

H-175
GOOD WORK IN EDUCATION:
WHEN EXCELLENCE, ETHICS AND ENGAGEMENT MEET
Spring 2009

Instructor: Howard Gardner
201 Larsen Hall, (617) 496-4929

Class: Mondays, 4–6 pm, Location: Gutman G-05
with an additional hour for sections (Mondays, 6-7 PM as marked on syllabus)

Office hours: By appointment

Teaching Fellow: Katie Davis, 203 Larsen Hall, ked491@mail.harvard.edu

Faculty Assistant: Kirsten Adam, 206 Larsen Hall;
(617) 496-4929; hgasst@pz.harvard.edu

Course Focus and Goals: Which personal, social, and cultural factors affect whether a worker (e.g., doctor, journalist, actor, or teacher) or a field of work (in this case education) exhibits GoodWork—work that is excellent, engaging, and ethical? Such GoodWork is at a special premium today in light of the fast pace of change, new communication and information sources (e.g., the Internet), other technological innovations, transient employment patterns, and the assertion of powerful market forces in the relative absence of once powerful ideological, religious, or governmental counter forces. While focusing on education in this course, we examine how Good Work occurs in various domains, including established professions (e.g., medicine, higher education), aspiring professions (e.g., K-12 education, journalism), non-professions (e.g., business, the arts), and blue-collar work. We explore the role of professionalization, morality, and expertise in supporting or thwarting Good Work. Our point of departure is the GoodWork Project, a large-scale national empirical study of professionals' success (Good Work) or failure (compromised work) in realizing the desired blend of excellence and ethics.

The class entails two hours each week of lecture, discussion, and exercises as a whole group, accompanied by occasional one-hour sections for smaller group conversations and targeted exercises. The primary assignment is an independent analytic paper or empirical research project, which will be developed, with guidance, over the course of the term.

Readings: Each week students are expected to read approximately 75-140 pages, with a somewhat longer reading load the first two weeks. Books are available at the COOP (**Required Text**). Some articles are available electronically (**E**) through Hollis's e-resources and/or through the course website. Other articles and chapters have been assembled into a course pack (**CP**). Books also were put on reserve at Gutman Library. Please contact Katie if you have difficulty accessing an article or book.

Weekly Assignment: Please upload a short (150-200 words) memo to the course website (under 'Assignments') by **5 PM ON THE SUNDAY BEFORE EVERY CLASS**. This memo should include at least one reflection/lesson learned and one question raised by the week's readings. The memo will constitute the basis of class discussion each week. NOTE: No memo is required for the first week of class (February 2).

Semester Project: There is only one graded written assignment for the course, completed in several stages over the semester. Each student will conduct an independent investigation on a research question of his/her own choosing related to good work or compromised work. Details of the investigation will be worked out in conjunction with the teaching fellow, in consultation with the professor. Two types of papers are acceptable:

- *Empirical papers.* Students may apply their research question to *data* either by creating and conducting their own interviews or surveys/questionnaires or by using existing data (with permission of the original researcher), such as are available through the Murray Research Center at the Harvard-MIT Data Center in Littauer Hall, the GoodWork Project, or students' own contacts. Empirical papers may use either quantitative or qualitative methods, depending on what is appropriate for the research question and sample size. This class, however, is not a methodology class. Although the teaching staff may direct students to helpful articles or books, no methods training is provided. Students who choose this option should either have appropriate methodological training or the initiative and time for bootstrapping during the semester.
- *Analytic papers.* Students may apply their research question to the *scholarly literature* by conducting a critical analysis of past studies, theories, and commentaries on the relevant topic. Although similar to the typical "term paper," this type of paper does more than summarize what the literature says. It builds a coherent, logical argument that addresses the research question and usually presents the existing literature selectively in light of a new framework or model. Students are also encouraged to indicate how their topic might be approached empirically.

Regardless of the type of paper a student chooses, the focus should be investigation, not advocacy. That is, the paper for this course should emphasize better understanding of some phenomenon, not what should be done about the phenomenon. Some papers from this course have evolved into papers on the Good Work website. See, for example, papers by Croft, Lang, Aarons-Mele, Ting, Stein, Henry, Seider, and Reid.

Students must receive approval of their topic from the instructor **no later than February 27**. If a topic is not approved, the student will be asked to choose from a set of topics provided by the instructor.

