

School and Democracy: A Reassessment of G. H. Mead's Educational Ideas

Filipe Carreira da Silva
Universidade de Lisboa
Instituto de Ciências Sociais
Wolfson College, Cambridge
fcs23@ics.ul.pt

ABSTRACT

In this paper I wish to provide a re-examination of G. H. Mead's educational ideas and their radical democratic import. Drawing on both published and unpublished materials, I discuss how Mead applies his social psychological insights to a number of educational matters. In particular, I will focus on the relation between the family and the school, the role model performed by the problem-solving attitude of experimental science for teaching activities, the relation between the school and the industrial world, the importance of schooling to a participative conception of democratic politics, and Mead's conception of the university as a scientific institution devoted not to vocational training, but to fundamental research.

1. Introduction

In this paper, I re-examine George Herbert Mead's philosophy of education, a much neglected aspect of his thinking.¹ In what will be a necessarily brief discussion of Mead's ideas on education, I will focus on the function performed by the school system in the process of ontogenetic development of the human self. For Mead, as well as for other pragmatists such as John Dewey, the psychological development of the child should be intelligently moulded and promoted by means of an educational system inspired in the model of experimental science. In my view, this will give us a privileged vantage point from which to evaluate how Mead applies his social psychological insights to a number of educational matters. Among these, I will focus on the relation between the family and the school, the role model performed by the problem-solving attitude of experimental science for teaching activities, the relation between the

¹ Excerpts of this paper have been published previously in my *Mead and Modernity. Science, Selfhood and Democratic Politics*. The bulk of the argument here being made, however, is original.

school and the industrial world, the importance of schooling to a participative conception of democratic politics, and Mead's conception of the university as a scientific institution devoted not to vocational training, but to fundamental research. This theme will be discussed by taking into consideration both published and unpublished materials written by Mead or notes made by others on his lectures. The pertinence of this methodological strategy is revealed as soon as one realizes that the only substantial text where Mead applies his theory of phylogenesis and model of action to educational issues is found in the 1910-1911 student notes from his course on 'The Philosophy of Education' (Mead, n.d.a).

2. *Mead's Philosophy of Education*

In these lecture notes, one can see how Mead articulates a 'psychological statement of the act' (Mead, n.d.a, p. 81) in light of which he proposes to explain the various stages of phylogenetic development of the human species. Mead identifies three main stages: the emotional, when man learns how to deal affectively with the objects that compose the surrounding environment; the aesthetic, when man learns how to appreciate the value of the surrounding objects; and the analytic or intellectual, when man acquires the cognitive ability to solve action problems (Mead, n.d.a, p. 82). Towards the end of the 1910s Mead's model of action undergoes a 'social turn'. Human rationality begins to be conceived of as gradually emerging in the history of the species due to the cooperative nature of social life. Indeed, in these lecture notes, one can already see Mead trying to draw the implications of such a social conception of human action and rationality for his theory of education. The efficient cause adduced by Mead for the phylogenetic development of the human species is the need for man to solve certain problems of adjustment to his surrounding environment. Education, from this point of view, is but the organized response of the community to the problem of teaching its individual members how to solve action problems. As always, in the back of Mead's mind there lies the scientific method as the ultimate example of a rational problem-solving procedure. The method of education is, then, a derivative of the method of modern experimental science (Mead, n.d.a, pp. 174-176). Mead's argument can be stated as follows. In modern times, the analytic level of thinking has attained predominance given the success of experimental science in attaining control over the surrounding environment. As a result, the school has to integrate science's methodological procedure if it wishes to provide the students with the re-

quired cognitive instruments to cope with the social, economic and political conditions of modern industrial societies.

Admittedly, Mead's philosophy of education cannot be fully understood if one does not take into account the fact that this was a very popular and controversial topic in Chicago at the turn of the century. In fact, Mead's theses on education are highly indebted to other colleagues and friends at the University of Chicago, especially to Dewey who wrote extensively on the subject. To begin with, it was Mead and his wife who edited and helped to publish Dewey's *The School and Society* (1900).² Dewey's theoretical interest in education gained concrete expression in the establishment of the University Laboratory School in January 1897, on the campus of the University of Chicago (Dewey, [1899]1976, p. 57). That this elementary school was often called 'experimental school' says a great deal about its approach to educational problems. That Mead's educational thought shared its basic psychological assumptions with Dewey's is clear when one realizes which were the chief working hypotheses that were adopted from psychology to the curricular organization of the Laboratory School. As Dewey explains, there were three main psychological theses adopted as educational principles. Firstly, the individual mind is understood 'as a function of social life' (Dewey, [1899]1976, p. 69) and education as an eminently social affair; secondly, the rejection of the dualism between mind and body, between psychological theory and educational practice ([1899]1976, pp. 70-71); thirdly, the conception of human mind as 'essentially a process – a process of growth, not a fixed thing' ([1899]1976, p. 71). Mead's published articles on education show the extent to which his proposals are in accord with Dewey's ideas.

