bricolage	191
<i>Bal Chandra Luitel and Peter Charles Taylor</i>	
9. Critical Ontology: Visions of Selfhood and Curriculum	201
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
Critical Ontology and Teacher Agency	219
<i>Elizabeth J. Meyer</i>	
10. The Knowledges of Teacher Education: Developing a Critical Complex Epistemology.....	227
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
The Knowledges of Teacher Education in Action.....	245
<i>Elizabeth P. Quintero</i>	
11. On to the Next Level: Continuing the Conceptualization of the Bricolage	253
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
Embracing Radical Research: A Commentary on to the Next Level: Continuing the Conceptualization of the Bricolage.....	279
<i>Kathleen S. Berry</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

12. Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research.....	285
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe and Peter McLaren</i>	
Reflecting on Critical Theory and Qualitative Research.....	327
<i>kecia hayes</i>	
13. Critical Ontology and Indigenous Ways of Being: Forging a Postcolonial Curriculum	333
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
On Critical Ontology and Indigenous Ways of Being: Framing a Kincheloean Agenda for Education	351
<i>Christopher Emdin</i>	
14. The Southern Place and Racial Politics: Southernification, Romanticization, and the Recovery of White Supremacy	357
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
Kincheloe and Interracial Recovery: A Child of the South on Dialogic Engagement	379
<i>Aaron David Gresson III</i>	
15. Critical Pedagogy and the Knowledge Wars of the Twenty-First Century	385
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
The Anti-Imperialist Pedagogy of Joe L. Kincheloe	407
<i>Curry Stephenson Malott</i>	
16. Selling a New and Improved Jesus – Christotainment and the Power of Political Fundamentalism.....	413
<i>Joe L. Kincheloe</i>	
Joe Kincheloe: A Proponent of Democracy and Christianity?	429
<i>Douglas J. Simpson</i>	
Afterword: The Music.....	437
<i>John Willinsky</i>	
About the Contributors.....	443

SHIRLEY R. STEINBERG

FOR MY NEXT TRICK, I'LL NEED A VOLUNTEER

Foreword

Joe Lyons Kincheloe, Jr. was born on December 14, 1950, in Kingsport, Tennessee. He was the son of a rural school principal, Joe Sr., and a third grade teacher, Libby Bird. Since he was a junior, he was called Jodie until his thirties. An only child of older parents, he found himself alone a lot, and found ways to amuse himself. Jodie learned to do what he called “routines” in the mirror, mimicking the characters he observed as a kid, and teaching himself the piano.

For the first twelve years of his life, he was apprenticed to his uncle, Marvin Kincheloe, a rural circuit preacher in the Methodist Church. Every Sunday, dressed in his Sunday best, Joe visited the elderly and sick parishioners, and attended Marvin’s church. At 12, Joe realized he would never be saved, and refused to continue along the soul saving path. However, he did learn how to preach.

Joe’s parents were staunch democrats, unusual in the mountains of Tennessee. He describes his youth: “Growing up among grotesque forms of classism and racism in the South of the 1950s and 1960s, I soon found a means, while still in high school, to bring people together and move them as a blues musician and songwriter.” By 16, he was the leader of the VIPs, a 4 piece band of white kids in Kingsport who played weekly at school dances. Joe began writing songs at a very young age, and wrote well over 600. He also started a satirical newspaper in 8th grade with his friends, called *DRUT*, TURD spelled backward.

Obsessively and consciously political, Joe’s grades were never great, and he tended to piss teachers off with his disagreements, his dislike of segregation, and his defense of underdogs. His high school counselor told him that his aptitude tests showed that he could never be more than a piano tuner, and he should seriously consider vocational school. Joe went to Emory and Henry College, a small Methodist College in Virginia, where he was promptly put on probation for his participation in anti-war rallies and his long hair. He did eventually graduate with a C average, and went to the University of Tennessee for a Master’s in history, a Master’s in education (where he read Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*), and a Doctorate in educational history—he completed his dissertation on the evangelical camp meetings of fundamentalist Christians in the 1800s in 1980.

I titled this preface after a song by Warren Zevon. Joe was a volunteer, both metaphorically and literally. Joe followed in his parents’ footsteps as a crazed, insane follower of the Tennessee Volunteers Football team. All things Tennessee orange were his, and he made sure everyone who knew him, knew the Volunteers. *Who ever heard of a team called the Volunteers?* His orange passion was legendary, and

FOREWORD

there is not a friend, neighbor, or student alive that wasn't aware of Joe's team. Every September heralded in the next great hope for his beloved Vols, and he relished the start of NCAA football like the arrival of a most welcomed guest. One winter holiday, we all schlepped to Arizona to watch the Vols play in the National Championship. Partnered by an orange-painted Chaim, Joe was a bouncing little kid watching his team clench the championship. Along with the Vols, he was a fervent Braves fan, and as the Vols began their season, he often would stress at the Braves' inability to consummate a world series...they did it once. Joe never lost hope, and followed his teams from the beginning of each season...He never abandoned them, and had no respect for fair-weather fans. Joe was always aware of the contradictions in male sports. He celebrated the crashing of some barriers and raged against others. He understood the complexity of gender relations yet didn't essentialize them...and he was an unabashed lover of the game. I smile when I recall his absolute disdain for the Boston Red Sox—they were the last team to integrate, he would never, ever cheer for them.

Joe's first job was probably his most significant, serving as the department chair of the education department at Sinte Gleska College on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota. It was there he began to publish and research on the disenfranchisement of Native Americans. In 1982, Joe was given the Lakota Sioux ceremonial name of *TiWa Ska*, meaning clear, loving, or brilliant mind. His time on the Rosebud informed his work, his life, and his context. Those two years allowed him the time to establish himself as a scholar, and to do work which really, really made a difference.

After two years on the reservation, Joe became an assistant professor at Louisiana State University, in Shreveport, where he started a doctoral program in curriculum studies. In 1988 he moved to Clemson University as a full professor having published his first two books. In 1989, he attended the Bergamo Conference—a radical Marxist, feminist, reconceptualist curriculum conference in Dayton, Ohio. Joe and I met when he overheard me talking about working on the Blackfoot Reserve. He politely interrupted my conversation and said that he had worked on the Rosebud Sioux Res. He was very proud that he knew I was living in Canada, as he heard me refer to the *Reserve* not the res, or the reservation. He wanted to continue our conversation, and after he assured me that he was neither gay nor married, we engaged in the one-night stand that never ended.

