

Student-Centered Learning Communities: Teachers' Perspectives

Ardeth Deay and Joy Faini Saab
West Virginia University

This study was designed to examine teachers' perceptions of changes in their classroom practices that have occurred as a result of training in process-education techniques commonly described as the Foxfire approach to learning. Teachers participated in a university class during which they studied techniques for implementing experiential, student-centered instructional approaches that give students a voice in the process of their education. Changes in classroom practices that affect teachers' interactions with students, parents, and other community members are described.

The school as we know it must be remade to a more social point of view. Now the aim is too often so to equip each pupil that he may the better get ahead of others. Content and method will need remaking. Much of what is now taught is too largely conventional and all too remote from life. The idea that education consists in the acquisition of stated subject-matter must give way to the study of problems vital within the lives of the young people and to the undertaking of enterprises significant within the community. (Kilpatrick, 1932, p. 80)

Throughout the 20th century, educators have periodically dealt with the need to make school activity relevant to life outside of the classroom. As early as 1908, Stimpson described home-projects "applying the teachings of the school in [students'] home farm work" that were implemented as part of the curriculum in rural communities (cited in Kliebard, 1987, p. 154). Since the first vocational agriculture projects, rural educators have been struggling with ways to revitalize classrooms by incorporating experience-based, student-centered instructional approaches into the process of schooling.

At a national level, much of the vigor in teacher education institutions during the first part of this century was centered on the dynamics of progressive education and issues of project-oriented educational programs (Dewey, 1963; Kilpatrick, 1932). Although the project curriculum (called the "activity" or "experience" curriculum in the 1930s) held great promise for schooling focused on "the

real and immediate interests of the students" (Kliebard, 1987, p. 156), this powerful teaching technique never pervaded American schools.

As we near the end of the century, teacher educators in rural Appalachia have a continuing concern that much of what is offered in the way of inservice education for teachers neglects their need for teaching strategies that will help them to make school relevant for children in rural, poor Appalachian areas. Too often the materials available are primarily oriented to suburban life and values. They often have a mainstream, urban/suburban perspective, without a participatory focus (Oxendine, 1990; Stumbo, 1989; Wigginton, 1985).

During the past two decades, rural teachers have realized that this mainstream perspective neglects rural communities, teachers, and children. The work of rural educators across the country reflects a new wave of concern for rural children and rural perspectives (DeYoung, 1987). Many agree with Theobald's (1991) analysis of the situation:

[W]e have to bring the "rural" back into rural schools. . . . [This] means . . . battling against the currently popular testing movement, convincing legislators that "outcomes" need not be the same in rural schools as in city schools, . . . [and] encouraging teachers to infuse their lessons with critical questioning about the forces that affect the lives of rural children and their communities. (p. 27)

The problems educators encounter in rural Appalachia are those of all rural impoverished areas.

This research was funded, in part, by a grant from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 1992 meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ardeth Deay, College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506-6122.

Places where older traditions and values openly conflict with national and modern ones are those places with long-term histories of economic depression and/or isolated communities . . . surrounded by images of a national culture only

marginally available to them; and a local culture which relies on a national economic and political structure which views them as archaic and outdated. (DeYoung & Theobald, 1991, p. 12)

The challenge for teachers who work in these school environments is to engage their students in activities that are academically sound, relevant to local lives, and pertinent to the local community. All of these factors need to mesh to create an effective, workable educational program for rural students. An effective program must include the context of these areas as described by DeYoung and Theobald (1991):

If rural school improvement is to be seriously pursued, particularly in depressed or isolated communities, more in-depth understandings of the cultural and social functions of schools in such places needs to be seen in those who would improve (not just "reform") them. (p. 12)

Oxendine (1990) describes the discrepancy between commercially prepared educational materials and the perspectives of rural Appalachian students:

The traditional basal reader oriented method of teaching reading doesn't work for mountain students. There is nothing in those pages for them to identify with. In those pages, they see nice brick homes or apartment buildings and well-dressed people with well-paying jobs. This teaches them to be ashamed of their environment and causes their self-esteem to plummet. (p. 32)

The difficulties of using such materials include issues of relevance, ownership, and integration, as well as the self-esteem issues so well described by Oxendine. These issues concern most teachers in rural Appalachia.