3. *The Family and the School*

As early as in 1896, Mead can be seen asking his colleagues whether a child's mind can be conceived of as an 'empty country into which the educator can go, like the manager of a telegraph company, and put wires where he will' (Mead, 1896, p. 143). The rejection of such a conception stems from Mead's

² In the author's note to the 1900 edition of this book, one can read: 'From my friends Mr. and Mrs. George Herbert Mead came that interest, unflagging attention to detail, and artistic taste which, in my absence, remade colloquial remarks until they were fit to print, and then saw the results through the press with the present attractive result – a mode of authorship made easy, which I recommend to others fortunate enough to possess such friends' (Dewey, [1899]1976, p. 3).

case against the principle of work being adopted as a principle of education. Instead, the school should adopt the notion of play as its key principle, in the sense that the stimuli provoked by the surrounding objects must be so arranged that they will ‘answer to the natural growth of the children’s organism, both as respects the objects he becomes successively interested in and the relations which they have, to each other in the life process that he will have to carry out’ (Mead, 1896, p. 145). From the beginning, then, Mead conceived of education as a means of intelligent control over the children’s natural process of development, rejecting both an authoritarian model of inculcation of information and a model where the absence of discipline prevents intelligence from guiding the child’s impulses. According to the pragmatists’ model of education, the school cannot be separated from the home since both are fundamental social spheres where the child’s development takes place. As Mead holds in ‘The Child and His Environment’ (1898), his working hypothesis maintains that life in the family and in the school should be related and unified, ‘with stimuli ready to call out the immediate connection between the different spontaneous acts of the child, as respects each other, and the life that lies behind them’ (Mead, 1898, p. 7). In light of Mead’s model of action, an act has a moral import insofar as it is oriented to the common good and thus transcends the order of the community in which it first arose: this is how, according to Mead, moral values are incorporated into intelligent action. Similarly, aesthetic values can be incorporated into human action in the phase of consummation, when the individual is able to appreciate the enjoyment that characterizes the successful accomplishment of the act (see Mead, [1926]1964, p. 296). In an unpublished fragment, Mead discusses the function performed by schooling for the development of the artistic impulses of the child. The school, he argues, can guide the child’s artistic impulses so that he can see how these impulses are actually related to his other impulses, thus achieving a sense of life as a meaningful whole. As he explains, “The education in artistic expression for the young child involves the recognition of the essential relation between the artistic impulse and the other child impulses and such an emphasis upon this connection that the product of the artistic activity as a stimulus to succeeding acts will rise naturally to consciousness and become a control over the productive act” (Mead, n.d.c, p. 2).

Mead reasserts the close connection between the school and the family in an address delivered in 17 December 1903, as president of the School of Education³ Parents’ Association. In this speech, Mead explicitly subscribes to the

³ This School of Education was another elementary school of the University of Chicago. The duplication of effort would lead to the merger of this school with Dewey’s Lab School

positions presented by Dewey in *The School and Society*, when he emphasizes that the common ground between the home and the school is 'the social consciousness of our children' (Mead, 1904, p. 344). Yet, in the following year, Mead's intellectual relationship with Dewey would suffer a major setback. I refer to Dewey's unexpected resignation from the University of Chicago in the spring of 1904 and subsequent departure to Columbia University, where he would begin working in February of 1905. The abandonment of the Laboratory School by Dewey, the only concrete expression of his philosophy of education, led Mead to a progressive treatment of educational issues on a different scale, no longer limited to elementary educational matters at the University of Chicago, but still according to the psychological principles laid out above.

