Kettering Foundation

Continuing the Conversation
October 2011

Part Two of the Fall 2011 continuing series on the Dayton Days Research Meetings

Introduction

To what extent do higher-education faculty members play a role in making democracy work as it should? Under what conditions could they create professional practices that would enable citizen participation and public happiness? How could or why can't these conditions be realized? This month, the research team grapples with these questions through analysis of Hannah Arendt's concept of public happiness and its connection with professional life (Section I), and by highlighting some of the institutional barriers within higher education that compromise faculty members' public happiness and their engagement with citizens (Section II). By coupling research and analysis of faculty life with the concept of public happiness, we aim to create space for a productive conversation about the capacity of higher education faculty to contribute to public life and to operate as civic agents.

Section I: Public Happiness and the Inwardness of Professional Life

When Thomas Jefferson famously modified John Locke's phrase about the proper ends of government ("life, liberty, and property") to include "happiness," he did not have in mind an individual hedonism protected by government writ. Instead he was referring to the idea of *public* happiness, which consists of the citizen's free right to participate in public affairs and share in public power—to be, as Jefferson put it, "a participator in the government of affairs." Jefferson's concept of happiness was so intimately connected with participation in public affairs that, when he reflected on the afterlife in a letter to John Adams, he imagined eternal bliss as a form of public service: "May we meet there again, in Congress, with our ancient Colleagues, and receive with them the

---

CONTINUING THE CONVERSATION

seal of approbation 'Well done, good and faithful servants'" (1963, 131). As Arendt puts it, this was a candid admission on Jefferson's part that "the joys of discourse, of legislation, of transacting business, of persuading and being persuaded," were more heavenly than any of the pleasures available within private life. Heaven, in other words, is a Congressional meeting.

For Hannah Arendt it was this demand for public happiness—and not particular grievances against excessive taxation—that precipitated the American Revolution. As the passion for public freedom and happiness has been steadily eroded by the dominant focus on *individual* happiness and freedom, this motive force for revolution has become, in Arendt's words, a "lost treasure" (1963, 215). In thinking about the increasing inwardness of professional life, and the growing concerns within higher education about the university's public mission, it will be useful to revisit the ideas of Arendt and the idea of public happiness that she describes.

Joseph Warren described public happiness in 1772 as depending "on virtuous and unshaken attachment to a free Constitution" (1963, 123). Political freedom in this light is understood less as the absence of restraint and more as the product of joint efforts to produce something of public importance. Arendt refers to public happiness as "something created by men" within "the man-made public space" (1963, 124). Neither freedom nor happiness is a private possession so much as a public creation—an artifact or effect of public work.

If this idea sounds strange or jarring, it is because Jefferson's "pursuit of happiness" has in subsequent centuries been largely "privatized" and "individualized." Hence for Arendt the "treasure" of the American Revolution—the demands for public freedom and participation in public power—has been lost or obscured, in part through the expansion of bureaucracies and formal government structures at the expense of citizen engagement and participation. Even if these formal structures are necessary in order to promote private wellbeing and to pursue the common good, they can threaten the pursuit of public happiness. In this respect even constitutional republics can become tyrannical. Tyranny, as Arendt sees it, occurs when the ruling body in a society "monopolize[s]…the right of action, banish[es] the citizens from the public realm into the privacy of their households, and demand[s] of them that they mind their own, private business" (1963, 130). The alternative to tyranny involves the resuscitation of the spirit of public happiness and freedom that, for Arendt, was the most valuable legacy of the American Revolution.

In many respects, Arendt's concerns with public happiness echo the idea of the Anti-Federalists, who emphasized a link between local self-governance, political participation, and public happiness. After the ratification of the American Constitution, the alternative voice of the Anti-Federalists has been submerged within a broader consensus about the Federalist "founders" of the Republic. Yet as Christopher Duncan (1994) argues in "Men of a Different Faith," the Anti-Federalist ideals are still valuable because they give voice to a recurrent aspiration within American life for public association, participation, and liberty. Duncan does not mean to diminish the accomplishments of America's second founding. Instead he uses Anti-Federalist resistance to the Constitution to index the flaws of the Constitution's political "ethos"—namely, its emphasis on "private happiness, individualism,

and a politics of administration" (1994, 391). For Duncan, the Federalist vision of public life leads inevitably to a "rootless and alienated" individualism. The result is a nation of Willy Loman's, Arthur Miller's infamous salesman who is isolated and powerless in the face of the impassive forces arrayed against him.

The Anti-Federalist faith, on the other hand, emphasized the priority of the community and local forms of public association. As Hannah Arendt has shown, the republican language of public happiness and freedom was at the root of the first American Revolution. The violations of the English monarchy had less to do with unjust taxation and more to do with the ability of the colonialists to participate in shaping a common life together. The Declaration of Independence is not as concerned with the loss of individual rights as it is with the "usurpation of local authority, and the rights of communities to govern themselves" (1994, 394). In other words, and echoing Arendt, the "happiness" in Jefferson's immortal "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," is less the individual's happiness than the flourishing of the public person through participation in self-governance.

If democratic government operates solely through public administration, then the skills associated with public happiness will desiccate and the broader political culture will shift. For Duncan this shift has largely occurred, as political power has been centralized in federal agencies and even local governance is increasingly professionally administered. The questions that remain include whether the alternative voice of the Anti-Federalists can still speak to recurrent aspirations for public happiness, and whether public happiness can find a place within the complex layers of the American polity.

Civic Engagement and Public Happiness

For those interested in the idea of public happiness, one area to explore is the correlation between participation in public affairs and measures of individual and social wellbeing. In this respect the Spring 2011 edition of the journal *Liberal Education*, which explores the relationship between civic engagement and the psychological wellbeing of college and university students, is clearly of interest. According to the authors included in the issue something is missing from the approaches to college student health and wellbeing. Barry Checkoway argues the problem is that both mainstream mental and physical health providers and those who focus on psychological health and wellbeing "view as the unit of practice the individual, rather than colleges and universities- or the society of which they are a part." What these analyses lack, in other words, is a focus on civic participation and public happiness.

Checkoway and other authors represented in the issue believe the concepts of civic engagement and psychological well-being are interrelated, and that for several reasons higher education institutions are perfectly positioned to strengthen this relationship. First, the educational mission of these institutions often expresses a public purpose. Second, students have purpose in life get more out of their studies. And third, these institutions have the "intellectual" and "institutional" resources to engage students in educational activities that encompass democratic practices. The problem is that institutions either do not see their mission as doing so, or they lack the sufficient resources to strengthen active civic engage-

ment. This edition of *Liberal Education* is mainly focused on investigating some ideas, strategies, and programs exercised by various institutions to engage citizens in voluntary and public work. For example, the "Bringing Theory to Practice project" (BTtoP) has started to develop the relationship between civic engagement, engaged learning, and psychological wellbeing as fields of practice and subjects of study. Currently there are over three hundred colleges and universities connected through the project.