Although I lived with my four kids in Alberta, within six months we were all in Clemson, South Carolina; and Joe was the father of four: Ian, Meghann, Chaim, and Bronwyn. How he loved those kids: they were spiritually his. We raised them in several states at different universities. We lived through Hurricane Andrew two weeks after moving to Florida International University, and Joe often said it was the most relaxing time of his life, he couldn't write—he just had to find food, ice, and water.

While at FIU, and after several new books, we began editing a book series. We were committed to publishing voices that had been marginalized by mainstream educational discourse. We moved to Penn State in 1994 and Joe and Henry Giroux became colleagues. Henry had been a huge inspiration and support to Joe, publishing

his work and giving advice, and advocating his hire at Penn State—how cool was that, to work with Henry? I finished my doctorate, and in 1997, Joe was offered an endowed chair at Brooklyn College. After two years in this position, he was invited to join the CUNY Graduate Center faculty and to create the urban education doctorate. Joe marveled at the fact that he had become (in his words) a calloused, urbane sophisticate. This kid from East Tennessee was an *endowed chair*, and a man who co-created the doctoral program at the Grad Center, wow...and he never stopped the wonder. The doctoral program flourished, joined by Phil Anderson and Ken Tobin (Joe relished that he could have two colleagues with the intellect and humor as did Phil and Ken), the program drew from urban teachers who were committed to teach urban kids. And as far as groups of students go, the students Joe worked with at the Grad Center were magnificent; Joe celebrated their successes til the day he died. By the end of the century, Joe had written about 40 books, hundreds of articles, and edited well over 400 volumes in our combined series. He was an international speaker, traveling over the world discussing critical pedagogy, cultural studies, and education...all tied to the notion of social justice and equity. He did love to preach.

In 1998, we hosted a luncheon in San Diego and invited several friends/scholars to dine with us and discuss the possibility of their contributing a volume to our Westview series. I sat between Joe and John Willinsky, and we quickly determined that discussing rock n' roll was far more important than pontificating social theory. John said he had been working feverishly to learn the electric guitar, and I told him that Joe played keyboards and was an old rock n' roll band member. I think it was my idea (Joe always said it was his), but around the same time, the three of us decided to start a band. The band would play every year at the American Educational Research Association. John knew a drummer and a bass player. In those days we called the band the SIG GIG...and a couple of years later, it morphed into Tony and the Hegemones. Next to our family, friends, students, and his teams, this incarnation of rock n' roll became the center of Joe's life. John and Joe were soul brothers, and quickly our annual band became twice a year, three times a year, four times a year...practices occurred from New York to British Columbia, and gigs were planned from coast to coast, North to South, between Canada and the US. John was our long lost sibling, and the three of us bonded through music, loud laughter, silly routines, sarcasm, and the reality that the academy was just a tad better than bullshit. Those years were precious, those gigs the absolute best. I know that Joe and John spent more than a few hours and a few dollars cooking up their next gig, next recording scheme. By the new millennium, conferences became places to have a gig, speeches and presentations the vehicle to get to the gig—and sometimes there were back-to-back gigs, lasting much longer than any scholarly presentation. In the last few years, the band started to highlight Joe's music. I think that was the ultimate compliment to him—that John would urge him to sing and play his songs. At that point, I was happy to be *with the band*.

We stayed in New York City until 2005, when Joe was hired to come to McGill University as a Canada Research Chair (the chair award was given by the Prime Minister of Canada). Once again, the kid from the Blue Ridge Mountains had

FOREWORD

attained a rank previously held for Ivy Leaguers and the politically mediocre. He was full of wonder. Joe founded The Paulo and Nita Freire International Project for Critical Pedagogy. The only one of its kind in the world, the Project is a virtual and literal archives of global initiatives in critical pedagogy; deeply committed to the study of oppression in education... how issues of race, class, gender, sexuality, and colonialism shape the nature and purpose of education. In the spirit of Freire's work, Joe understood the project as a means to "support an evolving critical pedagogy that encounters new discourses, new peoples, with new ideas, and continues to move forward in the 21st Century. The project is understood as continued evolution of the work of Paulo Freire." He chose to name it after Paulo and his wife, Nita, as a celebration of their partnership and radical love. *After Joe died, I was told the Project didn't fit the mandate of the Faculty of Education, and it was scheduled to close. I took the virtual Project off campus, where it remains strong and global.*

Joe was simultaneously writing his 56th, 57th, 58th, 59th, and 60th book when he died, and editing eight different book series. He was the senior and founding editor of *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* and the blogmaster to the several thousand registered readers and bloggers of the Freire Project blog. In addition to his scholarship, Joe remained committed to teaching classes and supervising students. 2008 was a long year: Joe realized that the greener grass in Montreal was parched, and felt that he didn't want to spend any more years there. The lack of collegial support was strong, and a passive aggressive environment drove him to search for another job. We were poised to leave in 2009, and that notion gave him peace of mind. When we left for Jamaica, Joe was ready to relax and chill. He was burnt out, and mentioned that the only good to come out of 2008 was the election of Obama. After losing our dear friend, Marisa Terrenzio, on the day of the American election, Joe remarked that death was not his greatest fear. Indeed, he said that other than leaving the kids and me, he was looking forward to the next chapter, the next level, and elevated cognitive and spiritual states. He also said he had so many more books to write.