4. *Social Psychology and Education*

It is not surprising, therefore, to see Mead analysing school children through the lenses of his scientific psychology. A notable instance of this can be found in Mead's involvement in the Chicago Physiological School as president of its board of trustees.⁴ This school, also known as the 'Hospital School' since it functioned under the joint supervision of the Departments of Philosophy and of Neurology of the University of Chicago, was created in 1900 by the initiative of President William Harper to provide students with learning disabilities with adequate training.⁵ One can see here how closely linked were Mead's interests in social psychology and education. Mobilizing the conceptual apparatus of his scientific psychology and model of action, which laid strong emphasis on the 'biological individual', Mead had the necessary tools to support his pedagogical concerns regarding handicapped children. Due to financial reasons, the school eventually closed in May 1904, but this did not change Mead's motivation for in 1908 he wrote to President Judson of the University of Chicago asserting that the establishment of another Hospital School 'commanded

in the fall of 1903, with Alice Dewey serving as principal. See Westbrook, 1991, pp. 111-112.

⁴ Surprisingly, none of the major commentators on Mead refers to his involvement in this enterprise. The only article where this issue is discussed is Deegan and Burger, 1978, pp. 363-365.

⁵ President Harper to Mead, 11 October 1900, University Presidents Papers, University of Chicago Library.

the immediate interest of the psychological and neurological departments”⁶. However, there are other examples that show Mead analysing educational issues from the perspective of a scientific social psychology. For instance, in December 1909, Mead was asked to discuss the social situation in the school as the subject of a scientific study before the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Boston. In this meeting, one can see Mead making use of his conception of the human consciousness, whose social character he was asserting with growing vehemence at the time. After having suggested that instruction takes the form of a conversation, and that language is an essentially social process, Mead then notes how the attention of the pupil should be conceived of as a ‘process of organization of consciousness’. Given the fact that the individual consciousness arises with the recognition and definition of other selves, Mead claims that it is “unfruitful if not impossible to attempt to scientifically control the attention of children in their formal education, unless they are regarded as social beings in dealing with the very material of instruction. It is this essentially social character of attention which gives its peculiar grip to vocational training” (Mead, 1910, p. 692).

In two articles published in 1906, Mead sets forth his views on the teaching of science. These essays constitute, I believe, a crucially important statement of Mead’s interrelated conception of experimental science, education and democratic politics. In ‘The teaching of science in college’ (1906a), Mead contends that the peculiar appropriateness of a course in the history of science lies in the fact that ‘the special character of modern science would grow out of the conditions that made it natural and necessary’ (Mead, 1906a, p. 394). Mead holds, in ‘Teaching of science in high school’ (1906b), that this fact is not acknowledged in most schools. As a consequence, high school students, at a time they are particularly sensitive to moral issues, are deprived of the opportunity to come into contact with ‘the high morality of science, with its decalogue of disinterested exactness, its idealistic hypothesis, its gospel of human intelligence’ (Mead, 1906b, p. 248). This passage certainly ranks amongst Mead’s most eloquent apologies for the moral democratic virtues of modern science.

5. *The School and the Industrial World*

The modern world is as characterized by scientific achievements as it is dominated by a growing concentration of capital, increasing industrial competition,

⁶ Mead to President Judson, 2 December 1908, University Presidents Papers, University of Chicago Library.

and exponential urban growth resulting from the influx of immigrants. Mead refers himself explicitly to the consequences of these two last traits of modern societies for the educative system. The problems raised by Chicago's rapid urban growth for the educational system of the city are addressed by Mead in 'The Educational Situation in the Chicago Public School' (1907). In this article, Mead's chief concern is a controversy in Chicago's Board of Education concerning teachers' assessment and their responsibilities in the definition of the curricula. Such a crisis, Mead holds, is exacerbated by the circumstance of the growing number of attending students. With an acute sense of the nature and implications of the process of social change taking place in the American society of the turn of the century, Mead argues that this is a problem "no large city escapes. (...) We are finding out in very various ways that when children are multiplied and the rooms piled up into huge structures we have entirely different problems from those which gave rise to the public school system in the United States" (Mead, 1907-8a, p. 131).

The other feature of the societal shift to modernity in the light of which Mead discusses educational issues is an industrial world with a growing need for a qualified labour force. In the immigrant workers who poured into Chicago at that time, growing industry found the solution for its needs. Industrial education is seen by the 'captains of industry' as the only way of providing vocational training for the working classes, since the liberal arts colleges and universities were oriented to the formation of the upper classes of society. Mead had good reasons to oppose this dual conception of education. Firstly, as he explained in an address to the Woman's Trade Union League of Chicago in 1908, industrial education means much more than 'technically trained men. It means greater efficiency in the whole community, because if rightly brought in, we are going to have better men and women in the community' (Mead, 1908, p. 19). For this reason, vocational training should be made part of the public system of education 'which belongs to the body politic of which we are members', and thus it cannot be 'left in the hands of manufacturers who are only immediately interested in the training of skilled men' (Mead, 1908, p. 20). Secondly, as a member of the editorial board of the *Elementary School Teacher*, a Chicago-based journal dedicated to educational affairs, Mead conceived of the public system of education as a means to supersede the class divide. Mead deemed the 'vast industrial interests' that demand trade schools 'to supply them with the skilled labor of which they are in need' (Mead, 1907-8b, p. 402) to be a 'narrow class attitude' (1907-8b, p. 405), against which a broader democratic perspective should be proposed. Such class distinction, with the workers' children attending trade schools and the more affluent classes being