Peter Levine, in "What do we know about civic engagement?" (2011), summarizes several empirical research programs that seek to engage youth and critically evaluate their subjects, such as Positive Youth Development (PYD), which provides political education for disadvantaged youth to make them more civically engaged. Investigating the pros and cons of such programs, Levine points to some critics of "service" who argue, "it encourages a distinction between the active server, and the passive recipient", because it marginalizes civic engagement as something to be done on charitable basis and temporally, not as an aspect of one's life work (2011, 2). Yet another strand of research focuses not on the impact of civic engagement on recipients of service, but rather the benefits for those who engage. Levine argues there is considerable evidence that young people develop in healthier ways when they are civically engaged.

James Youniss, in his piece, "Service, Public work, and Respectful Public Citizens" (2011), advocates service as both a kind of public work and a strategy that higher education can use in fulfilling its civic mission. In this type of service both volunteers and recipients engage in political action and policy formation and "benefits are coordinate with costs in an ever changing social ecology" (2011, 3). Public work is especially promising according to Youniss because "it can promote the kind of informed, committed, and participatory citizenship the nation needs" (2011, 1). The problem, however, resides in the fact that service as public work is rare within higher education. Youniss refers to some scholars who argue that too much of emphasis on volunteering as a solution to social problems risks neglecting the political root causes to the problems. In contrast, service as public work, advocated by Boyte (2004), would go beyond only offering help and to participation in democratic life as political actors by engaging decision-making and acting upon collective problems. Also, as Youniss cites Boyte, public work would empower individuals "so that they have the opportunity to find health, happiness, and security through the democratic way of life" (2011, 1). Examples such as grassroots youth involvement in the 2008 Obama campaign indicate that some young people can actually "make the leap from doing good to do public work," and if this is the case more people could do the same if they are given adequate resources.

As most universities do not have the capacities to engage students in addressing social problems, the mediating institutions that are operated by service-providing organizations, are appropriate spaces for service as public work. According to Youniss, public work through civic organizations allows youth to experience the ideology of civic democracy and the power of organized collective action. Service also makes youth distinguish the inequalities and diversities, as well as opening their eyes to the benefits that are made through sacrifices of others as they seek to balance these social relationships. Youniss also notes that the digital space today is where most might enter the public domain, but that is both promising and concerning. He questions the relevance and power of the virtual world as a tool and a

space for real conversation, deliberation, and collective action.

The Inwardness of Professional Life and Other Threats to Public Happiness

The concerns of Arendt and the Anti-Federalists surrounding public happiness echo discontent about the so-called "inwardness" of professional life (Harwood, 2009). According to William Sullivan, for instance, "something has gone wrong with the professions in the United States" (1996, 15). Sullivan believes that the public has continued to lose confidence in the professions, believing that professionals focus solely on the technical and monetary aspects of their work rather than its public importance or nature. This lack of confidence feeds public anger and frustration with the professions and in turn threatens the profession's legitimacy. Sullivan argues that there is a need for the professionals to recognize the public and political nature of their professions. Indeed, he argues, the professions cannot survive until practitioners realize the public value of professionalism.

In order to renew professionalism, professionals must regain the public's trust; and to regain this trust, new partnerships must form between the professionals and the public. However, to do this, citizens and experts must find ways to understand and respond to each other. Sullivan calls this new professionalism "civic professionalism" (1995). For Sullivan the idea of civic professional implies that professions operate by means of a "contract" with the public. The basis of this contract is a set of common goals shared by the public and for which different professions undertake responsibility. Thus, according to Sullivan, the professions are, in a sense, public occupations even when they work outside government or publicly supported institutions.

The inwardness of professional life might be difficult to counter because, as Jeff Schmidt argues in his book *Disciplined Minds* (2001), the training of professionals is largely a process of fostering political and intellectual conformity. Each profession—from business to education to nonprofits—disciplines their initiates in both subtle and explicit ways. Schmidt cites the Ph.D. qualifying exam as an example: the exam is a mechanism by which guardians of the discipline enforce their understandings of the material rather than cultivating the student's own interests and concerns. Those who pass the exams and become part of the discipline (the "disciples") are those who have learned to play by the system's rules, even if that requires the abandonment of their dearly held ideals or values.

When the choice arises whether to speak out in an effort to "make a difference," or to remain quiet to protect one's career, professionals are trained to take the latter path. Therefore, civic professionalism might be compromised despite the good intentions of public engagement and involvement among individual professionals. These good intentions will be sacrificed if the discipline norms do not honor and pursue public engagement and civic professionalism.

Obstacles to public happiness are also clearly evident in the health professions. In a recent article in *Academic Medicine*, Diane Calleson and her co-authors argue that there is a gap between recommendations made by national commissions about faculty scholarship related to service activities that strengthen public health practice, and the reality of how

promotion and tenure actually works in health professional schools. There are internal and external challenges to bridging this gap. Externally the health institutions and schools are dependent on government and other research grants to sustain themselves. Internally, faculty roles and rewards policies are barriers to genuine faculty involvement in communities. Faculty members usually receive promotion based on publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals rather than demonstrating an active commitment to addressing community problems.

Unlike many health professional schools' policies for rewarding and promoting faculty members, the authors note that some schools have codified the values of community-engaged scholarship in their mission. However, the experience of these institutions shows that recognizing and rewarding community-engaged scholarship should be implemented not only in the wording of policies and procedures, but even more importantly in institutional culture. The authors suggest that we need to pay attention to the *process, product, and outcome* measures to determine whether a community-based service can be considered as scholarship. Faculty members and community partners should "listen to one another, deliberate critically about common problems, arrive at solutions to mutual problems in the community, and work together to implement solutions" (2005, 319).

Meanwhile, community engaged scholarship should generate products that both benefit the community and the health institutions. The authors propose three of these products: peer-reviewed articles based on the experience and evaluation of community work, applied products that transfer the knowledge into actual work which "serve to strengthen the collaborative tie between academics and practice," and community dissemination products such as forums and newspaper articles (2005, 320). Impact occurs through the process and the product of the work and encompasses the sustained change that the community-engaged scholarship brings into communities. The authors note that while there is some light in implementing such policy and strategies, the scholars need to be aware that "community-based anything takes time, length, and breadth" (2005, 320). Thus a commitment to further improvements needs to be strengthened both by the academia and the officials.

Opportunities for Engagement

If professional life is increasingly "inward-focused" and less able to provide public happiness for its professionals, then where are the opportunities for engagement in order to address this problem? One valuable finding along these lines is a study by Gene Brewer that shows government employees and public workers score highly on measures of social capital and political interest, which implies that there exists an untapped demand for public happiness within the professional workforce of the government.

In his quantitative study of attributes linked to social capital, Brewer finds that overall public servants are more active in civic affairs than other citizens. Reviewing the literature on social capital, he identifies six important components: social trust, social altruism, equality, tolerance, humanitarianism, and civic participation. The first five attitudes are normative and "soft evidence", which are hard to measure. Civic participation, on the other hand, shows hard behavioral evidence of social capital. Using a multivariate model, Brewer es-

timates the strength of public employment as a predictor of civic participation while he controls for an array of other variables. The study finds that "public servants are far more active in civic affairs than other citizens and that they appear to be the catalysts for building social capital in society at large" (2003, 5).