Individual teachers have provided their students with school experiences that are relevant to their lives and that build on the strengths of their communities. In a 1989 issue of the *Harvard Educational Review*, two rural high school teachers, Stumbo and Wigginton, each describe the power of educational processes that recognize, value, and incorporate student and community perspectives into the acquisition of skills in the classroom (Stumbo, 1989; Wigginton, 1989). These teachers were able to implement experience-based, student-centered instructional approaches that gave students a real voice in the process of their education. Their focus on student voice in the classroom was an essential part of the processes used to make school relevant and appropriate to the lives of their students.

Student participation was missing in the findings of Schmuck and Schmuck (1990), who examined democratic participation in small-town schools and concluded that

democratic processes were virtually non-existent. They recommend initiatives that would enhance democratic participation in the schools, suggesting that teachers develop ways to use shared decision-making in their work with students.

Although the findings of Schmuck and Schmuck seem typical of American schools (Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1984), individual teachers such as Stumbo and Wigginton have found ways to make school relevant and participatory. However successful, these efforts have been sporadic and isolated. Many current teacher inservice programs emphasize teaching and learning that are experiential, student-centered, and provide for student voice in the classroom. Part of that effort has been educational programs such as Foxfire that teach teachers process-education procedures.

The current study was designed to explore teachers' perspectives concerning the changes that occur after Foxfire training. The two areas addressed are the teachers' changes in their perceptions of themselves as teachers and the changes that occurred in their classrooms as a result of implementing the Foxfire approach to teaching.

Method

Sample

Sixty-four teachers from nine counties in West Virginia participated in the training program reported in this study. The teachers had 2 to 20 years experience teaching grades kindergarten through high school. Thirty-six of these teachers completed the Classroom Instruction Profile (described below) before and after training. Of these 36, 22 taught at the K-6 level and 14 taught grades 7 and above. Twenty-four of the teachers who completed the course (37% of the sample) were interviewed six months to a year after the training was completed. Six of these teachers did not describe themselves as having successfully implemented a Foxfire project.

Training Program

The training program took the form of a university Foxfire course. Each class comprised 45 contact hours and incorporated the reading of John Dewey's *Experience and Education*, Eliot Wigginton's *Sometimes a Shining Moment*, and a variety of journal articles concerning democratic teaching methods. All participants studied the same content and were asked to implement a Foxfire project in their classrooms.

During their Foxfire training, teachers learn to include the students in the planning of classroom activities using teaching techniques developed by Eliot Wigginton during his 25 years in the classroom (Wigginton, 1990). Wigginton has shared these steps with others through various Foxfire

training programs. Initially, teachers brainstorm with their students about the qualities of "good teachers" and "memorable learning experiences." They create lists of descriptions of teachers and learning experiences that stand out as highly significant in their memories. These lists become guides by which the class plans learning experiences for the year. Then the teacher introduces the course objectives. The teacher creates a discussion with the class about how these objectives are connected to the real world. The class talks about such questions as: Who uses this information? Why do they need to know this? Where do they use this information? How do they use this information?

Once the students and teacher have explored the real-world connections of the learning objectives, they begin to discuss how they could design a project that would help them learn about this information. They spend time brainstorming a variety of project ideas that would help them learn the objectives. The class then narrows the list by voting for multiple project ideas that are interesting to them. Eventually, the class votes on a project, designs the steps for completing the project, and then implements it. At regular intervals, the students and teacher evaluate the project.

The students discuss the following types of questions as they review their progress: Where are we now? What have we learned so far? Are we still going in the right direction to accomplish our objectives? Are we satisfied with our progress to date? Where do we go from here? In these discussions, students are active evaluators of their own work.

Teachers use the "core practices" of the Foxfire approach as guides for their work on a classroom level (Kugelmas & Walker, 1991). In moments of reflection, the group can look to these principles to see how they might be incorporated into the current class projects being carried out. Foxfire projects are designed to flow from student desire, with the teacher serving as the guide and collaborator to insure that academic integrity is maintained. This project work is characterized by student action. Emphasis is on peer teaching, small group work, and teamwork. Projects often involve an audience outside of the group that helps to affirm student efforts and can also become one of the many connections to the world outside of the classroom. In establishing these community links, students often explore the interrelatedness of the content they are studying with the real world.