able to send their children to liberal arts colleges, is ‘destructive of American democracy’ (Mead, 1908-9a, p. 157). To the contrary, Mead contends that ‘American industrial training must be a liberal education’ (1908-9a, p. 157). This theoretical claim would gain empirical support with the findings of research on industrial and commercial training in Chicago that Mead conducted as chairman of the City Club Committee on Public Education, between 1909 and 1911. The main contention of this three-hundred-page long *Report on Vocational Training in Chicago* was that ‘vocational training [ought to] be introduced into our schools as an essential part of its education – in no illiberal sense and with no intention of separating out a class of workingmen’s children who are to receive trade training at the expense of academic training’ (Mead, Wreidt and Bogan, 1912, p. 9). The same idea can be found in an unpublished manuscript entitled ‘Social Bearings of Industrial Education’, where Mead compares the cases of Chicago and Munich. Referring to a talk given by Kerschesteiner at the Commercial Club of Chicago in late 1910,⁷ Mead points out that in that German city ‘a boy can go to a continuation school and get direction in his own trade, a training something along the line of civics, which is an enormous advantage to him’ (Mead, n.d.b, pp. 16-17), whereas ‘the situation in Chicago is an entirely different situation from that in Munich’ (n.d.b, p. 18). For this reason, the American public school system ‘will have to care of the children from the period of fourteen until they enter into their vocation’, ‘it has got to undertake this task and carry it out, not only for those children who wish to go on to a college education, but for all the children’ (n.d.b, p. 23).

6. *Towards an ‘Informed Citizenry’*

Behind Mead’s proposal, one finds the pragmatist *ethos* of an egalitarian democratic society, whose citizens must be both physical and mentally able to perform their social functions. In other words, it is not only against a class-divided society that Mead is directing his criticisms; it is also against the philosophical dualism between body and mind. Mead’s ideal society is all-inclusive and cooperation is its chief principle of organization. All Americans are immigrants, he claimed, with only one difference separating them: some came in the Mayflower, while others arrived in later ships. The best means of securing social integration is the school. The socialization function performed

⁷ I would like to thank Harold Orbach for this information.

by schooling is a keystone of the pragmatists' philosophy of education. In Mead's case, the public school system is seen as the 'one American institution that will do more for the assimilation of this foreign population than any other means' (1909, p. 224). What Mead is calling for is a unified public school system, by means of which children from all economic and social backgrounds would acquire the intellectual and practical abilities necessary for the full exercise of their citizenship. As a consequence of his rejection of the Cartesian dualism between body and mind, Mead claims that 'there is nothing more democratic than intelligence', which consists in the 'constant interaction of theory and practice' (1908-9c, p. 376). The inherently democratic nature of scientific inquiry is thus mobilized by Mead to suggest that education should be seen as the central social institution through which American society could intelligently solve the problems posed by the process of rapid modernization. Hence the ethical function of the school is the development of citizens whose cognitive abilities are as well trained as their practical competences. Only in this way will individuals become citizens conscious of the social import of their particular activities.

The school is the most important instrument at the disposal of a community in order to provide its younger members with the cognitive and moral abilities needed for the informed exercise of citizenship. An active citizen, for Mead, is an individual capable of rationally addressing social problems taking into account all the values at stake, and of being able to reconstruct this problematic situation by transcending the particular order of the society in which he lives. Citizenship is not a merely juridical concept; rather, it is the continued involvement in civic affairs, a practice that requires a set of cognitive and moral competences. In this sense, the moral training provided by the public school system is of the utmost importance. In 1908-9, Mead compares the educational systems of Great Britain and of the United States from this vantage point. His conclusion is that only in the latter case would it be possible to mould the moral consciousness of the student body insofar as the 'school becomes organized as a social whole, and as the child recognizes his conduct as a reflection or formulation of that society' (1908-9b, p. 328). Moral training is, from this perspective, one of the school's educative aims, to be achieved through the same means as its other goals, namely through the application of the experimental method of science and of social psychology's conclusions about the development of the self. The pragmatists' theoretical claims on education would not, however, be applied in the Laboratory School for much longer. In 1909, due to internal divergences at the University of Chicago, Mead gives up editing the *Elementary School Teacher*, just as Tufts abandons