Grading: Students' final grades are based on the following factors:

- The quality of the final paper
- The quality, timeliness and conscientiousness shown in the research process through meeting the requirements of intermediate project deadlines over the semester
- Attendance and thoughtful participation in discussions and activities during class and section
- Consistent submission of weekly response memos

As the project is a cumulative experience, it does not make sense to grade each intermediate submission separately. Written feedback will be provided on students' intermediate submissions to scaffold their continuing research progress. However, only the final paper will receive a letter grade. **No extensions or incompletes will be granted.**

Course Format: Class entails two hours each week of short lectures, discussions, and activities as a whole group, plus regular sections geared towards helping students plan and carry out their term projects. The class is readings based. Therefore, to prepare for class each week, students should carefully and critically read the assigned books and articles and give some thought to the generative questions on the class schedule particular to each week's readings. General questions to ask yourself each week:

- What is the definition of the key term(s) (e.g., good work, compromised work, professions)? Often the readings present more than one point-of-view or conceptualization of the term. How do their definitions differ? Why?
- In a few sentences, what is the main point or argument each author is making? How does it overlap or differ from the other authors that week? How does it tie in with or contradict readings from past weeks?
- How might this reading expand our understanding of good or compromised work?

CLASS TOPICS AND READING/ASSINGMENT SCHEDULE

Weekly Assignment: Please upload a short (150-200 words) memo to the course website (under ‘Assignments’) by **5 PM ON THE SUNDAY BEFORE EVERY CLASS**. This memo should include at least one reflection/lesson learned and one question raised by the week’s readings. The memo will constitute the basis of class discussion each week. NOTE: No memo is required for the first week of class (February 2).

Shopping Week, January 28: Introduction

Students who plan to enroll in the course are asked to submit an application by **4 PM on Thursday, January 29**. You can download an application from the course website.

Week 1, February 2: Good Work (NOTE: No memo is required for this week.)

Readings:

- Browse GoodWork Project website: www.goodworkproject.org
- Read ‘The GoodWork Project Overview’ (**GWP website**)
- Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Damon, W. (2001). *Good work: When ethics and excellence meet*. New York: Basic Books. **BEGIN BOOK; FOCUS ON PARTS I & IV** (**Required Text**)
- Verducci, S. and Gardner, H. (2006). Good work: Its nature, its nurture. In F. Huppert (Ed.), *The Science of Happiness* (pp.341-359). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (**CP**)

Generative questions:

- What do “good work” and “compromised work” mean to you?
- How does your personal definition correspond with the definition used by the GoodWork Project?
- What are examples from your own work experiences of people or situations that you would characterize as good work or compromised work? What are the aspects of the person or situation that you think contributed to your assessment?
- Why should we care about good work?

SECTION 1: Choosing a Topic, Forming a Research Question, Type of Study

Week 2, February 9: Origins and Development of Good Work

Readings:

- Fischman, W., Solomon, B., Greenspan, D., & Gardner, H. (2004). *Making good*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (**Required Text**)
(If your last name falls within A-F, please read about Young Geneticists. If your last name falls within G-P, please read about young journalists. If your last name falls within Q-Z, please read about young theater workers.)
- Gardner, H. (2005). Compromised work. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 42-51. (**E**)

- Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Damon, W. (2001). *Good work: When ethics and excellence meet*. New York: Basic Books. COMPLETE BOOK (Required Text)

Generative questions:

- What formative influences seem important for the development of a good work attitude?
- What role should educational institutions play in the promotion of a good work attitude?
- What types of experiences, encounters, forces, conflicts/disjunctions seem to turn young people toward compromised work?
- Do you believe that young people today are less prone to be good workers than their predecessors? How would you document your opinion?

SECTION 2: Conducting a Literature Review

Week 3, February 16: No Class due to Presidents' Day

ASSIGNMENT DUE (upload to course website): ½ page stating topic, research question/s & description of method (sample, data sources, etc.)

- Students must receive approval of their topic from the instructor **no later than February 27**. If a topic is not approved, the student will be asked to choose from a set of topics provided by the instructor.

The following is a list of successful student papers from previous years. They are all available for download on the GWP website:

www.goodworkproject.org/publications/papers.htm

- Aarons-Mele, M. (2008). Bloggers: Citizens or entrepreneurs?
- Croft, J. (2008). Beneath the dome: Goodwork in planetariums.
- Lang, C. (2008). Through the eye of a needle: Resolving conflict between wealth.
- Seider, S. (2005). "Framework experiences": A key to the development of social responsibility in young adults.
- Ting, T. (2002). An exploration of good work in contemporary visual art.