On his 58th birthday, December 14, 2008, Joe attended the Whitehouse, Jamaica Church of God of Prophecy with our dear friends Sadie and Mackie Gordon and our beloved Giuliana Cucinelli. The pastor asked him to speak, and he took the microphone and preached a mini sermon on the importance of faith, humility, and the human body as the vessel for great minds. Giuliana caught this on her camera. As a cynical Jew, I stayed back at the house, waiting for their return. That was the last time Joe spoke in public, and what an audience. One can barely hear his words on the tape, over the Amens, Hallelujahs, and Praises shouted by all. The next few days were spent floating in the warm waters of Jamaica, laughing with friends and our students, Myunghee, Suhun, Maria, and Giuliana. He died in Kingston, Jamaica on December 19, 2008, after spending the day before with Giuliana and me in *9 mile*, Bob Marley's home. I have a vivid image of Joe joining in with the Rasta men singing Marley's *Three Little Birds*. This is exactly how Joe would have chosen to spend his last week. His last Facebook post was: *Joe is regenerating.*

Joe was passionate, he had many radical loves: his family, rock n' roll, his students, and writing. Joe's passion fueled his struggles against inequality, oppression in all

FOREWORD

of its varied forms, and the stupidification of education. He is recognized for his scholarly contributions to a range of topics that include postformal thinking, critical constructivism, critical multiculturalism, critical indigenous knowledge, and the work we did on critical cultural studies topics such as the notion of *kinderculture* and *christotainment*. In addition to his scholarship, Joe taught countless classes and supervised scores of doctoral students, most of whom are now well-established scholars and professors all over the world.

Joe Lyons Kincheloe, Jr.—Jodie, lived a full and loving life. He was humble as he was confident, gentle as he was strong, a father to Ian, Christine, Meghann and Ryan, Chaim and Marissa, and Bronwyn, a *zaide* to his precious Maci, Luna, Hava, Cohen, Tobias, and Seth. Joe was loud when he yelled at the TV, watching a bad play in the second quarter of the Florida/Tennessee game; he was quiet when he looked out on our snowy birch trees and smelled the fresh, cold night air. Joe was a passionate lover of people, and a radical hater of those who oppressed. Joe was patient with others, impatient with himself...he told me that he just didn't know if he had time to write all the songs, all the books he wanted to write. He never sought out approval, just hoped for respect; you didn't have to like him, he just wanted to do his thing and love his peeps.

On October 27, 2009, Milo Joe was born to Chaim and Marissa, the sweet punctuation of the bitter sentence of 2009. Milo Joe has ushered in our gentle memories and strong commitment to continue Joe's work. I hope that we will commit ourselves to a better world, a better way to articulate, a better path to educate, and a hell of a lot more rock n' roll.

This book is a collection of some of Joe's seminal chapters and articles. Each chapter is followed by a commentary from a dear friend and colleague, who wanted to punctuate Joe's work and impact in pedagogy and in life. An italicized commentary prefaces each chapter. As Joe was the ultimate contextualizer, I wrote each mini-preface in order to give a polysemic body to the text, and to place Joe within each piece.

KENNETH TOBIN

LEARNING FROM A GOOD MATE

An Introduction

A big part of growing up in Australia involved being with my mates, peers with whom I developed strong social bonds in the process of my day-to-day life. Mates were close friends I looked out for, enjoying their successes, helping them when they were in trouble, confiding in them knowing they would protect my interests, and when necessary giving them advice, even when it was not invited. When I came to the United States I missed my mates and even more so the institution of mateship. However, Joe Kincheloe, who was from Tennessee, was an exception—he was my mate.

It was Joe Kincheloe's idea to have a Key Works series of books. I was visiting him at Penn State and he excitedly told me about an idea he and Shirley Steinberg had to publish a collection of papers that represented a scholar's career trajectory. He invited me to contribute to the series and the idea was immediately appealing—although I have yet to submit my own collection of articles as a contribution to the series. Neither Joe nor I would have imagined at the time of our meeting at Penn State that his Key Works would precede mine, a selection of articles that reflect Joe's stellar career as a leading scholar.

As the articles in this collection of key works clearly attest, Joe Kincheloe made a huge contribution to education through his prolific writing over a career that came to a premature ending with his death in Jamaica. As a science educator I became aware of Joe's scholarship through Deborah Tippins, who was co-author with Joe and Shirley on the book entitled *The Stigma of Genius* (Kincheloe, Steinberg, & Tippins, 1999). Having been alerted to Joe's work I was anxious to meet him because it was evident that he was not only a distinguished contributor to education research but also was a person who reached out to junior faculty to get them involved in publishing their work. Subsequently I met Joe at an annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association where, even though it was almost impossible to get uninterrupted time with him, he was friendly, articulate, jovial, witty, and deeply substantive. Based on my very positive impression of him, I invited Joe to present a keynote address at a large science education conference I was organizing in Miami, Florida. The meeting involved several hundred elementary and middle school science educators who were immediately in sync with Joe's presentation on critical pedagogy.

As my career aligned more closely with urban education Joe and I communicated frequently and eventually became colleagues at the Graduate Center and neighbors in a small city in South Amboy, New Jersey. For several years we collaborated

TOBIN

over our ongoing research projects, including work of doctoral students. I had mixed feelings when Joe was appointed to the prestigious Canada Research Chair at McGill University—delighted with the opportunities this position afforded him and his line of research, and disappointed to no longer have the proximity of a close friend and colleague. The loss of his intellectual prowess at the Graduate Center was enormous. Joe was a tower of strength in terms of designing and enacting the doctoral program in urban education. Whereas he was open to improving the program in myriad ways, Joe steadfastly resisted efforts from outsiders to hijack the program and enact changes in ways that would better align with their interests rather than those of students.

TEACHERS AS RESEARCHERS

Joe and I shared a strong interest in teachers and students doing research on their own practices. Also, we had strong interests in the ways in which sociocultural theory could provide a methodology for urban education and a framework for substantive issues to focus research and inquiry in urban education. I had the privilege of sitting in core and elective courses Joe taught in the urban education doctoral program. I read books and articles he assigned and participated in rich dialogues that unfolded in those classes. Almost without exception, students were enthusiastic and active participants. Many of the urban education students worked with Joe as advisor, but many did not, including those who opted to work with me. As an advisor I soon found that I could rely on the fact that students who had been taught by Joe were extremely well prepared to understand the methodologies we employed in our research and to raise important questions concerning the teaching and learning of science, mathematics and literacy in urban schools—especially those in New York City. Joe's teaching was highly influential and in many ways inspirational for students who worked with him. They brought a critical edge to their scholarship and willingness to continue to learn throughout their careers. As is often the case, I soon took this for granted and it was only after Joe left the Graduate Center that the magnitude of his contributions became apparent. The constantly positive impact of his teaching was sorely missed, even though his products accrued at an amazing rate and were accessible not only to scholars at the Graduate Center but to scholars around the world. I rationalized his departure with the thought that at McGill University Joe was well placed to have an even greater impact on the world at large, especially because he received a national grant to establish the Paulo and Nita Freire International Project for Critical Pedagogy.