the editorship of the *School Review*. The educational profile of the Laboratory School would eventually come to assume a different character from that envisaged by Dewey, Mead, and their colleagues. As a result, Mead turns to other voluntary associations such as the City Club of Chicago (already in 1905) and the University Settlement (in 1909), in order to continue to pursue his reformist activities. The years 1909-10 thus mark a turning point in Mead's research and policy work on educational issues, curiously enough at a time when the social character of his conception of the human perception was becoming increasingly pronounced.

Some years later, Mead's theoretical claims would eventually receive concrete expression with the creation, in 1916, of the Bureau of Vocational Guidance by the Chicago education authorities⁸. At this time, Mead attributes to the university the functional role of, within the educational system, combining science's method, social psychology's findings, and morals' universalistic orientation for the benefit of the community. In one of his last published articles on educational issues, Mead argues that the university should perform the functions of finding out what culture is and of promoting it; it should determine what is proper professional training and provide it; it should find out what is right and wrong and teach it; and it should state research problems and solve them (see Mead, 1915b, p. 351). Mead asserts that the university 'does not know where it is going, but being self-conscious it does know that it is advancing or it is stationary, or even in retrograde motion, and it knows this by its success or failure in solving its own problems' (Mead, 1915b, p. 351). Curiously, it was to the university that Mead would devote the remainder of his career, either through his research activities on time and cosmology, or through his lectures on various subjects.

7. *Concluding Remarks*

The title of this paper – 'School and Democracy' – is deemed to show the centrality of the category of 'informed citizenry' for Mead's social and political thought. Mead's deliberative theory of democracy places its faith not on the skills of the professional party members, but on the wisdom of the informed

⁸ In the year before the creation of this Bureau, Mead commented on the evolution of the educational situation in Chicago since the early 1900s in the following way: 'Fortunately this gap between the community and the school has been bridged at a number of points. The schools have undertaken a certain amount of vocational training (...). It has been even in some degree sought by the school itself' (Mead, 1915a, p. 45).

laymen. Mead's model of democracy is not centred on the state; on the contrary, it presupposes a pluralistic and decentralized set of political institutions of which the state is simply the one operating at the national level. Below the state, there are the municipal authorities, whose importance Mead never ceased to emphasize; above the state, there should be an international institutional body able to arbitrate and settle the conflicts between national states. At each level, the existence of an active public sphere is of pivotal importance: the denser the communicative network between the individual members, the more democratic and effective the influence of that sphere of political activity. It is in such an 'informed citizenry' that Mead finds the ultimate source of legitimacy of a constitutional democratic regime. When Mead speaks of 'institutionalized revolution', he is drawing the borders between the piecemeal reformism of the pragmatists and the revolutionary means of the socialists.

This relative positioning allows us to better grasp the import of Mead's contributions to contemporary social and political theory. If 'science and democracy' is a common theme amongst classical pragmatists, it is to Mead that we owe the only communicative social theory that systematically connects science's problem-solving nature to democracy's deliberative character by means of social psychology that establishes the social nature of the human self. The ideal of a 'republic of letters', a radical democratic community in which violence and coercion have been rejected in favour of the force of the best argument, was indeed a life-long inspiration for Mead. Of course, as with any other ideal, this regulative notion of a 'republic of letters' has a dual character. On the one hand, it refers to the concrete historical experience of the literate elites of seventeenth-century Europe. On the other hand, it constitutes a normative ideal that transcends the boundaries of historical experience and is able to inspire the conduct of latter generations. Our generation, in particular, seems to have much to gain from the rational, deliberative understanding of democratic politics underlying such an ideal. At a time that scientific political inquiry is under the dominant influence of methodological individualism and instrumental conceptions of rationality and action, Mead's intersubjective model of politics offers a convincing alternative for all those that rest unconvinced by the application of rational choice theory to the political realm. Several reasons support this contention. Firstly, Mead's proposed model of action is more realistic and rigorous than the all-too-convenient abstractions of rational choice models. Instead of *presupposing* that social action is solely motivated by narrow instrumental reasons, political scientists need *to show* that other motivations and external factors do not play a role in explaining political conduct. If they happen to do so, then, it is the task of the political scien-