The data for Brewer's study is drawn from 1996 American National Election Study (NES) that includes all US citizens of voting age on or before Election Day. The key sorting question, however, is citizen's employment by a governmental organization. Brewer operationalizes the measure of civic participation on the basis of involvement and financial contribution to non-political organizations and the extent to which people connect with life in their communities, including membership and participation in organizations as well as other means of socializing and interacting. Other factors that might influence political participation such as individual resources (time, money, skills) and their demographics (age, race, gender, marital status, education, and public employment) are also included in the model. The study affirms theory of public service motivation (PSM) which suggests public employees are strongly motivated to do public, community and social service and that they are more civic minded than are other citizens, thus they are more likely to participate in civic affairs (2003, 17). The study casts doubts over rational theorists view of civic engagement that suggest public servants exhibit enthusiasm for civic engagement only as a way of fulfilling their own interests in the eye of their patrons, and not because they are motivated and interested to do so.

Section II: Faculty Happiness and the Conditions of Higher Education

In this section, we explore the concept of public happiness and how it connects to faculty work within institutions. We review recent studies about faculty work, the institutions and external forces within which faculty operate, and describe the everyday possibilities and constraints of colleges and universities as institutions operating for the public good.

Faculty Happiness and the Motivation to Connect

Going Public (2004), a Kettering Publication edited by Harry Boyte, is a collection of 12 essays by scholars and administrators describing the events and narratives that pushed them "beyond the walls of a culture that stresses detachment and private pursuits . . . without regard for public impact" (7). As faculty members, the contributors share unique stories of professional transition, and personal identification and enrichment. For example, pediatric neuropsychologist Cathy Jordan recalls a community health project initiated by residents with the university. Reflecting on this experience as her first engagement work, she notes how residents pushed back on her "researchy" language, and told the researchers that they must define and explain their terms (2004, 20). Professor of English Julie Ellison's story is one of reflection on the professional happiness she gets from challenging the narrow "borders" of her discipline, and in making broader "public claims" as a scholar (2004, 16). As an occupational therapist, Nan Kari adds that her community action-research project, "gave me a language to name things I had felt from earlier experiences" (2004, 23). Each scholar touches on the importance of contextualizing his or her work in a way that allows

the scholar to be a part of a world in which they "'breath the same air' as the rest of humanity" (2004, 7).

In a recent unpublished report to the Kettering Foundation, Kerry Ann O'Meara interviews 25 faculty "exemplars in higher education civic engagement" from a range of disciplines to better understand the context of their success (2011, 5). She argues that the common underlying factor linking the faculty in their achievement is a sense of civic agency. She defines civic agency as abilities and capacities to "negotiate and transform the world toward greater democracy," and "the ability to act on behalf of goals that matter to [oneself]" (2011, 6). Their stories are important for locating these individuals and their sense of civic agency in both institutional and social contexts.

O'Meara asked faculty about the origin of their sense of civic agency. While no one reason emerged, responses ran the gambit, touching on both professional and personal motivations, such as parental occupation and identity. Other faculty rooted their sense of civic agency in place, having grown up in the locale where they now live and engage. Others began with the desire to give students a richer experience and understanding of life, while some faculty simply interpreted civic engagement as "what they were supposed to do" in their profession (2011, 10). The idea here is there is some underlying reason, sense of agency, or starting point where these individuals engaged in public work, and identifying it is telling of the limits of policy or any other approach intended to foster more public scholars.

The interviews encouraged faculty to discuss the barriers and enabling factors to civic work. O'Meara was encouraged to hear faculty note that institutional resources to create non-profit centers and bridge administrative resource personnel, such as service learning directors, were widely available. Faculty also felt that they had professional autonomy, which was crucial in opening up space for these pursuits. Barriers and disabling conditions included 1) the academic and research calendar and 2) the reward system. The first makes it difficult to maintain regular participation for both students and faculty. A faculty member, who quoted a community member, stressed this in the interview: "Semesters are not the way the real world works" (2011, 29). The reward system, faculty argued, devalues service learning and engaged scholarship, labeling it as less rigorous scholarship.

For Marguerite Shaffer, a professor of American studies and History, the concept of "public culture" captures the process through which individuals engage in public discourse to shape, influence, and create culture. She articulates some of her work as an "engaged scholar" in an interview with David Brown in the *Higher Education Exchange* (2008).

Her projects counter some trends apparent in both public and academic culture: the tendency of students to care more about their grades than their cultural future, the university compartmentalization of teaching, service, and research, and the "bureaucratic" tenure process (2008, 28). She is concerned that students have limited opportunities to "experience themselves in public terms," which hinders students' ability to imagine how they might influence the *process* of culture, instead being idle consumers of it, unable to act as agents of culture and part of something public. She questions the professional compartmentalization of duties for faculty, which she believes hinders interdisciplinary work and creates barriers

to "democratic knowledge production and dissemination" since scholars are focused more on tenure and promotion, requiring "first and foremost . . . a scholarly monograph and good teaching that fits into a standardized three-credit-hour framework" (2008, 28).

As the interview continues, Shaffer discusses her work as a "partnership mechanism" between students, faculty, and the community (2008, 33). This mechanism promotes thinking beyond theory, stimulates opportunities for acting on knowledge and implementing solutions, and creates a place (figuratively, but also concretely) of integrative learning that includes community members as partners with assets to contribute for an exchange. In this way, the university, or postsecondary institution, can be a catalyst for bringing people together "not simply to judge and critique, but as a foundation on which to act in the world" (2008, 32).

Institutional and External Considerations of Faculty Happiness

As the above section indicates, a discussion of faculty happiness inevitably involves conditions of the context within which they operate. The articles highlighted in this section more explicitly illustrate some of the challenges to and enabling conditions for meaningful connection between faculty members and their work. They range from institutional practices and policies to external grants, and they include broad social conditions, such as neoliberal trends.

Adrianna Kezar and Jaime Lester highlight key practices to facilitate "faculty grassroots leadership" on campus. They define faculty grassroots leadership as the creation of local innovative programs or solutions that could be adopted and shared across campus. Through a series of external and internal influences—including publishing demands, changes in teaching through technology, and the decrease of full-time faculty members—faculty have been diverted from leadership opportunities in their departments and across campus. They are no longer getting the professional efficacy they once had. The authors base this argument in part on the socialization process in graduate school, which doesn't encourage leadership.

In their research, Kezar and Lester note that there was no "single practice, policy, or set of values" that supported faculty leadership, but instead "a combination of practices, [and] policies that made a difference and perhaps can be conceptualized as creating a new environment or culture on campus" (725). They highlight three dimensions along which faculty grassroots leadership can be enabled: 1) departmental or school-wide approaches, which include individuals (often department leadership) who facilitate leadership opportunity, flexible workloads, and certain conferences for professional development; 2) campus-wide approaches, which include collegial campus networks, inclusion policies for non-tenured faculty, attending to dysfunctional departments, and campuses that frame questions as healthy and not threatening; and 3) through multiple levels with diverse role models and mentors throughout the institution.