While the projects are in progress, students are encouraged to examine the aesthetic qualities of their work and incorporate their creativity and imagination as they refine their efforts. New ideas for projects spiral naturally from past experiences, emphasizing the connectedness of the learning process. Students and teachers reflect upon and evaluate their work throughout the projects.

Instruments

The two instruments used to collect information from the teachers are the Classroom Instruction Profile and an open-ended interview protocol. These instruments are described below.

Classroom Instruction Profile. Teachers reported descriptions of their teaching on a Classroom Instruction Profile. The Profile is a 20-item Likert scale developed by Junius Eddy for the Foxfire National Networks in 1985. Items focus on the teachers' use of student involvement in curriculum and instruction design and implementation, integration of community in the daily life of the classroom, and traditional/nontraditional approaches to instruction. The teachers responded to surveys administered at the start of each of three introductory Foxfire courses and readministered, by mail, three to six months after completing the course.

Interviews. In addition, 24 teachers were randomly selected for open-ended interviews 6 months to a year after completing the training. All interviewers used the same interview schedule. The interviews centered on the teachers' perceptions of changes that occurred in their classrooms as a result of implementing Foxfire projects. Teacher interviews were conducted at the teachers' convenience: in their homes, at their schools, or at a breakfast meeting. A typical interview lasted for roughly one hour.

The interviews started with the open-ended question, "How has your teaching changed as a result of Foxfire?" Probe questions to elicit more information were asked when necessary. They included such prompts as, "What were the most significant changes that occurred as a result of Foxfire?" "How have you changed as a teacher as a result of Foxfire?" "How have your students changed since or due to Foxfire?" Teachers were also asked what problems they had when implementing Foxfire projects in their classrooms.

Analyses

Pretest and posttest means and standard deviations were examined for each item on the Classroom Instruction Profile for the 36 teachers who completed both forms; total scores were assessed, as well (see Table 1). For each item and the total score, an effect size¹ was computed to represent the difference between pretest and posttest values. Our discussion below focuses on effect sizes of .50 or greater.

Teachers' responses to open-ended interview questions were recorded by the interviewer. At the end of each

¹An effect size is a standardized mean-difference. For example, an effect size of .50 would indicate that the mean response on a posttest item is one half of a standard deviation higher than the corresponding mean on the pretest.

interview, teachers reviewed their written responses for accuracy. We categorized the written interview responses, sentence by sentence, into idea units. Further analysis focused on the themes or patterns that emerged from the interviews. We checked the idea units and themes until we were satisfied that the teachers' ideas had been accurately reported. We then analyzed the interview data according to the phenomenological method described by Hycner (1985). These techniques were used to sort and categorize the teachers' responses into units of general meaning and then into units of meaning relevant to the research questions. We summarized the data after clustering idea units into themes of meaning. At each step in this process, we revalidated the data against the original transcripts for contextual meaning.

Results and Discussion

Classroom Instruction Profile

The survey questions regarding student involvement that demonstrated the greatest change and, therefore, the largest effect sizes, were student discussions (Question 20, $ES = .96$), peer teaching (Question 2, $ES = .92$), student planning for instruction (Question 4, $ES = .77$), students as co-learners with teachers (Question 6, $ES = .73$), and active student roles (Question 14, $ES = .61$). These reported shifts in teaching mirror the core practice of students as active learners, which is a central component of the Foxfire style of instruction.

The survey questions related to the incorporation of the community into the learning process revealing the greatest effect size were considering the audience beyond the classroom for student work (Question 5, $ES = .63$) and using community resources (Question 3, $ES = .50$). These questions relate directly to the core practice of considering the surrounding community in the planning for meaningful instruction.

Another survey question that revealed a teacher-reported change concerned the consideration of creative and imaginative responses from the students (Question 15, $ES = .53$). The shift that occurred in response to this question may reflect the creative ideas that emerged when students were active in planning class projects.

The remaining survey questions (ES s ranging from .11 to .40) related to more technical and mechanical aspects of traditional teaching. Examples of these questions were the memorization of skills (Question 13, $ES = .38$), a focus on the use of textbooks (Question 1, $ES = .26$), the importance of basic skills (Question 7, $ES = .18$), and the state curricular requirements (Question 16, $ES = .24$).