There are many purposes for teachers and other school participants to design and enact research on their practices. Chief among these is the identification of oppression and the resources to overcome disadvantage. However, Joe made it clear that doing research involved much more than interpreting the status quo. It would not be sufficient to look at test scores and figure out ways to reduce the gaps associated with social categories such as social class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and proficiency in the use of English. Effectively enacting practitioner research necessarily involved new ways of thinking about education and places in which it

is conducted. Understanding teaching and learning in schools necessitates deep understandings of the communities in which schools are embedded, including their histories, not only as they are portrayed through the voices of the mainstream, but also those histories as they are expressed in the voices and lives of those who are oppressed and represent minorities. Just as Lawrence Stenhouse advocated teachers as researchers as a hedge against the domineering effects of positivism (Stenhouse, 1975), Joe regarded teachers as researchers as a hedge against the perpetuation of oppression through the well-intentioned efforts of educators (Kincheloe, 1991). Whereas Joe identified positivism as pervasive and dangerous, he also recognized many other dangerous ideologies and associated practices that reproduced disadvantage and oppression (Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009). Accordingly, Joe regarded practitioner research as a priority.

THEORY AND RESEARCH

Joe embraced the necessity for researchers to inform their intellectual work with rich theoretical frameworks. Doing research was necessarily more than an empirical activity and may not involve empiricism at all. Accordingly, another standpoint we shared was opposition to the tradition of describing research in terms of the qualitative/quantitative binary. Many of Joe's students described their approach to research as theoretical—as if to emphasize a non-empiricist stance. After Joe's death I worked with a number of his former students and was forced to address just exactly what was meant by theoretical research. A side remark from a colleague at the Graduate Center reminded me that this was an important issue when he asked in a whisper (during a doctoral examination of one of Joe's former students)—“do you think this is research?” At the time I was astonished and answered emphatically “absolutely!” What I did not realize was this perspective was the tip of an iceberg. Many of my colleagues embraced an axiology of preferring/requiring empirical studies for doctoral education in urban education. The whispered remark was a sign of a widespread problem—acceptance of an empirical ideology that included continued use of a qualitative/quantitative binary.

It is surprising to me that scholars accept a qualitative/quantitative binary as a viable way of thinking about preparing researchers. Due largely to Joe's careful planning we have a core course in the urban education doctoral degree called the *Logics of Inquiry*. The course examines different ways of undertaking scholarly inquiry in education through the lenses of a variety of theoretical frameworks—in other words, the course allows doctoral students to examine the viability of a range of methodologies, including positivism and behaviorism, constructivism (e.g., social, radical, critical), cultural historical activity theory, hermeneutics, phenomenology, historicity, cultural sociology, and the sociology of emotions. Also, the theoretical underpinnings are examined for research that employs (for example) quasi-experimental designs, inferential statistics, ethnography, conversation analysis, and discourse analysis. Unfortunately, the course is a direct challenge to the qualitative/quantitative binary and many of my colleagues do not value the course or support its presuppositions.

TOBIN

They adopt the view that what students need are research methods and prefer a structure that stipulates that all students should study at least one quantitative and one qualitative methods course. They like to use the term mixed methods and what they mean is to use a combination of qualitative and quantitative data. Hidden beneath their preference for this binary system is a reality that most research is profoundly theoretical and that the theories permeate the methods employed and the research issues that focus the research. Unwillingness to probe the theoretical standpoints associated with research methods can lead to unwitting acceptance of ideologies such as positivism and empiricism, just to name two.

The preoccupation with methods is associated with good intentions—to ensure that doctoral graduates are well educated to produce and consume research. A common argument is that doctoral students should do a minimum of three methods courses, having at least one qualitative and one quantitative course. Often the purpose underlying this standpoint is to prevent students from dodging quantitative courses (assumed to be hard), focusing instead on qualitative courses (assumed to be easy). The well-intentioned goal is to ensure that all students can be literate consumers of published research, with an often-unstated intention that they should be able to understand data tables and associated statistical analyses. This deficit-laden position has many shortcomings, including several that I briefly touch on. First, the binary classification system of qualitative and quantitative methods is an empiricist standpoint that masks more complex systems that reveal the impossibility of studying all useful methods in a doctoral degree. Second, studying just one quantitative course fails to acknowledge that any one course would be a palpably inadequate preparation for making sense of publications with a statistical orientation. Advocates of lifelong learning might argue in favor of allowing doctoral students to specialize in learning methods that are germane to their scholarly interests and to learn other methods when and as necessary.

PURPOSES OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

There are many purposes for doing research in education. Some of my collaborators, such as Wolff-Michael Roth, embrace an axiology that research should emphasize the development of theory. In contrast, since I first began to work with graduate students in science and mathematics education in the 1980s my research program has been oriented toward the teaching and learning of science and mathematics in classrooms. Accordingly, there has been a strong focus on improving the quality of teaching and learning while learning more about learning and learners, teaching and teachers, and learning environments. As I moved from doing statistically oriented research prior to the mid-1980s toward genres of research grounded in hermeneutics, phenomenology, and ethnomethodology, I adopted an ethical stance that all participants in a study should benefit directly from their participation in the study. This standpoint is grounded in ethical concerns I had with researchers who argued that benefits could accrue when the results of research were applied in practice at some time after the research had been completed. Also, the hermeneutic approach we adopted in our research emphasized learning from different perspectives, bringing

into question the assumed ascendancy of coherence and parsimony over difference and complexity. Initially we ensured that we understood what was happening in our research from the perspectives of the participants—using approaches that embraced polyphonia. Since we were also cognizant of people who are placed differently in social space having different stories to tell, we gradually incorporated polysemia into our research. In the late 1980s we adopted Guba and Lincoln's authenticity criteria as a basis for planning and judging our research (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Accordingly, all studies in which I was involved were planned to have ontological, educative, catalytic, and tactical authenticity. The first two criteria (i.e., ontological and educative) oriented toward theoretical products and the second two (i.e., catalytic and tactical) toward transformation of the institutions and people involved in the research.