Current institutional solutions to the lack of faculty leadership (often professional development, faculty development centers, and formal mentoring) are not the correct path to solve

the challenge of a lack of faculty efficacy, but instead a more holistic approach considering "environment or culture" is necessary (733). While not mentioned explicitly by interviewees, the authors find concepts associated with faculty guilds (unions) to "cut across the data" (733) and argue that modeling guild practices could create a solution.

Similarly, Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, and Summers Thompson (2011) investigate the faculty-perceived effects of institutional grants to encourage community scholarship. The authors posit a framework illustrating how community-based scholarship grants for faculty can reinvent the institution toward community engagement or can contribute to empty rhetoric in an institution's mission. In focus groups with faculty who received the grants, faculty members frame their community-based work in a few ways. For example they highlight how their work and these grants further student development and community capacity. They also note some themes emerged related to tensions including "expanded professional roles" for faculty and administration related to grants, along with a "community engagement conundrum". The tensions associated with expanded roles and an engagement conundrum—which they define as the mix between excitement about university support for this work coupled with reservations as to how participating in the engagement process disrupts the tenure timeline—create tradeoffs for faculty. How the institution reacts to and interacts with these tensions enable either the broad institutionalization of engagement practice or its support in rhetoric only. Reacting dynamically creates a "community engaged campus" while the "status quo" enables faculty withdrawal from engaged work and a "vision & mission without action" (p. 46).

Julie Ellison and Timothy Eatman (2008) articulate a series of extensive recommendations for making tenure more inclusive to faculty engaged in a range of scholarship practices. Their work addresses "tenure as a public matter," since tenure policies directly influence and reward individual scholars for their professional pursuits (2008, 5). This report is designed to serve as a resource and conversation starter for those interested in engaging the complex issue of tenure relevant to engaged scholarship. The publication builds on interviews, research, and lived experience from a group of over 30 scholars and administrators—who represent several Tenure Team Initiative members—synthesized by Ellison and Eatman.

The authors use the concept of a "continuum" to highlight a wide spectrum of faculty and institutional practices. This understanding accepts the complexity of institutional structure, acknowledging that there can be no one-size-fits-all approach. They point out very early that changing policy will not be enough to make tenure inclusive to alternative forms of research, scholarship, and public work: "Enlarging the conception of who counts as 'peer' and what counts as 'publication' is part of something bigger: the democratization of knowledge on and off campus" (2008, 6). They highlight four "key domains" along public scholarship continua that can ground institutional practice:

1. A continuum of scholarship within which academic public engagement has full and equal standing;
2. A continuum of scholarly and creative artifacts;
3. A continuum of professional pathways for faculty, including the choice to be

a civic professional; and
4. A continuum of actions for institutional change (2008, 11).

The authors' intent is to stimulate discussion between students, professionals, academic and administrative faculty, and the community. These discussions could enable a general reevaluation of how scholars engage, what they create, and more fully consider the pressures influencing their choices.

Taking an institutional perspective, Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh, and Bush identify the concept of "full participation" to stitch together the divergent conversations across higher education diversity initiatives and the public engagement movement (2011). They define full participation as Sturm does: "an affirmative value focused on creating institutions that enable people, whatever their identity, background, or institutional position, to thrive, realize their capabilities, engage meaningfully in institutional life, and contribute to the flourishing of others" (3, 2007). Through this they link higher education to a concept of institutional citizenry and allow the institution to be related to a "broader polity" (4). The authors argue higher education's engagement with this concept along three points:

> 1. Public engagement encourages and enables full participation of diverse groups and communities;
> 2. Full participation of diverse communities is a critical attribute of successful and legitimate public engagement; and,
> 3. The systems that take account of these synergies are likely to enable the successful pursuit of both public engagement and full participation/diversity, and to enhance the legitimacy, levels of engagement, and robustness of higher education institutions (4).

To them, higher education institutions need to change so they can align their practices across the "spectrum of decisions" occurring every day that have the potential to create a more inclusive environment for diverse individuals. Considering the changing demographics and institutional policies, structures, and culture, they note higher education's gap in regard to aligning "intention and practice" for the public (7). Through a case analysis of a young, publically engaged faculty member of color, they highlight the lack of continuity created by "add on" programs that foster engagement, as opposed to broad, institutional wide missions. They argue that add on programs manifest as "first-order change," which only change practices for some, and not their institutional roles, as opposed to "second-order change," which affects the whole institution, and is intentional and slow (8). This article implicitly discusses the institutional conditions and constraints on enacting a reciprocal public mission. Institutions can't simply espouse goals of engagement, but those goals need to be backed by coherent systematic practices that can enable across multiple programs and practices, and create the opportunity to engage with the public, and they must include a broader definition of the public, one that includes full participation.

Investigating institutional practices from a macro-level, Rhoades and Slaughter argue that academic capitalism is a detrimental force affecting higher education today. It occurs as higher education institutions "generate revenue from their core educational, research, and

service functions, ranging from the production of knowledge (such as research leading to patents) created by the faculty to the faculty's curriculum and instruction (teaching materials that can be copyrighted and marketed)" (37). They contend that college and university practices are shifting to align with market demands, thus privileging efficiency and cost cutting over educational ends as measures of success. The authors have written extensively about academic capitalism, and in this article they emphasize how institutions capitalize on curriculum and instruction with detrimental effects on leadership, curriculum development, and access to the institution.

First they reframe department heads as "educational entrepreneurs" whose role is to cut costs and streamline service delivery. These entrepreneurs accomplish this by increasing departmental ties to business and evaluating the value of a course by the number of credit hours generated. Additionally, technological demands in the classroom have created professionals, in addition to faculty, to design and deliver curriculum resulting in a Tayloristic approach to instruction, where each individual is responsible for small parts on an instruction assembly line. This division of labor distances any individual faculty or professional from a holistic curricular design. Finally, students are affected as the process of academic capitalism manifests in selecting participants for the classroom; it encourages institutions to recruit the most effective learners. They argue that this shifts higher education access aims to "accessibility" aims (44), redefining "access in ways that focus on boundaries of time and space (and convenience), directing attention away from cultural, social and economic barriers" (53).

For the authors, the turn toward academic capitalism is at odds with demands and expectations of the public and policy makers, and to remedy this trend, the authors call for "republicizing of U.S. Colleges and Universities" (p. 57). Current policies and institutional practices "involved disinvesting in the public interest functions of education…and they involve orienting higher education in such a way that it benefits the interests of the few at the expense of the many" (57). The authors conclude by calling for institutions to "reprioritize the democratic and educational functions of the academy, in addition to the local economic roles in community development that colleges and universities can play" (57). They call for faculty to reorient their agency in the institution toward creating public discussions about the entrepreneurial ventures in higher education today.

References

Arendt, Hannah. 1963. "The Pursuit of Happiness," in *On Revolution* (New York: Penguin).