Clearly, teachers reported changes regarding the ways in which they were involving students in the design and participation of learning activities, especially in the use of discussions, peer teaching, and planning units of instruc-

tion. These changes, combined with the increased incorporation of the community in the learning process, suggest that teachers were more likely to consider the student voice in the activity of the classroom after completing a Foxfire course.

Interviews

Of the 24 teachers interviewed, 18 (75%) reported a variety of changes in their classrooms as they implemented Foxfire projects. The projects included a new approach to spelling lessons, a math class that made coonskin hats, and a basketball game fund raiser to buy books for a classroom library. A content analysis of the interviews revealed six kinds of changes described by teachers.

More open and flexible approach to teaching. After implementing this approach to teaching, teachers saw themselves as more creative, more excited about teaching, and more tolerant of student direction. Overall, teachers described themselves as more open and flexible, more enthusiastic. Their enthusiasm for the changes they were experiencing was captured by statements such as "I feel freer to be creative with sharing my ideas with my students," "I feel refreshed," "With this approach you never get in a rut," and "I think I'm a better listener."

The energy created by the shift in focus of the teachers' perspective on their role in the classroom seemed to renew their appreciation of themselves as educators. The teachers re-examined their relationship to the curriculum requirements, the content to be taught, and the young people in their classrooms. As a result of this process, the teachers report that their lives as educators are reinvigorated whether they have taught for 2 or 20 years.

Approach to curriculum. Teachers related a difference in their approach to curriculum content. They described their classrooms as more focused on what meaning students find from the subject-matter and more concerned about the relevance and usefulness of the content to be studied. They also say their orientation toward textbooks has changed. Teachers' descriptions of these changes include "I have learned how to use the books as reference tools;" "I am not committed to the textbook as much. I find myself trying to find ways not to use the text;" "I [now] try . . . [to] show students connections between school objectives and the real world—they always seem more willing to learn if they can apply it."

The Foxfire training seemed to serve as a catalyst for a shift in perspective that made the goals and objectives of the curriculum more meaningful and relevant to teachers as well as students when projects were developed together.

Sharing responsibility for learning. Teachers also related that they were now sharing the responsibility for learning with the students in the class. Teachers described ways they were including students in designing projects and

Table 1

Classroom Instruction Profile Survey Results: Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (N = 36)

Survey Questions	Pretest	Posttest	Effect Size
In your approach to classroom instruction, to what extent do you . . .			
1. center your instruction around textbooks, workbooks, and similar ready-made materials?	3.83 ^a (1.36) ^b	4.19 (1.32)	.26
2. provide opportunities for your students to teach what they know to their classmates or other students?	3.80 (1.32)	4.94 (1.14)	.92
3. make use of resources from your surrounding community—individuals, agencies, organizations, sites, etc.?	4.22 (1.62)	4.97 (1.34)	.50
4. involve students in working with you to develop units or elements of instruction?	3.02 (1.48)	4.13 (1.39)	.77
5. consider it important for students to work on tasks or projects designed for an audience beyond the classroom?	4.19 (1.34)	4.97 (1.13)	.63
6. include activities that involve you as a co-learner with your students?	3.94 (1.30)	4.86 (1.22)	.73
7. base your activities on the belief that a solid grounding in the basic skills enables students to deal effectively with more complex tasks later on?	5.50 (1.20)	5.27 (1.32)	.18
8. plan classroom activities around students' out-of-school experiences?	4.22 (0.98)	4.52 (1.34)	.25
9. respond to students' disruptive behaviors by re-examining aspects of your own teaching practices?	5.11 (1.14)	5.25 (1.31)	.11
10. structure your courses in ways that students learn from their mistakes, rather than feel punished or discouraged by them?	5.13 (1.07)	5.36 (1.29)	.19
11. emphasize the fact that you expect students to master skills and concepts, not merely respond correctly on quizzes, tests, etc.?	5.38 (1.04)	5.63 (1.26)	.21
12. create a learning environment in which most of the question-asking is initiated by the teacher?	4.02 (1.29)	4.50 (1.08)	.40
13. prefer to have your students memorize, recall, and recite information imparted in class and/or from the text?	4.77 (1.55)	5.30 (1.19)	.38

^aMean.