Because we were involved in participative observation types of studies in which we rejected the researcher/researched binary, all participants were considered to be researchers and all were considered to be learners and teachers. For this reason it made sense when Joe suggested that all participants should change their ontologies as a result of being involved in research. Previously, we had aimed for the university researchers to show evidence of progressive subjectivity—i.e., gradual changes in both the stories they used to represent what they had learned and evidence provided to support assertions pertaining to the research. Joe pointed out that all participants should change their stories as a result of them changing their positions in social space as they participated in research on their own education and that of their peers. Because of the symmetry we sought in the roles of all participants, it made sense to consider the ethics of research as a priority and to regard the four authenticity criteria as dialectical constituents of a whole; equally applicable to all participants in a study.

LEARNING COLLABORATIVELY

One of Joe's ever-present virtues was his willingness to listen attentively to what was being said and to comment on it, as often as necessary, and with hermeneutic intent. His oral contributions oriented toward making sense of what was being proposed, testing possibilities, and responding in an emotionally positive way to others' contributions. Joe wrote about this process in a revision of a book he and I co-edited, referring to it as radical listening (Tobin & Kincheloe, 2010). Making an effort to understand others' standpoints without seeking to change them is referred to as radical listening. When persons enact radical listening they listen attentively to a speaker, ensure that they understand what has been said, and identify the key components of the speaker's standpoint. Then, rather than arguing a case against what is being proposed; radical listeners endeavor to adopt that standpoint, thereby exploring the possibilities. Only when the possibilities have been reviewed in terms of their viability for the collective are alternatives considered based on different standpoints. Radical listening, therefore, is a respectful way to deal with others' ideas, thereby increasing the possibility of adopting good ideas associated with others' culture.

TOBIN

Attentive listening is at the heart of effective dialoguing. Radical listening is a process that has the clear purpose of making sense of others' oral contributions with the express purpose of ascertaining what they can contribute. Each person listens carefully and when questions are asked and comments are made their purposes are hermeneutic, to push on the idea and figure out the affordances the idea provides. Any talk is oriented toward expanding the conversation around a particular contribution, not to suggest alternatives but to identify possibilities and boundaries, strengths and weaknesses. The goal is an expansion of the dialogue not contraction and certainly not to provide alternatives that pursue different directions. Accordingly, a dialogue that involves radical listening will thoroughly explore the contributions of all participants, regarding them as resources for the group, structures to expand possibilities and accomplishments. Only when consensus has been reached and the group has taken a given idea as far as it can go can alternatives be introduced as part of the ongoing dialogue. When radical listening is a constituent of dialogue all contributions are offered for the purposes of expanding collective agency, structures that can afford the process of attaining a group's motives. At the same time oral contributions, as structures, are associated with passivity. As such all participants create culture as they listened attentively to the ongoing verbal interactions within the context of an ethical commitment to speaking only for the purpose of testing ideas that are already on the table and expanding them in ways that align with the group's motives.

RESEARCH ON AND WITH COGENERATIVE DIALOGUE

Cogenerative dialogue (i.e., cogen) has been a path for ongoing research for more than a decade (Tobin, 2010). We designed cogen as a field in which teachers, students, and others with a stake in the quality of teaching and learning could come together to discuss ways in which enacted curricula could be improved. At the time we did not have radical listening as a construct. However, the rules for cogen addressed the necessity to share the number of turns at talk and the duration of talk among all participants. Furthermore, it was the responsibility of all participants to ensure that everybody was involved. If a person was silent others had the responsibility to bring that person into the conversation in productive ways. We embraced the idea that talking should be not only for the self but also for the other. We also had a rule that the topic of conversation should not be changed until the group had reached consensus on what was to be done regarding that topic in future lessons. Taken together these rules are consistent with radical listening, which we adopted as part of the rule structure for cogen as soon as we knew about it. At the present time we regard it as central to effective cogen.

As is the case with all social constructs, radical listening is theorized to expand the possibilities of the construct. For example, polyphonia necessitates all participants contributing to the dialogue, saying what is on their mind in regards to a given topic. It is important that all individuals' rights to participate by speaking their mind is respected by all participants and no matter what is said, all contributions are considered thoughtfully in relation to the ongoing dialogue. An important axiological

component of radical listening and cogen is the respect shown for all contributions and the value given to difference as a resource for a group. Difference is accepted as a resource in the sense that each structure is considered as an expansion of the capital produced and created within the field. Similarly, acceptance of polysemia allows a group to focus on the hermeneutics of making sense of each oral contribution, examining its potential to contribute, rather than questioning its viability. If all oral contributions are regarded as potentially viable then the group's motives can orientate toward working collectively to expand possibilities.

An important outcome of the research we undertook in Philadelphia, before I came to New York City, was that cogen was a seedbed for the production and creation of culture. When we first envisioned the field of cogen we selected participants to be different from one another in as many ways as possible. The rationale for so doing included polyphonia and polysemia. We expected the participants in cogen to learn from difference, and we expected each participant to learn different things in different ways while contributing to the group's motives. After a number of years of research it became apparent that the participants in cogen learned to produce success through the creation and production of new culture. At this time the outcomes of cogen began to focus more on what happened during the cogen rather than what happened subsequently in the whole class. It was not as if the class suddenly became unimportant, but that success was occurring without the necessity for all participants to become the same. The valuing of difference afforded participants interacting successfully with one another, while focusing on reaching consensus on shared goals/motives and how to succeed.