Boyte, Harry C., et al. 2004. *Going Public: Academics and Public Life*. Ed. Ilse Tebbetts. Dayton: Kenneth A. Brown.

Brewer, Gene A. 2003. "Building Social Capital: Civic Attitudes and Behavior of Public Servants." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(1): 5-26.

Calleson, Diane C., Catherine Joran, and Serena D. Seifer. 2005. "Community Engaged Scholarship: Is Faculty Work in Communities a True Academic Enterprise?" *Academic Medicine*, 80(4).

Checkoway, Barry. 2011. "New Perspectives on Civic Engagement and psychological well-being," *Liberal Education*, 97(2).

Christopher M. Duncan. 1994. "Men of a Different Faith: The Anti-Federalist Ideal in Early American Political Thought," *Polity*, 26(1): 387-415.

Ellison, Julie and Timothy K. Eatman. 2008. Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University. *Imagining America*.

Evans, Scott D., and Isaac Prilleltensky. 2007. "Youth and Democracy: Participation for Personal, Relational, and Collective Well-being." *Journal of Community Psychology*. 35(6): 681-692.

Harwood, Richard C. and Creighton, John A. 2009. *The Organization First Approach*. The Harwood Institute for Public Innovation and the Kettering Foundation.

Interview with Marguerite S. Shaffer. Changing Public Culture. *Higher Education Exchange*. 23-38.

Kezar, Adrianna, and Lester, Jaime. 2009. Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in Higher Education*, 50: 715-740.

Lawrence, Peter A. 2009. *Real lives and white lies in the funding of scientific research: The granting system turns young scientists into bureaucrats and then betrays them*. PLoS Biol 7(9): e1000197. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1000197.

Levine, Peter. 2011. "What Do We Know About Civic Engagement?" *Liberal Education*, 97(2).

Nicotera, Nicole, Nick Cutforth, Eric Fretz, and Sheila Summers Thompson. 2011. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 4(1): 37-49.

O'Meara, Kerry Ann. 2011 "Because I Can. . . . ." Unpublished Report for the Kettering Foundation.

Rhoades, Gary, and Sheila Slaughter. 2004. Academic capitalism in the new economy: Challenges and choices. *American Academic* 1(1): 37-60.

Schmidt, Jeff. 2001. *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul-Battering System that Shapes Their Lives*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Sturm, Susan, Tim Eatman, John Saltmarsh, and Adam Bush. 2011. *Full participation:*

Building the architecture for diversity and public engagement in higher education (White paper). Columbia University Law School.

Sullivan, William. 1995. *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America*. New York: Harper.

Sullivan, William. 1996. "Experts and Citizens: Rethinking Professionalism," *Tikkun*, 11(1).

Sullivan, William. 2004. "Can Professionalism Still Be a Viable Ethic?" *The Good Society*, 13(1).

Youniss, James. 2011. "Service, Public Work, & Respectful Public Citizens." *Liberal Education*, 97(2).

New and Noteworthy Books and Articles

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2005). *La universidad en el siglo XXI: Para una reforma democrática y emancipadora de la universidad* **[The university in the 21st century: For a democratic and emancipatory reform of the university]. México: Centro de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias en Ciencias y Humanidades, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.**

TIn 1994, Boaventura de Sousa Santos published an essay entitled "From the idea of the University to the University of ideas." In that essay he argued that globally the public university faced three interrelated crises: a crisis of hegemony, a crisis of legitimacy and an institutional crisis. Back then he worried that the institutional crisis would capture all the attention and be "solved" to the detriment of the public university. A decade later in *The university in the 21st century: For a democratic and emancipatory reform of the university* Santos looks back at his initial work to analyze why his worries became a reality and what could be done to rebuild the public university as a necessary project. Santos is a Portuguese public academic who writes about globalization, sociology of law and the state, and democracy in several languages. He is Professor of Sociology at the School of Economics at the University of Coimbra (Portugal), Distinguished Legal Scholar at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School and Global Legal Scholar at the University of Warwick (see http://www.boaventuradesousasantos.pt/pages/en/homepage.php).

In this book Santos argues that public universities face three main interrelated crises globally:

- *A crisis of hegemony* resulting from tensions between the traditional role of the university and what has been asked of these institutions along the 21st century (i.e., tensions between producing "high culture" and critical thought necessary for the formation of the elites, and producing technical knowledge necessary for the labor force needed by the predominant economic interests). The inability of the public university to handle these tensions effectively led to the emergence of other institutions that could meet some of the demands

on the public university. This in turn led to an erosion of the hegemony of the public university.

- *A crisis of legitimacy* stemming from the unresolved tension between the growing hierarchicalization of specialized knowledges[1] through restricted access on one hand, and public demands for democratization and greater access for underserved populations on the other.
- *An institutional crisis* resulting from the unresolved tension between the claim for autonomy and the increasing pressures to subject the public university to business-related standards (productivity, efficiency…)

The author unpacks these crises and places the analysis in the context of the globalization of neoliberal politics and policies. Briefly, he argues that the institutional crisis of the university has historically been the most recurrent since its scientific and pedagogical autonomy hinges on financial support from the State. Although public universities have faced institutional crises for about 200 years, this kind of crisis has exacerbated since the 70's. The stability of the university was somewhat guaranteed while the university was viewed as a public good (just as the judicial system is seen, for instance). But as the State began to reduce its commitment to education in general (public higher education included), education began to be seen as a personal investment rather than a public good and the institutional crisis of the public university took hold.

For Santos, the problems of the public university are global as they are intimately related to the erosion of the role of the State in the era of neoliberal capitalism. He argues that rebuilding the public university requires a focus on reconstructing its legitimacy within national projects aiming at strengthening democracy. His proposal entails attending five main areas: access, extension, action-research, ecology of knowledges, and the relationship between university and public schools. These areas are complemented by a different way of looking at the relationship between public university and industry, reinforcing the social responsibility of the public university towards those who do not have the power to impose their social demands.

Finally, Santos believes that at least four actors need to be engaged in the reconstruction process:

1. The public university community itself
2. The national State, as long as it chooses to work towards a globalization of the university that is based on solidarity
3. The individual and organized citizens interested in a more cooperative relationship between the university and their social interests.
4. The national capital (in contrast to transnational capital) with an interest in local knowledge production

---

[1] Santos is in line with other authors who speak about "knowledge" in plural to highlight an increasing recognition of the multiple ways of understanding and producing knowledge, doing away with the longstanding separation between "expert" and "lay" knowledge, "those who know" and the rest.

For Santos, the public university is as necessary as ever (although no longer hegemonic). Its value as a public good resides in being the institution that can link the present to the future through knowledge production and open critical discussions. He sees the reconstruction of the public university's legitimacy as the most urgent and difficult task. And he believes that its fate is intricately linked to the fate of the State in the 21st century.

For Kettering purposes, the author provides an in-depth look at global and local forces that create tensions for public universities across the planet as well as the kinds of policies that would strengthen the university as a public institution. The author is unapologetically normative, requiring the reader to take a critical ethical-political stand on whether the public university has a specific role in a democratic society that is unlikely to be fulfilled by private (nor privatized) institutions and whose role it is to make sure it stays that way.