^bStandard deviation.

Table 1 (continued)

Survey Questions	Pretest	Posttest	Effect Size
14. structure activities so that students are stimulated to assume an active role in their own learning?	4.75 (1.13)	5.41 (1.02)	.61
15. acknowledge creative, imaginative responses from your students?	5.58 (0.87)	6.08 (1.02)	.53
16. use traditional strategies to satisfy state and local curricular requirements when you'd rather experiment with different ways to reach the same goals?	4.19 (1.65)	4.55 (1.27)	.24
17. systematically plan your classes so that you can give individual students personal attention?	5.16 (1.25)	4.83 (1.27)	.26
18. employ independent student projects as an instructional strategy?	4.47 (1.52)	4.66 (1.45)	.12
19. connect the content of your classes with what your students are studying in other content areas?	4.83 (1.05)	5.02 (1.18)	.17
20. maintain an environment for discussions so that students talk as much to one another as to you?	4.11 (1.36)	5.30 (1.11)	.96
Total	90.30 (13.07)	99.83 (13.44)	.71

units that the class would undertake for at least one content area during the day: "My role has changed. I am a co-learner, a co-adventurer"; "I am not the only person in the room responsible for the learning agenda—for the overall success or failure of the experience"; "I always thought I was a good teacher—by including the kids in the decision-making, the kids see now all I missed"; "I am more tolerant of student direction (even when I don't get my own way)."

This shared responsibility for learning led to students becoming more involved in decision-making and democratic processes. Teachers described students as taking charge of what they learned while working to potential because they wanted to do it for themselves.

Student involvement. As student involvement increased, the decision-making activities also included extracurricular activities, fund-raising projects, classroom rules, parent programs, and field trips. Many teachers reported students taking the initiative to solve problems and asking for outside help from authorities. They described students initiating decision-making with the words "let's vote on it," or "what can we do? I'll make a list." Teachers said: "They love making their own choices. When a problem arises,

they will say, 'Can we vote on it?'; "My students know how to make decisions and discuss ideas"; "[Students are] more confident, more willing to take responsibility." These teachers describe a difference in student engagement in the learning process. They attribute this to opportunities to make real decisions about meaningful activities in their lives.

Students' approach to learning. Teachers describe students' approach to learning as being remarkably different. The word "ownership" often came up when teachers described how students had changed. Teachers reported that students took initiative in the planning, organizing, and implementing projects as a way to learn the content: "Students learn curricular requirements and at the same time learn group dynamics, personal knowledge, aesthetics and mastery, and empowerment"; "The kids have become thinkers. They know how to brainstorm and think past the obvious." When students are learning in ways that matter to them, they explore the world in and out of the classroom with more vigor.

Community involvement. The teachers' descriptions of the students' changes in their approach to learning included

the way they related what they did in school to their lives outside of school. The dynamics of parent and community involvement with school projects shifted. Teachers indicated that project activities led to community involvement in different and more meaningful ways. They often used the word "real" when talking about student and parent/community involvement in Foxfire projects. One third-grade teacher described parent involvement as more "real" because it evolved from student initiative. "We did not say, 'how can we involve parents?' The children carry their enthusiasm home."

Teachers reported parents saying their children were more excited about school and discussed their Foxfire projects in ways that demonstrated their ownership and involvement in learning experiences that had personal meaning for them. The children volunteered parents and other relatives for help with the projects. One primary school class's weather unit became a scientific investigation as students collected folk myths about the weather from grandparents and neighbors, gathered data, and then substantiated or refuted common tales about weather prediction with their own documentation. Teaching subject matter that relates to the world outside of the classroom seems to influence the dynamic of the community's interaction with the school in ways that make these interactions more purposeful.

Teachers Not Implementing Projects

Of the 24 teachers interviewed, six (25%) did not implement Foxfire projects in their classrooms. Their perspective is best captured by a teacher who said, "This year has not been the right time for it." The stated reasons included perceived lack of administrative support, a state on-site evaluation of the school, a serious illness of a family member, and a change in teaching assignment.