Week 4, February 23: Foundations of Good Work: Ethics & Morality

Readings:

- Pinker, S. (2008, January 13). The moral instinct. *The New York Times Magazine*. Available from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/13/magazine/13Psychology-t.html> (E)
- Turiel, E. (1998). The development of morality. In W. Damon (Ed.), *The handbook of child psychology, Vol. 3* (pp. 881-896). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (CP)
- Wilson, J.Q. (1995) *The moral sense*. Preface (pp. vii-xv). New York: The Free Press. (CP)
- Wolfe, A. (2001). *Moral freedom*. Chapter 7 (pp. 171-214). New York: W.W. Norton & Company. (CP)

Recommended:

- Boss, J.A. (1994). The autonomy of moral intelligence. *Educational Theory*, 44 (4), 399-416. (CP)
- Colby, A. & Damon, W. (1994). *Some do care*. Chapter 11 (pp. 293-311). New York: Free Press. (CP)
- Michaelson, M. (2001). A model of extraordinary social engagement, or “moral giftedness.” In M. Michaelson & J. Nakamura (Eds.), *Supportive frameworks for youth engagement* (pp. 19-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (CP)
- Shweder, R. (2004). George Bush and the missionary position. *Daedalus*, 133(3), 26-36. (E)

Generative questions:

- Is there a difference between ethics and morality? How would you conceptualize and operationalize the difference?
- How have these readings affected how you think about morality? For example, do they change the types of questions you’d ask yourself in the mirror test?
- How might morality be considered its own domain and how might it be considered an aspect of all domains?

SECTION 3: Developing an Interview Protocol, Conducting Interviews

Week 5, March 2: Professionalization

Readings:

- Barber, B. (1963). Some problems in the sociology of the professions. *Daedalus*, 92, 669-688. (CP)
- Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The third logic*. Chapters 8 and 9 (pp. 179-222). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. (CP)
- Gardner, H., & Shulman, L. (2005). The professions in America today: Crucial but fragile. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 13-18. (E)
- Hughes, E. (1963). Professions. *Daedalus*, 92, 655-668. (CP)
- Sullivan, W. (2005). Markets vs. professions: Value added? *Daedalus*, 134(3), 19-26. (E)

Generative questions:

- What distinguishes a profession from other types of occupations?
- How might good work differ in professional, aspiring, marginal and non-professional domains? Why?
- How has the concept of professions changed and stayed the same between the 1960s (Hughes & Barber) and now (Freidson)?
- The GoodWork books argue that journalism and theater are not professional fields. What would full professionalization look like?
- Several authors argue that professions are more ethically and community minded than business. Take a stand on this issue.

Week 6, March 9: Good Work Among Ordinary Workers

Readings:

- Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mold: Women, men, and time in the new corporate world*. Chapter 4 (pp. 64-78) and Chapter 6 (pp. 105-120). New York: The Free Press. (CP)
- Lamont, M. (2000). *The dignity of working men: Morality and the boundaries of race, class, and immigration*. Introduction (pp. 1-54). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (CP)
- Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 21-33. (CP)

Recommended:

- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity*. Chapter 5 (pp. 107-126). New York: HarperCollins. (CP)

Generative questions:

- Is a sense of calling or ethical worth more a factor of personality or the type of work a person does? How so?
- What are the implications of different conceptions of work for individual health, well-being, and job satisfaction?
- How do conceptions of ethics and ethical work vary with social class?
- Identify the constraints on excellent and ethical blue collar work.
- Take a stand: Is it ethical to save the world if you neglect your own family?

ASSIGNMENT DUE (upload to course website & turn in 2 hard copies at the start of class):
Literature review with revised research question, 5 pages

Week 7, March 16: Good Work in Higher Education

Readings:

- Furman, A. (2004). Measure professors' real service, not lip service. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(11), B20. (E)
- Lagemann, E.C. (2004). Toward a strong profession of education. Excerpts from an address given at Harvard Graduate School of Education, January 1, 2004. Available from: <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/features/lagemann01012004.html> (E)
- Menges, R.J. (1999). Dilemmas of newly hired faculty. In R.J. Menges, & Associates (Eds.) *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support* (pp. 19-38). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publications. (CP)
- Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2005). Engagement in a profession: The case of undergraduate teaching. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 60-67. (E)
- Rosovsky, H. (1990). *The university: An owner's manual*. Chapter 15 (pp. 261-288). New York: W.W. Norton. (CP)
- Shulman, L. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52-59. (E)

Generative questions:

- Should education be considered a profession? Why or why not? Does it make a difference if we consider higher education versus K-12?
- What types of ethical dilemmas and barriers to good work have you noted in your or others' experiences in the field of higher education?
- Identify the factors affecting good work in higher education.