—*Reviewed by Mariolga Reyes Cruz*

Ravitch, Diane. 2011. "School 'Reform': A Failing Grade." *The New York Review of Books.* **September 29. pp.1-12.**

"School 'Reform': A Failing Grade," is a review by Diane Ravitch of two recently published books about the American education system. Ravitch notes that since late 1980s there has been a consensus among political leaders that what is needed to improve education is greater "accountability," based on standardized tests. This has resulted in a legislation known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which was passed in 2002. The legislation mandated a series of sanctions such as firing part or all the school staff, closing the school entirely, or handing control of the school over to state or private management, unless, by 2014, every student had reached proficiency in each subject of standardized tests.

The Obama administration on its part has offered to grant waivers from these sanctions, but only if schools are willing to adopt their proposed remedies, such as "privately managed charter schools, evaluations of teachers on the basis of their students' test scores, acceptance of recently developed set of national standards in reading and mathematics, and agreement to fire the staff and close the schools that have persistently low scores" (3). Ravitch argues that none of these reforms is supported by "experience or evidence." To her these reform processes constitute a crisis within the educational system.

Ravitch gives "reform" a failing score and criticizes the ideas of Steven Brill which defends such reforms in his book *Class Warfare: Inside the Fight to Fix America's Schools*. Ravitch notes that those who call themselves the "reformers" are billionaires, equity investors, and hedge fund managers who have financed the reform movement and advocate adherence to "free market principles in relation to employees (teachers) and consumers (students)" (4). She rejects the reform movement ideas in trying to find measurable outcomes to the problems and argues that putting faith in test scores contradicts the views held by most educators and scholars, "who understand that standardized tests are not scientific instruments and that scores on the tests represent only a small part of what schools are expected to accomplish" (5).

Reviewing a second book, *As Bad as They Say? Three Decades of Teaching in the Bronx* by Janet Grossbach Mayer, Ravitch points to others who reject reform proposals and emphasize the importance of addressing "social conditions," especially poverty, that is at the root of poor academic achievement. The book's author, a career teacher, describes her life as a teacher in one of the poorest districts. Ravitch argues that when scores become the goal by which students and schools are measured, students who are poor have disabilities, or lack adequate knowledge of English will be left far behind and "stigmatized by their low scores" (11). Mayer's book, in contrast to the reformers' views, demonstrates how one dedicated teacher can improve the education of poor young people.

For Ravitch, evaluating teachers on the basis of student test scores promotes narrowing curriculum to only the subjects tested, closing underperforming schools, disrupting communities without necessarily producing better schools, and blaming teacher unions for laziness and non-cooperation. For her, these strategies are not the remedy to the root causes of the current education crisis. A society that does not take responsibility for the non-school conditions of its children should be also blamed. Addressing the root problems instead of their symptoms would encourage teachers to be trained to support social, emotional, and intellectual development, and to engage local communities on behalf of their children (11).

—Reviewed by Afsaneh Haddadian

Schafft, Kai, A. Jackson, and Alecia Youngblood, ed. *Rural Education for the Twenty-First Century: Identity, Place and Community in a Globalizing World*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010.

Chapter 10 "The Golden Cage of Rural College Access: How Higher Education Can Respond the Rural Life," Patricia M. McDonough, R. Evely Gildersleeve, and Karen McClafferty Jarsky.

Rural life, qualitatively different from urban and suburban cultures, is under served by higher education. Despite better high school graduation rates, rural students are underrepresented in the higher education population by about 8% from students in urban settings. Rural students may have access to community colleges, but may not have the money for, nor expectations of, college attendance in ways that are different from their urban counterparts. Urban students may have similar constraints, but at least can see around them education and career as normalized. College students from rural backgrounds have higher levels of reported motivation to return home and serve their communities than do other students. The authors argue that higher education must take greater responsibility to address the different and specific concerns of rural students.

Social status in rural settings may be based on a long history of work and involvement in community life, while most research on rural life takes a deficit perspective, with a focus on socio-economic status. The "golden cage" metaphor represents a high quality, closely knit rural lifestyle that students may be loathe to leave, but the authors' claim cannot be sustained in a global economy. They look to an area of northern California to show how

college preparation courses and seamless cooperation between rural high schools, local community colleges, and the state university system allowed university outreach-practitioners to help build the rural college-going culture by making higher education "a vital part of the rural schooling experience."

"Conclusion: Economics, Community and Rural Education: Rethinking the Nature of Accountability in the Twenty-First Century," Kai A. Jackson.

This chapter speaks to the broken bond between communities and schools as having been exacerbated under the strong influence of No Child Left Behind legislation. Rural areas of limited means may tend to focus on testing areas to the detriment of other educational endeavors, including that of community building. As the primary community-building institution, schools in rural communities need to be both actively engaged and engaging. That said, this chapter includes a fantastic example of aligned institutions in the story of a school in rural Pennsylvania. Educators took the high value placed on the environment in the community culture as its starting point for extensively developed and connected aquaculture, horticulture, and other sciences that were used to build inter-generational social bonds, improve educational results, and locate student success in the real world.

—Reviewed by Connie Crockett

Doumit, Gilbert and Marwa Abu-Fasil. "Benghazi: Libyan workshop begins; Difficulties abound, owing to the onerous legacy of Qadhafi [Benghazi: al-Warsha al-Libiyya Bida't wa al-Musa'ab Kathira Jira' Tarikat al-Qadhdhafi al-Thaqila]" Trans. Jeff Reger. *al-Hayat*. 23 September 2011.

A civil society group recently organized a workshop in the Libyan city of Begnahzi that brought together Arab activists as well as journalists and activists from Libya. What follows is a contribution is from two of the participants about their journey and their observations in Benghazi:

Upon arriving to Benghazi, one feels that time has stopped for 42 years, which is the length of time that has passed since Qadhafi assumed power. At first glance, the streets seem completely safe, despite the presence of armed men in civilian clothes at every intersection. But after residing for a few days in the city, one becomes aware that this place is on the verge of collapse: the people here are possessed by hatred, fear, and a desire to be rid of injustice and oppression.

Our visit to Benghazi aimed to strengthen our conceptions of citizenship and democracy in light of the ongoing military revolution, and the martyrdom of dozens of young men each day on the field of battle, for the sake of liberating Libya. The itinerary of the visit focused on the implementation of a series of workshops on "active citizenship and democratic participation" attended by academics and civil society activists, in addition to meetings with a number of members of the National Transitional Council and other actors. More than a hundred participants took part in the workshop, with occasional attendance by members of the NTC.

When we arrived to the Egyptian-Libyan border, we witnessed a scuffle between two young men, one bleeding from his head, and we asked one of the bystanders about the cause of the squabble. He clarified that there is a tobacco smuggling operation between the two countries, adding: "You are on the border between a state without a president [Egypt], and a country without a state [Libya], so what do you expect?"