Our project on cogen incorporates a standpoint that includes myriad dialectical relationships between social constructs that are often regarded as binaries. For example, we recognize the salience of the individual | collective dialectic and acknowledge the importance of individuals accomplishing their goals while contributing to the group's motives. Both are important. Accordingly, it does not make sense for individuals to be held accountable solely for their personal success or for a group's success. On the contrary, all participants in cogen, for example, are responsible for one another's successes and failures. The failure of any one individual to be successful is a matter of concern not only for the individual but also for the group. Not surprisingly, in a field that is structured as cogen is structured, a strong sense of solidarity emerges that is conducive to forging new identities associated with the group's accomplishments in cogen.

THEORETICAL RESEARCH

I had to struggle with the idea of theoretical research and its nuances. Initially, I understood theoretical research to involve narratives that presented personal experiences of various sorts, explicating salient issues through the aegis of theory. It was not that human subjects were not involved in this research, but that the experiences on which the research focused had already happened at the time the study was designed. A researcher reflected on experiences and designed a study to highlight issues that were of salience. Research of this sort readily emerged from critical pedagogy, where issues of power, oppression, equity and social justice are studied

in everyday life. In this genre of research a scholar's day-to-day experiences become the focus of deconstruction. Many of the chapters in this book are of this genre. For example, Joe's experiences with McDonald's afforded *The Sign of the Burger: McDonald's and the Culture of Power* (Kincheloe, 2002), a social analysis that examined the globalization of the problems within the framework of American ideology—including capitalism, democracy, and neoliberalism (Kincheloe, 2002). Hence, some of the ingredients of theoretical research, as it was often described, were history, existing data of various sorts, and narratives. For the most part the research consisted of narratives into which theory was woven. Points were made usually through storytelling rather than analysis of qualitative and quantitative data resources. In this genre of research, which I regard as hermeneutic/phenomenological, the approach is essentially non-empirical.

In my own research I had used narrative as a part of ethnography ever since I began to do interpretive research in 1984 (Tobin, 2000). Initially, my approach to analysis was highly reductionist and I viewed stories/narratives as resources for identifying themes and associated contradictions. That is, my approach was empiricist. Recently, I am very much more aware of the importance of stories being holistic representations of systems of knowing. Much can be missed when reductionist approaches are used in a process of learning from stories. Once stories have been told and included as part of the research it can be left for the reader to make from the stories whatever meanings are possible. For this reason, stories can be included as wholes in research reports, including dissertations. This approach acknowledges the holistic aspects of narrative and recognizes that reductionist attempts at analysis will not produce the best meaning, the only meaning, or complete meaning. Whereas I would once proclaim that stories cannot speak for themselves, I now acknowledge that stories can be included as artifacts in research reports; resources for the hermeneutic endeavors of readers. Basically the stories can be objects on which to focus dialogues from which meanings can unfold.

Other artifacts can be regarded in an analogous way. For example, we have used text boxes to allow for "voice over" techniques to be used in research reports. The texts provided in text boxes are not part of the ongoing flow of the manuscript but are related to it in a variety of possible ways. The idea is to present texts as multiple voices; an approach grounded in an axiological preference for polyphonia. Of course, the text inserted into a text box might be from many different genres including songs and poems. The text box may contain graffiti or a combination of text and picture. The possibilities are endless. The idea is to display many texts and allow the "reader as hermeneut" to build meaning through single and multiple readings.

Photographs, pictures, video files, and other artifacts can contribute to the communication of meaning in research. Obviously, it is not possible to include all artifacts in textboxes and the ways in which research is packaged will expand in the next several years. If this is the case it seems important that educators move beyond oversimplified binaries such as qualitative/quantitative when it comes to describing research genres. It is important that researchers have the theoretical tools to undertake thoughtful research that makes a difference in the variety of ways that creative individuals seek to improve the quality of social life.

BRICOLAGE

As a bricoleur a researcher can appropriate multiple methodologies (i.e., theories of method) to employ in a study and also utilize multiple theories to frame substantive research. The foci for the research unfold as the research is enacted and there is no need to settle on a focus at the stage a study is designed. Also it is desirable neither to lock in on a genre of research that must begin with questions nor to rule out entirely the possibility that at some stage questions will focus a study or part of it. Why limit the repertoire of possibilities when it comes to doing research? Joe laid out the possibilities in his work on bricolage, using a pastiche of methodologies and theoretical frameworks in research that is ongoing. Initially, I thought of bricoleur and bricolage in relation to a particular study, but more recently I perceive bricolage in relation to grain size. Like most social constructs bricolage can be used to zoom in and zoom out—to focus at micro, meso, macro and global levels of social life. Accordingly, I find it useful to examine my methodologies and frameworks over a research career and stand amazed at the rich breadth of theory that has informed my research. Similarly, at a given point in time I can see my methodologies and frameworks in terms of bricolage and seek to unsettle equilibria so that what we do is always under scrutiny in terms of its viability. When we come to the table to do research it is always appropriate to subject what we are doing and what we are not doing to detailed scrutiny from within. Since, whenever culture is enacted, it is both reproduced and transformed, it is as well to incorporate searching for possibilities for change as part of the methodology for research, both in the immediate and long term futures.

... AND IN THE FUTURE ...

Joe was a prolific writer who loved to write every single day. His many books and articles represent a vast reservoir from which we can continue to learn through Joe's accessible written texts. Like a good mate, Joe told it as he saw it, looking at social life through a plethora of rich social frames. The collection we have assembled in this volume and the associated companion texts honor a trajectory that shows brilliance, willingness to learn from others, and emerging maturity. Through these works and many others like it Joe L. Kincheloe continues his scholarly tradition of being an exemplary teacher | learner. Mate, we appreciate all you have done and commit to learning from your endeavors.

REFERENCES

- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (1991). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative paths to empowerment*. New York: Falmer.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2002). *The sign of the burger: McDonald's and the culture of control*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg S. R., & Tippins, D. J. (1999). *The stigma of genius: Einstein, consciousness, and education*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

TOBIN

- Kincheloe, J. L., & Tobin, K. (2009). The much exaggerated death of positivism. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 4, 513–528.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann.
- Tobin, K. (2000). Interpretive research in science education. In A. E. Kelly & R. Lesh (Eds.), *Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education* (pp. 487–512). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tobin, K. (2010). Collaborating to transform and reproduce science education. *Enseñanza de las Ciencias*.
- Tobin, K. & Kincheloe, J. L. (Eds.), (2010). *Doing educational research: A handbook* (2nd ed.). Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishing.