What implications do the articles have for schools of education in general and HGSE in particular?

SECTION 4: Making sense of your data

Week 8, March 23: Spring Recess

Week 9, March 30: Good Work in K-12 Education

Readings:

- Fischman, W. & Gardner, H. (2008). *Implementing GoodWork programs: Helping students to become ethical workers*. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

(CP)

- Fischman, W, Gardner, H., & DiBara, J. (2006). Creating good education against the odds. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(3), 383-398. **(E)**

- Gardner, H. (Ed.). (2007). *Responsibility at work: How leading professionals act (or don't act) responsibly*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. **READ THE TWO TEACHER PROFILES (ANDREA GRIMES AND MARY SKIPPER) IN CH.4, PP.84-89 (Required Text)**

- Ripley, A. (2008). Rhee tackles classroom challenge. *Time*. Available from: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1862444,00.html> **(E)**

Recommended:

- Johnson, S.M., & Birkeland, S.E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617. Available from: <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~ngt/papers.htm> **(E)**

Generative Questions:

- What types of ethical dilemmas and barriers to good work have you noted in your or others' experiences in the field of education?
- Identify the factors affecting good work in education.
- What role does feeling good about one's work play in good work?
- Do you think Michelle Rhee's approach to education reform will successfully promote good work in the classroom? Is Rhee herself doing good work?

SECTION 5: Crafting your paper

Week 10, April 6: Responsibility at Work

Readings:

- Gardner, H. (Ed.). (2007). *Responsibility at work: How leading professionals act (or don't act) responsibly*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. READ CHAPTERS 8, 11, 12, 13 (Required Text)

Generative questions:

- To whom or what do you feel most responsible in your work? In your personal life?
- How do individuals across different professions think about responsibility?
- What does it mean for a profession if its individual workers operate with quite diverse understandings of their responsibilities?
- In what ways do individuals (esp. educators) limit their responsibilities, and what impact do these limits have on good work?
- What does irresponsible work in education look like at the individual, institutional, and domain levels? What causes irresponsible work at each level?
- In what ways can educational settings (K-12, higher ed, schools of ed) foster rather than discourage habits of responsibility?

Week 11, April 13: Good Work in the Global Era

Readings:

- Gardner, H. (Ed.). (2007). *Responsibility at work: How leading professionals act (or don't act) responsibly*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. READ CHAPTER 10 (Required Text)
- Suárez-Orozco, M. & Qin-Hilliard, D.B. (2004). *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium*. Chapter 1 (pp. 1-37). Berkeley and London: University of California Press. (CP)

Generative questions:

- What impact does globalization have on the three “E’s” of good work?
- What opportunities and challenges does globalization present for good work?
- What can we learn from the Danish context about good work, responsibility, and the effects of globalization on each?
- What does good work look like in the global era?

Weeks 12, 13 & 14 (April 20, 27 & May 4) Student Presentations, 4-7 PM

ASSIGNMENT DUE BY 5 PM ON APRIL 22 (upload to course website & turn in 2 copies to Kirsten Adam, Larsen 206): **First draft of paper, 15-20 pages**

Friday, May 8, 2009: FINAL PAPER DUE BY NOON, NO EXTENSIONS

**H-175 GOOD WORK IN EDUCATION:
WHEN EXCELLENCE, ETHICS AND ENGAGEMENT MEET
Spring 2009 Course Reading List**

Books, Available at Harvard Coop and On Reserve at Gutman.

- Fischman, W., Solomon, B., Greenspan, D., & Gardner, H. (2004). *Making good*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gardner, H. (Ed.). (2007). *Responsibility at work: How leading professionals act (or don't act) responsibly*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Damon, W. (2001). *Good work: When ethics and excellence meet*. New York: Basic Books.

Articles & Chapters, Available in Course Packet. Not on Reserve at Gutman.

- Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mold: Women, men, and time in the new corporate world*. Chapter 4 (pp. 64-78) and Chapter 6 (pp. 105-120). New York: The Free Press.
- Barber, B. (1963). Some problems in the sociology of the professions. *Daedalus*, 92, 669-688.
- Boss, J.A. (1994). The autonomy of moral intelligence. *Educational Theory*, 44 (4), 399-416.
- Colby, A. & Damon, W. (1994). *Some do care*. Chapter 11 (pp. 293-311). New York: Free Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity*. Chapter 5 (pp. 107-126). New York: HarperCollins.
- Fischman, W. & Gardner, H. (2008). *Implementing GoodWork programs: Helping students to become ethical workers*. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The third logic*. Chapters 8 and 9 (pp. 179-222). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hughes, E. (1963). Professions. *Daedalus*, 92, 655-668.

Lamont, M. (2000). *The dignity of working men: Morality and the boundaries of race, class, and immigration*. Introduction (pp. 1-54). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Menges, R.J. (1999). Dilemmas of newly hired faculty. In R.J. Menges, & Associates (Eds.) *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support* (pp. 19-38). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publications.

Michaelson, M. (2001). A model of extraordinary social engagement, or “moral giftedness.” In M. Michaelson & J. Nakamura (Eds.), *Supportive frameworks for youth engagement* (pp. 19-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rosovsky, H. (1990). *The university: An owner’s manual*. Chapter 15 (pp. 261-288). New York: W.W. Norton.

Suárez-Orozco, M. & Qin-Hilliard, D.B. (2004). *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium*. Chapter 1 (pp. 1-37). Berkeley and London: University of California Press.

Turiel, E. (1998). The development of morality. In W. Damon (Ed.), *The handbook of child psychology, Vol. 3* (pp. 881-896). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Verducci, S. and Gardner, H. (2006). Good work: Its nature, its nurture. In F. Huppert (Ed.), *The Science of Happiness* (pp.341-359). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, J.Q. (1995) *The moral sense*. Preface (pp. vii-xv). New York: The Free Press.

Wolfe, A. (2001). *Moral freedom*. Chapter 7 (pp. 171-214). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People’s relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 21-33.

**Articles & Chapters, Available Electronically through Hollis or Distributed in Class.
Not on Reserve at Gutman.**

Fischman, W, Gardner, H., & DiBara, J. (2006). Creating good education against the odds. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 36*(3), 383-398.

Furman, A. (2004). Measure professors’ real service, not lip service. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(11), B20.

Gardner, H. (2005). Compromised work. *Daedalus, 134*(3), 42-51.

- Gardner, H., & Shulman, L. (2005). The professions in America today: Crucial but fragile. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 13-18.
- Johnson, S.M., & Birkeland, S.E. (2003). Pursuing a “sense of success”: New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617. Available from: <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~ngt/papers.htm>
- Lagemann, E.C. (2004). Toward a strong profession of education. Excerpts from an address given at Harvard Graduate School of Education, January 1, 2004. Available from: <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/features/lagemann01012004.html>
- Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2005). Engagement in a profession: The case of undergraduate teaching. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 60-67.
- Pinker, S. (2008, January 13). The moral instinct. *The New York Times Magazine*. Available from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/13/magazine/13Psychology-t.html>
- Ripley, A. (2008). Rhee tackles classroom challenge. *Time*. Available from: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1862444,00.html>
- Shweder, R. (2004). George Bush and the missionary position. *Daedalus*, 133(3), 26-36.
- Shulman, L. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52-59.
- Sullivan, W. (2005). Markets vs. professions: Value added? *Daedalus*, 134(3), 19-26.

Research Project Aids

These are not on reserve or in the packet, but might be helpful to students for their papers.

Appendices of Gardner et al. (2001)

Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. (some parts on reserve—2 copies)

Bromley, D.B. (1986). *The case-study method in psychology and related disciplines*. NY: John Wiley.

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (1998). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Glesne, C. (1997). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. New York: Longman.
Chapter 4: Making words fly: Developing understanding through interviewing
- Light, R.J., Singer, J.D., & Willett, J.B. (1990). *By design: Planning research on higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (statistical research design)
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wallace, D.B. (1989). Studying the individual: The case study method and other genres. In D.B Wallace & H.E. Gruber (Eds.), *Creative people at work* (pp. 25-43). New York: Oxford University Press.
- TO NOTE:** The following book is currently in press and will be published later this year. Interested students can obtain a .pdf of the manuscript from the professor.
- Nakamura, J., Shernoff, D., & Hooker, C.H. (2009). *Good mentoring: Fostering excellent practice in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.