Problems and Barriers

The teachers who had implemented the Foxfire approach (18, or 75% of those interviewed) discussed problems they had encountered in implementation. They cited an increased need for nontraditional evaluation and assessment and more communication with people not familiar with the process (e.g., school board members, administrators, other teachers and parents). Teachers reported that a few parents noted the interest and enthusiasm of their children in the Foxfire projects without always recognizing the academic integrity of the process. One parent was reported to say, "[The students] really enjoyed the Foxfire project, but I'm not sure how much they learned."

The student who is more comfortable with traditional structures was occasionally mentioned as a challenge to the committed Foxfire teacher. Students sometimes do not

trust the process. These students do not see the projects as a chance for them to genuinely participate. They are reluctant until some critical moment when they realize the project is something they are doing for themselves.

A teacher working with remedial seventh graders in a large middle school reported that

finding an audience outside the classroom has not been simple. The class voted down any attempt to display our achievements to the outside. They enjoyed the in-class recognition, but seemed genuinely suspicious of any outside observation. The students still seem to feel there must be a "catch" to this approach. They are just waiting to be humiliated in some way. Hopefully when given some time they will accept that they are "safe".

One teacher's comment captures some of the constraints involved when attempting change. When asked about any areas where she could use help, she said, "Pry my brain open and take out my traditionalism and rule-following and set me free." This sentiment illustrates the change in perspective necessary when teachers are successful at implementing process education methods in their classrooms.

Implications

We recognize that, for the most part, we are reporting the success stories. However, once a classroom is involved in the Foxfire approach, the underlying beliefs associated with this method seem to permeate the classroom in a way that allows the teachers, students, parents, and community members to become partners in the learning process. There are several implications for educators.

The vigor of past efforts in process education is reflected by the teachers in this study. The passion evident in the work of Kilpatrick, Dewey, and other progressive educators in the first half of this century is evident in the teachers who were able to implement Foxfire projects. These teachers exemplify the potency of a teacher stance that lives learning, rather than prepares students for tomorrow.

The teachers' enthusiasm seemed to be sustained by a difference in the quality of the classroom climate. The teachers describe new interactions for themselves with the curriculum and the students. Clearly, when teachers focus on relevance, student voice, and participatory decision-making, an inherently sound change in classroom dynamics occurs. These dynamics seem especially important in rural impoverished areas where the links between school and community are often not well established.

When the subject matter is relevant to their lives, students will be more genuinely engaged and will accept

responsibility for their learning. Educators need to consider the value of school processes that refresh teachers and invigorate students. Hard questions need to be asked about school curriculum that improves test scores but teaches students that learning is separate from living.

The Foxfire approach seems to stimulate "lives of the mind." When students are active participants in designing and implementing learning activities, engaged minds are a result. The teachers participating in this study conveyed a liveliness and freshness that allowed and encouraged them to look at their teaching from a new perspective.

References

- Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Macmillan.
- DeYoung, A. (1987). The status of American rural education research: An integrated review and commentary. *Review of Educational Research*, 57, 123-148.
- DeYoung, A., & Theobald, P. (1991). Community schools in the national context: The social and cultural impact of educational reform movements on American rural schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 7(3), 3-14.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hycner, R. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies*, 8, 279-303.
- Kilpatrick, W. (1932). *Education and the social crisis*. New York: Liveright.
- Kliebard, H. (1987). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kuglema, J., & Walker, S. (Eds.) (1991). The Foxfire approach: Perspectives and core practices. *Hands On: A Journal for Teachers*, 41, 3-8.
- Oxendine, L. (1990). Dick and Jane are dead. Let's begin anew! *Hands On: A Journal for Teachers*, 37/38, 32-42.
- Schmuck, P., & Schmuck, R. (1990). Democratic participation in small town schools. *Educational Researcher*, 19(8), 14-19.
- Stumbo, C. (1989). Teachers and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(1), 87-97.
- Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Theobald, P. (1991). Country lifers reconsidered: Educational reform for rural America. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 7(2), 21-28.
- Wigginton, E. (1985). *Sometimes a shining moment: The foxfire experience*. New York: Doubleday.
- Wigginton, E. (1989). Foxfire grows up. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(1), 24-29.
- Wigginton, E. (1990, July). *Using the Foxfire Approach in the Classroom*. Notes presented over a three-day portion of a graduate course for teachers at West Virginia University, Morgantown.