Joe was a younger brother to the Giroux generation, which ushered in a welcomed cynicism to federal educational interventions; he was disgusted and angry at the Republicans' attempts to change schooling by launching empty initiatives and slogans. This article highlights the technocratic, deskilling nature of schooling, and is an early discussion of the intervention of technology into the modern era. Never a Luddite, and never a technological genius, Joe was aware of the challenges we were to face with the advent of a media society. One of the first to buy a fax machine, he would sit cross-legged on the floor to fax work back and forth to colleagues, and started an early theoretical read of the need of immediate gratification and the new nature of cognition due to technology. This piece highlighted his awareness and fear of positivism, a theme which would follow him throughout his writing, alas, one of his final pieces was with Ken Tobin, attempting to shed light on the continued academic obsession with what Joe called, the God of Objectivity. SS

JOE L. KINCHELOE

1. EXPOSING THE TECHNOCRATIC PERVERSION OF EDUCATION

The Death of the Democratic Philosophy of Schooling

INTRODUCTION: TECHNIQUE AT THE EXPENSE OF UNDERSTANDING

In *Anna Karenina*, Leo Tolstoy writes an interesting passage concerning the meaning of the word “technique.” Some art patrons are discussing an artist’s work in which Christ is a main figure.

“Yes—there’s a wonderful mastery!” said Vronsky... “There you have technique.” ...The sentence about technique has sent a pang through Mihailov’s [the artist’s] heart, and looking angrily at Vronsky he suddenly scowled. He had often heard this word technique, and was utterly unable to understand...a mechanical facility for painting or drawing, entirely apart from its subject.¹

Tolstoy’s passage provides insight into the themes we attempt to develop in the following pages. In modern American society and modern American education technique often takes precedence over meaning. Colleges of education in their teacher-education curricula have often moved away from the exploration of educational meaning. In the process, they have devoted more and more time to teaching technique—techniques examined outside of a social, political, and philosophical context.

Like Tolstoy’s painter, Mihailov, we are disturbed by the use of the word “technique” in the contemporary discussion of education. The over-emphasis on

technique at the expense of contextual understanding is in part a product, we think, of twentieth-century technological development. In the following pages we attempt to delineate the impact of technology on school and society. In our discussion we refer to the concept of technocracy—a situation in which society is guided by the demands of the current technology and not by democratic concerns about the welfare of people. In other words, in a technocracy the technology becomes the master of the people not their servant. We also refer to technicalization. This term is used to describe the process by which technique comes to take precedence over purpose. In the technologically-driven society we argue that technique is viewed as an end in itself—in Tolstoy’s words, “entirely apart from its subject.”

To avoid the dehumanization that such over-emphasis on technique brings about, educators must first recognize that there is a problem. Once recognizing the problem, they must attend to the subtle and insidious ways that technicalization invades our workplaces, our schools, and our assumptions about human nature and education. This chapter is not in tune with the *Zeitgeist* of the 1990s—a time whose spirit is marked by too much complacency and unquestioned acceptance of the technocratic spirit. We hope that our essay serves to, at least momentarily, disrupt that spirit.

THE NATURE OF TECHNOCRACY

Americans have traditionally placed great faith in the power of technology to solve the myriad of social, economic, and political problems which have faced us. Often in our enthusiasm for technological benefits, however, we failed to anticipate the social and environmental side effects of technological innovation. As Issac Asimov had maintained, anyone could have predicted the automobile, but few could have forecast the traffic jam; anyone could have predicted the television, but few could have forecast the soap opera. We would extend Asimov’s paradigm to technological change in general. Anyone could have predicted the assembly line but few could have forecast the ____ (fill in the blank). Anyone could have predicted behavioral objectives but few could have forecast the ____ (fill in the blank). Anyone could have predicted the computer, but few could have forecast the ____ (fill in the blank). It must be the concern of educators to complete the statement. Our modern obligation is to devote attention not merely to the sophistication of educational technique, but to the educational and social side effects of the new technology.

Despite our historical faith in technology, a tradition of technological suspicion has emerged in the last two centuries. This fear of unchecked technology can be traced in the literature of science fiction from Samuel Butler’s *Erewhon* written in 1872 to Ray Bradbury’s *Fahrenheit 451*, Arthur C. Clarke’s *2001: A Space Odyssey* and countless other works of the modern era. For example, consider just a few of the authors who have pointed to the possibility of dangerous side effects of computers. Butler, writing in 1872, warned of machines with artificial intelligence that might turn on their makers. These machines of great calculating ability, he wrote, may enslave man and supersede him. “Have we not engines which can do all manner of sums more quickly and correctly than we can?” The wise man of *Erewhon* fears that humans will someday relate to the intelligence machines as cattle now relate

to man. Moved by his argument the inhabitants of Erewhon destroy these proto-computers. Thus begins the science fiction tradition of the computer as villain.²

The Industrial Revolution alerted many individuals to the underside of technological progress. The fear of the sociopolitical side effects of technological change is well-documented by Karl Marx. Social revolutions, he wrote, occur when a new mode of production breaks the constraints of established laws and relationships. Those who control the new “technology,” Marx argued, emerge as a new class destined to become the ruling elite. Technology has created “new modes of production” as the information and service sectors of the economy have surpassed the agricultural and industrial sectors. Indeed, the gap between the information economy and other modes of production continues to grow. The implications of Marx’s analysis for the future of the American economy are interesting. If his interpretation is applicable to the modern era, then modern technology and the information society it brings with it may widen the gap between management and labor and rich and poor. Thus, it becomes more important than ever to study education in the context of technological change. To view educational goals and teaching outside of this larger context is to misunderstand the forces which direct educational policy.

Albert Einstein argued that the results of technology have posed a threat to mankind since they have fallen into the hands of morally blind exponents of political power. Echoing Marx, Einstein maintained that technological innovation has “led to a concentration of economic and also of political power in the hands of small minorities which have come to dominate completely the lives of the masses of people who appear more and more amorphous.”³ But what is even worse is that this concentration of power made possible by technological innovation has served to prevent the development of truly independent human personalities. Again, the theme emerges—unchecked technological change limits human freedom. Like the warnings of the science fiction writers, technology comes to enslave human beings.