We spent six days in Benghazi listening to a myriad of stories about the suffering of the Libyan people … For every family there is a detainee, a martyr, or an individual who joined the revolutionaries to free Libya. We heard many reports about the rule of Qadhafi, among them: Cutting off television transmissions for a period of two days and broadcasting just a single sentence, saying "The Leader is contemplating;" removing all street signs so that the "invaders" would lose their way; modifying the school curriculum and limiting the school day to just three hours; banning the teaching of foreign languages; and imposing the Green Book as the core focus of instruction. The strangest bit of news was connected with prohibiting the playing of football, under the pretext that the game is "undemocratic," which meant that the youth had to play football without any spectators whatsoever.

The most prominent story we heard was tied to the killing of 1,270 people at the Abu Salim prison in 1996. Since this incident occurred, the families of the victims have been demonstrating annually to demand that the Qadhafi regime reveal the truth about what happened to their loved ones. As is their custom each year, the families called for a gathering on 15 February 2011, which led to the arrest of the legal coordinator for the victims' families, Abdul-Fattah Tirbil. When the families took to the streets of Bengahzi, the sit-in transformed into a public rally demanding the fall of the regime, inspired by the revolutions of Tunis and Egypt, and this was the spark that launched the Libyan revolution.

Libyan citizenship in the transitional stage

The Qadhafi regime deprived Libyans of their freedoms of expression, belief, and assembly, which limited the notion of citizenship to the legal status of the individual. Libyans were not accustomed to concepts of rights, obligations, and participation. Muhammad, one of the participants in the workshop, expressed his bitterness with a sense of shame and sadness, saying: "This is the first time I have discussed these notions, and the first time I've expressed my opinion in front of a group … So please excuse me if I make a mistake."

The interest of the participants in the workshop revolved around discussing their political rights, such as participating in formulating the constitution, pushing for accountability of politicians and the prosecution of corrupt officials, in addition to securing the right of assembly, the establishment of political parties, unhindered expression of opinion through the media, and equal opportunity to assume public posts.

The most intense debate concerned the role of the clergy in politics. Most of the participants were inclined to accept the idea, except for the youth, who objected.

Other heated discussions concerned the right of equality between men and women, such as equal opportunity in obtaining employment. The conversation moved to the physical capabilities of women and "the right of men to hit them." One of the participants said, "It's possible to hit some women, in a particular way," and a group of the women in attendance revolted against this, while the reactions of the other attendees varied between embarrassment and anger.

The challenges of democracy in Libyan society

One of the sessions included an exercise in which the participants drafted a constitutional preamble, a topic that has been at the center of the discussion among political groups in Libya today. The results were largely consistent, most prominently in the shared importance of defining a term limit for the president of the republic, establishing controls on the possibility of amending the constitution, and putting in place mechanisms of accountability to protect the independence of the judiciary—in order to fight corruption and ensure the separation of powers—in addition to adopting the Arabic language as the official language of the state, while at the same time preserving the rights of minorities to use their languages, specifically Amazigh (Berber).

The discussion during the constitution exercise touched on the rightness regarding the Holy Qur'an and Islamic Shar'ia as a source for legislation. Most of the opinions leaned toward adopting this proposal, despite the presence of some voices that expressed their fear of its exploitation by certain parties, who would interpret the texts in a way that would limit civic liberties, particularly the rights of women. It was also worth noting that one of the female participants raised a question to the attendees, asking: "What do we do about Jews of Libyan descent, shouldn't they have the right of return to their country, to enjoy the same rights as we all do," a proposal that most of the participants supported.

From these discussions, it seems that the coming stage in the transition to Libyan democracy is threatened by a number of challenges, chief among them the building of a political system that believes in integrating diverse groups into the state, beginning with the tribes and ethnic groups and continuing to include opposing politicians from both extremes of hardline Islamists and secularists, and all who fall in between. The debate between federalism and decentralization reflects the beginnings of a schism that hides in its folds divergent tendencies that will not be clearly pronounced until after the fall of Qadhafi and the start of the state formation process.

Libyan identity and cultural pluralism

The last portion of the workshop focused on the topic of national identity. The participants were asked to create a list of their personal, cultural, political, and professional and other affiliations, and then to choose the five most important from among them, ranked in order of priority. Then, the participants worked in groups in order to choose, and arrange in order of priority, five shared elements of identity. The recurrent priority of "belonging to Islam" was remarkable, despite the presence of some who argued for "belonging to Libya" as the top priority. As for the other priorities, "belonging to the Arab world" and

"belonging to civil society" were ranked second and third, respectively.

Some of the participants expressed their opinion that the choice of "Islam" for the top position came as a result of this being the sole affiliation permissible during the Qadhafi era. They argued that the outbreak of the current revolution has multiplied the sense of national belonging, while also leading to a weakening of a sense of belonging to the Arab world, which has become associated with those who supported Qadhafi during his reign. As for those participants who called for "belonging to Libya" as the top priority, they argued that the notion of "Libya" brings all citizens together and assures the incorporation of minorities into the state.

This part of the workshop included an exercise on stereotypes in society. It was difficult to push participants to reflect on their own stereotypes for two reasons: The first is the conservative culture of Libya, reflected in a type of overwhelming respect that makes it difficult to act otherwise, leading to a dismissive rejection of any behavior by others who are "different" in Libyan society. The second is the long years beneath the shadow of repression and terrorization that makes Libyans wary of expressing their ideas and feelings towards others.

<u>The future of Libya?</u>

We heard a lot throughout our journey about the era preceding Qadhafi's coming to power, when Libya was a developed country, in the 1950s and 1960s. During our visit to the museum of "the tyrant" in Benghazi, one of the local historians discussed how Libya was distinguished during the rule of King Idris by its progressive constitution, openness in public life, and development in general. In Benghazi, it is possible to perceive what Libyans will face during the next stage, in terms of great challenges, in attempting to overcome the social, cultural, and political destruction that they have suffered over the past 42 years—and in treating the extensive pain inflicted upon the country during the revolution, which has claimed the lives of twenty thousand young men, at least, during the fighting.

But, it is also possible to sense what incredible enthusiasm Libyans have for freedom, equality, and justice. They recognize the difficulties of the democratic process and the difficulties of constructing the institutions of a modern state, which are riddled with a number of monumental challenges, above all the need to construct a pluralistic system that forestalls fissure and fragmentation.

The current political conflict revolves around the constitution, and a civil system and its connection with Islam, which could be expected to continue in the next phase. However, the true challenge lies in the possibility of managing these differences under the principles of democracy.

—*Translated by Jeff Reger*

Romand Coles (2004). "Moving Democracy: Industrial Areas Foundation Social Movements and the Political Arts of Listening, Traveling, and Tabling," *Political Theory*. Vol. 32, No. 5 (October), pp. 678-705.