tist to incorporate them in his model: analytical parsimony is a valuable goal only insofar as it is not pursued at the cost of intellectual rigor and empirical complexity. Secondly, the ‘deliberative turn’ that political theory has experienced in the last thirty years has given origin to a substantial body of work (see, for example, Elster, 1988; Bohman, 1998; Guttmann and Thompson, 2004). These significant conceptual developments and empirical clarifications provide today’s practitioners with excellent tools in order to transform Mead’s (arguably sketchy) insights into consistent theories and models. Thirdly, the ahistorical, progressive narrative that legitimizes contemporary rational choice theory does not resist the critical scrutiny suggested by Mead’s historically sensitive approach to science and democratic politics. Along with the rational communicative basis of his thinking, this ranks among Mead’s greatest contributions to today’s social and political theory. Reason and history, entwined in a democratic fashion under modern conditions, are the basic tenets of Mead’s pragmatist approach to politics. It is my belief that they are as valid today as they were a century ago – at least, the adversaries against which Mead developed his theories in the early twentieth century, abstract individual rationalism and positivism, can still be seen, albeit in renewed fashion, having a prominent role in the social sciences today.

References

- Bohman, J. (1998) Survey Article: The Coming of Age of Deliberative Democracy, *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 6 (4), pp. 400-425.
- Deegan, M. J. and Burger, J. (1978) George Herbert Mead and social reform: His work and writings, *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*, 14, pp. 362-73.
- Dewey, J. (1899) The school and society, in: J. A. Boydston (ed.), *John Dewey. The Middle Works, Volume 1: 1899-1901* (Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press).
- Elster, J. (1986) The market and the forum: Three varieties of political theory, in: J. Elster e A. Hyland (eds.), *Foundations of Social Choice Theory* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Guttmann, A. and Thompson, D. (2004) *Why Deliberative Democracy?* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press).
- Mead, G. H., Wreidt, E. and Bogan, W. (1912) *A Report on Vocational Training in Chicago and in other Cities* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).

School and Democracy: A Reassessment of G. H. Mead's Educational Ideas

- Mead, G. H. (n.d.a) The philosophy of education, (unpublished typescript of student notes by Juliet Hammond, 1910-1), University of Chicago Library, Mead Papers, box 8, folder 9.
- (n.d.b) Social bearings of industrial education, (unpublished paper, n.d.), University of Chicago Library, Mead Papers, box 9, folder 24, 24 pp.
 - (n.d.c) The art impulse in the young child, (unpublished paper, n.d.), University of Chicago Library, Mead Papers, box 10, folder 32, 2 pp.
 - (1896) The relation of play to education, *University of Chicago Record*, 1, pp. 140-145.
 - (1898) The child and his environment, *Transactions of the Illinois Society for Child-Study*, 3, pp. 1-11.
 - (1904) The basis for a parents' association, *Elementary School Teacher*, 4, pp. 337-346.
 - (1906a) The teaching of science in college, *Science*, 24, pp. 390-397.
 - (1906b) Science in the high school, *School Review*, 14, pp. 237-249.
 - (1907-8a) The educational situation in the Chicago public schools, *City Club Bulletin*, 1, pp. 131-138.
 - (1907-8b) Editorial notes: industrial education and trade schools, *Elementary School Teacher*, 8, pp. 402-406.
 - (1908) Educational aspects of trade schools, *Union Labor Advocate*, 8, pp. 19-20.
 - (1908-9a) Editorial notes: resolution on industrial training, *Elementary School Teacher*, 9, pp. 156-157.
 - (1908-9b) Editorial notes: moral training in the schools, *Elementary School Teacher*, 9, pp. 327-328.
 - (1908-9c) Industrial education, the working-man, and the school, *Elementary School Teacher*, 9, pp. 369-83.
 - (1909) The adjustment of our industry to surplus and unskilled labor, *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, 34, pp. 222-225.
 - (1910) The psychology of social consciousness implied in instruction, *Science*, 31, pp. 688-693.
 - (1915a) The larger educational bearings of vocational guidance, in: M. Bloomfield (ed.), *Readings in Vocational Guidance* (Boston, Ginn).
 - (1915b) Madison, *Survey*, 35, pp. 349-51, 354-61.
 - (1926) The nature of aesthetic experience, in: A. J. Reck (ed.), *Selected Writings. George Herbert Mead* (Chicago, Chicago University Press).

Silva, F. C. (2008) *Mead and Modernity. Science, Selfhood and Democratic Politics* (Lanham, Lexington Books).

Westbrook, R. (1991) *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press).