How exactly does technology come to limit human freedom? When most of us think about technology we often concentrate on its labor saving aspects which grant us greater control over our time. In this context technological innovation does *not* constrain human activity but allows greater choice over how we live our lives. The automobile and the interstate highway, for example, grant us more expendable time than our ancestors could have ever envisioned.

There is another side to technological innovation, however. Other than labor-saving devices, technology has rarely served to make for a humane workplace in modern America. In fact, technological innovations such as the assembly line and accompanying efficiency procedures have often served to limit worker options. New technologies of worker control, often called scientific management, may have extended the tendency of industrial supervisors to view workers as objects to be manipulated. Too infrequently have techniques of scientific management served to encourage a view of workers as human beings with emotions to be considered and individual talents to be cultivated.

Industrial managers have often sought specific worker personality types to meet the needs of the technicalized workplace. According to many industrial analysts, workers who possess the following personality traits are more valuable to the

enterprise than employees who do not: 1) an acceptance of a subordinate role in the hierarchy; 2) submission to the rigid discipline required by the bureaucracy of the workplace; 3) comfort with the lack of concern for human emotions and the subtle dynamics of human interaction that are characteristic of the technicalized, bureaucratized workplace; 4) and acceptance of innovation based not on the value of the work itself but on external reward structures such as monetary incentives.

The role of education often revolves around the production of these personality traits in students. Men and women are students before they are workers. Workers who give up their control of the planning and direction of the activities which comprise their jobs, first surrender their autonomy to a teacher. This teacher plays the role of the boss, granting rewards and assessing penalties. As far as discipline is concerned, the schools succeed in preparing the future worker for the requirements of the dehumanized, bureaucratic workplace. Some of us have experienced that workplace directly through our own work histories. Others have experienced it vicariously through the stories of our friends or by reading about the line workers in Studs Terkle's *Working*. It is a structured world marked by highly standardized routines and degrading requirements of conformity to time schedules, regulations, and stifling technocratic procedures. Schools prepare our psyches for such a place with their, paraphrasing Charles Silberman, oppressive and petty rules which govern student behavior.

The schools often condition students to remove their emotions from their schoolwork—a characteristic highly valued in the workplace. The more “dehumanized” a bureaucracy becomes the more “success” it attains. When love, hatred, irrationality, and other emotional elements are removed from the official business, then rules and regulation can work more predictably. Thus, as educational studies have indicated, teachers tend to value student personality traits related to the cognitive mode of expression. Students with highly developed affective personality traits are often not rewarded for their compassion and emphatic insight. Also, students like workers frequently are not intrinsically interested in their work. In both cases the organization has to rely on external rewards such as grades, pay incentives, class ranks, or titles to motivate the individual.

What are the implications here? Simply put, this view of schooling turns our conventional notions upside down. To see one of the roles of school as the production of personality types which better suit the needs of those who run the technical workplace challenges the assumptions on which many modern discussions of education rest. We often look at schooling as a force which frees us from ignorance, helps us envision alternatives, gives us choice in the direction of our lives, and opens the doors of opportunity. Viewed in the context of “personality adjustment” school serves not as a force for freedom but as a vehicle of constraint. Instead of granting us power to shape our lives, it often manipulates us so that we better serve the needs of the workplace. This is not the way many Americans interpret the role of schools in a democratic society.

If schools serve this sometimes manipulative role, why don't more Americans understand that this is the case? Why do we rarely hear this view expressed in the public discussion of education? The answers to such questions are very complex

EXPOSING THE TECHNOCRATIC PERVERSION OF EDUCATION

and ambiguous and this is not the forum for a full discussion of them. Suffice it to say that many Americans intuitively understand that something was wrong with their education—they have just not articulated precisely what it is. Many Americans, especially those who have worked in low-status factory jobs, know that school was similar to work. And in neither school nor the workplace do these Americans feel that their talents were appreciated or that they have much input into what went on. It is important that these voiceless workers, these victims of technocracy, understand that school does not have to be an institution which limits choice. It is important that the concerns of these Americans be considered in the national conversation over educational policy. The concepts of technocracy and technicalization are valuable in the attempt to understand the role of schooling, for they provide us with a means of articulating our vague feelings that modern society and modern education are somehow hostile to individuality.

What is the nature of the process by which technocracy squashes the individuality of the worker? Because of its complexity and subtlety it is often unrecognized. The process merits examination in some detail.

Employers to exist must extract labor from their workers. In this society the employer must make an effort to avoid the appearance of treating labor harshly. The ideal situation, employers have reasoned, would involve a labor force which “voluntarily” cooperated with management to increase profit margins and to boost productivity.

Through the use of scientific management employers have found several ways to avoid harsh treatment of labor and to contribute to the creation of a cooperative workplace. The procedure which has worked best, however, has been to design technologies which simplify and specify the activities of workers. If the technology is sufficiently sophisticated, workers will not have to think for themselves as they merely follow a redesigned routine. The employer does not have to worry as much about supervision, as the workers relinquish their control of the process of production. The technology not the employer forces the employee to follow orders.

One of the most important outcomes of this technicalization of the workplace is the creation of a strict hierarchy. The hierarchy accentuates the division of labor and de-emphasizes thinking and decision making by the workers. Such a workplace conditions workers to take orders. Since workers do not control decision-making about the execution of their jobs the hierarchical structure necessitates the hiring of many foremen and supervisors, quality-control specialists, administrators to coordinate production, efficiency engineers, and researchers and consultants to provide the information necessary for the few at the top to make intelligent decisions. Unfortunately, this description of the technicalization of the workplace and the solidification of the workplace hierarchy sounds hauntingly familiar to the organization of our school systems.

The hierarchy in the workplace keeps those workers at the lowest rung of the ladder ignorant of the way the production process works as a whole. The low level workers see only a minute part of the process and they see it in isolation from the logic of the process. This ignorance requires that these workers accept the fact that decisions regarding their work be made by higher-ups. Some workers sometimes