Despite high levels of enthusiasm for civil society organizations as the lifeblood of contemporary democratic politics, problems remain within this model of democratic association. For Romand Coles, these problems stem in part from an overemphasis on "voice"—i.e. the challenge for marginalized groups in a democracy is a lack of voice and the goal of a more democratic politics is to expand the table so that more voices can be included. As Coles sees it, even though the empowerment of marginalized voices is a crucial democratic project, an overemphasis on the articulation of demands and interests can "conceal key elements of democratic vision and practice" (682). By focusing on voice, democratic theorists and practitioners might overlook the subtle and complex arts of listening and receptivity.

In this article Coles shows how a rearrangement of democratic priorities towards practices of receptivity can change the metaphors and practices surrounding public life. Namely, practices of receptivity can shift the location of democracy from a centralized "table" towards a variety of "tables" in multiple locations. Instead of seeing the challenge of democracy as getting "more voices at the table," the challenge for Coles is pluralizing the tables and spaces in which democratic politics takes place. Coles turns to the organizing efforts of groups associated with the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) in order to demonstrate how practices of receptivity and "tabling" might force us to "re-envision the space-time of democratic engagement" (681). By shifting the emphasis from a centralized democratic table, IAF practices reconceptualize democracy "as an activity in which the tables of engagement…must be repeatedly altered…moved and multiplied" (681).

The Industrial Areas Foundation in recent decades has shifted its focus to the construction of an intergenerational culture of participatory democratic practices in order to transform political and economic power. At the heart of these practices is the art of forming "bridging relationships" that cross lines of social, economic, and racial difference. In order to cultivate these relationships, IAF organizers emphasize the importance of listening and receptivity. Long before an IAF coalition can have a "voice," its members "patiently cultivate horizontal relationships by emphasizing practices of listening between individuals and between religious institutions, political associations, and neighborhood groups that they then try to weave into a deep alliance bridging differences" (685). Receptivity is embodied centrally in the IAF practices of "one-on-ones": where active members will ask questions of potential participants in an effort to open (often unexpected) "lines of dialogue, paths of relationships, and political possibility that might otherwise be slammed shut" (685). One-on-ones evolve into larger "house meetings," where new and old participants share stories and experiences in an effort to find common ground.

While listening is a crucial democratic practice within IAF organizing, for Coles the practice of receptivity "exceeds listening in important ways" (687). Receptivity includes not only the "complex art" of listening whereby stories and experiences are shared and relationships are constructed, but also "literal bodily world traveling" into different spaces

in order to experience the lived texture that informs different stories and experiences (687-8). For IAF this involves the continual movement of meetings and members around to various neighborhoods, associations, and institutions within public life. As Coles puts it, "this actual world traveling bends, broadens, and nurtures one's hearing and vision, and it transfigures the imagination as our bodies experience…the textures of worn doors, a patched broken window, buildings shedding paint and sloping" (689). If democratic voice is only built through a patient practice of listening, then authentic democratic listening, for Coles, is deeply dependent on traveling: "listening must pass through world traveling to begin to experience other worlds or aspects of world that intersect and bear upon each other but are not simply common objects experienced from different angles" (689).

Practices of listening and receptive traveling can change how democratic theorists and practitioners envisage the work and place of democracy. In order to conceptualize this shift, Coles addresses the idea of a "table" within the democratic imagination. The idea of a table as a space where actors convene to deliberate and act misleads us into thinking that democracy depends on these centralized tables of decision and power. For Coles, democracy should not be "solely or primarily at a central table…but only from tables that let themselves be moved and move us to very different spaces and modes of relation" (694). IAF embodies this practice of "tabling"—of moving the tables of democracy—in two concrete ways. First, by the aforementioned practice of moving members and meetings into different organizational and neighborhood spaces, IAF bridge relationships across lines of difference. Second, once a coalition is formed IAF will host public accountability meetings that, in effect, reverse the tables on elected officials. At these meetings, public officials do not preside over the public space but are among the many voices to be included in the conversation. These sessions, for Coles, "transfigure the official representations all the more powerfully because they include official representatives within a drama that is not of their own making" (697). By light of these practices, the result is "a vision of democracy as a movement of many interacting changing tables" (698).

The act of convening citizens in public is a crucial democratic practice. Getting more voices to the proverbial table is an important part of deliberative politics, and it reflects the central ideals of democracy as a form of government where all voices have equal weight or standing. Yet if democratic theorists and practitioners focus exclusively on the central tables of democracy, they will miss the important democratic work going on at a variety of tables within different neighborhoods, associations, and organizations. The idea of "moving democracy" not only draws attention to the necessary tensions within democratic representation, but it cultivates important democratic skills such as listening and receptivity.

—Reviewed by David W. McIvor

Brecher, Jeremy. 2011. *Banded Together: Economic Democratization in the Brass Valley.* **University of Illinois Press.**

In Connecticut's Naugatuck Valley, a place where people bonded over their hard and dan-

gerous labor in the brass industry and built dense community networks and institutions that gave them a measure of control, children grew up believing that there would always be more hard work to be done in the local factories. People made brass that others turned into rivets, snaps and Seth Thomas clocks, so sturdy and reliable that the Navy had never used anything else. As an example of network formation and community learning, the book is a historian's thirty year observation of a specific locale comparable to *Tupelo*, but with a northern accent.

When Seth Thomas abruptly closed its doors to move to Georgia, it was only another loss in a longer string of closings, but it took a particularly hard toll on local identity. As more workers considered moving away too, an experienced organizer started an alliance that changed how people interpreted the problem of economic decline and saw themselves as political actors. The "Naugatuck Valley Project" became a structured network of organizations and collective actions with a goal towards local ownership of many differing enterprises and worker/community decision-making at its core. This was a complicated challenge requiring members of the alliance to grow ever more sophisticated in their understanding of diffused corporate fiduciary channels of responsibility and ownership. Their shared concerns and learning led them into experiments with worker collectives, land trusts, housing coops and other inter-related (and aligned) efforts.

Tensions that arose during the efforts are not glossed over in the reporting, and the story is not framed as a narrative of "success." Rather, the author relates numerous conscious efforts made to gain small measures of control over events that signaled the end of a way of life, local adaptation to changing demographics, and the power of loosely connected hubs of community.

Banded Together is a story of rebirth and reinvention through which many hundreds of people came to see themselves as responsible for their own (and collective) economic futures. Despite start-ups and buyouts that ultimately did not survive, indications of changed attitudes can be found in the fact that every neighborhood now has its own organization and insists on being a part of planning and decision-making at every level. The newfound sense that "people have a right to participate in the decisions that affect them" stands in contrast to the prevailing local culture born in the 1970's, when people had less confidence in their participatory rights.

The NVP has remained active 25 years and after many "failures" since its inception. It is now part of a larger regional network called the InterValley Project that does organizing work in five states. The NVP functions in chapters that decide local priorities and through annual meetings determine together statewide issue priorities. Beyond the book itself (and perhaps more interesting) is an online interactive repository of the NVP work at http://www.naugatuckvalleyproject.org/ and http://www.brassvalley.org/ where one can view actual documents such as a list of victories, newspaper clippings, and a typed sheet of "warning signals" that one's employer might soon close their doors, drawn up by workers whose hindsight has been hard earned.

—*Reviewed by Connie Crockett*