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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the moral atmosphere of the elementary school and ask: How does the elementary school principal contribute to the moral atmosphere of the elementary school? In addition to this question, this study also explored the likenesses and differences between male principals and female principals in regard to the degree to which the principal practiced either an “ethic of care” or an “ethic of justice.” Four case studies were constructed using data collected from observations and interviews that were conducted in four elementary schools. Also, two female principals and two male principals were shadowed by the researcher.

The findings of this study suggest that the moral influence of the elementary school principals who participated in this study cannot be reduced to a set of behaviors or actions. Rather, the moral influence of principals seems to be revealed in a way of “being” rather than merely the “doing” of certain actions. In regard to the question of gender and the “ethic of care” and the “ethic of justice,” two interesting findings were suggested: the “ethic of care” and the “ethic of justice” can be practiced simultaneously; and there seems to be multiple ways to show “care” that at times may even seem contradictory.
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

Problem

Many would agree that our country is facing a moral crisis. To compound this problem, we do not have the vocabulary necessary to discuss or evaluate the problem. This project attempts to study one institution that is vital to nurturing morality in society -- the public elementary school. In particular, to ask, how does the elementary school principal contribute to the development of the moral atmosphere of the school? The purpose of this exploratory study is to "open up" the dialogue about critical aspects of life, schools, and schooling.

Research Question

This research project begins with the belief promoted by the work of Jackson, Boostrom and Hansen (1993), that schools have a moral nature that is worthy of study. Currently, public schools prefer to appear neutral on value and moral issues, but this situation seems to be changing. Scholars have offered a variety of opinions regarding what schools should do to improve their moral/ethical characters, suggesting in many instances that a reexamination of the purpose of schools and school leadership is in order. Jackson et al., concluded that teachers and administrators are largely unaware of the magnitude of the moral influence that their everyday actions exert upon students and vice versa. While the focus of Jackson, et al. is on the teacher in the classroom, this study will examine the work of the elementary school principal with a "heightened moral sensitivity" to what is experienced. Murry, Bogotch, and Miron (1995) argue that "morality arises within
the lived, interactive experience of practitioners" (p. 1). It is argued here that, as a principal interacts with others, a moral space is created which provides a context for investigation. This space, if thought of aesthetically or as an "expressive medium," becomes much more than just the place where an interaction occurs, much more than just a building comprised of many classrooms.

To develop the notion of a school as a moral space, it may be useful to reflect on the way interior designers think about the concept of space. Consider the following taken from Interior Design (1995):

The fundamental concern of interior design is how space can be used as an expressive medium. As they create and modify spaces, both architects and interior designers communicate ideas, concepts, and feelings to all those who see, use, and occupy those spaces. Although we may not be conscious of such meanings in any overt way, we can all think of places that have been depressing or inspiring, dignified or cheerful, snug and cozy, or bleak and cold. Many spaces are designed with little or no thought of such matters; created predominantly to serve some functional purpose or to be practical or economical, they may have an impact on users that is inappropriate. Perhaps this does not matter in a warehouse or an automated factory; in spaces intended for human use, however, it can be disastrous (Pile, 1995, p. 60).

Likewise, if schools as moral spaces are created with little thought regarding the impact on the students using the spaces, the effect can also be disastrous. If school principals, on the other hand, were to conceive as their fundamental problem the design and creation of inspiring moral spaces, the work of school principals and the lives of students and teachers might change dramatically. To view a school as an expressive medium, much like an architect or designer might view a building or a room, requires a fairly high level of consideration on the part of the principal.
With this thought in mind — that morality arises out of action — the experience of practicing elementary school principals will provide the context for the present study. While secondary issues concerning community and gender will also be addressed, this study is based on the primary research question: How do the discourse/practice of the school principal impact the moral atmosphere of a school?

Justification

Within the moral/ethical realm of educational discourse, there has been a variety of opinions regarding the relationship between ethics, morals, and public education. Purpel (1989) asserts that we have not adequately discussed the impact of moral and ethical issues on education and argues that educational discourse in this country has been trivialized in two ways: The neglect of larger more critical topics, and the emphasis that has been placed on technical rather than social, political, and moral issues (pp. 2-3). Discussions about school restructuring, for example, typically focus on topics such as reforming the core technology of schools, reforming the working conditions of teaching, or reforming the relationship between schools and their clients (Elmore, 1990). There is little mention of social, cultural, or moral aspects of education to be found in the restructuring literature.

Purpel (1989) urges the educational community to begin a discussion of more serious matters such as this: How does one make moral choices? This difficult but nonetheless critical question has been largely overlooked in educational administration, despite its relevance. The notion that educational administration is a moral practice has been argued, but little attention has been paid to how
administrators make moral choices. The situation is problematic as a large part of school administrative practice involves making decisions that have underlying moral implications for those involved. What follows is a discussion of a generally shared view of the field of the moral dimension of educational administration.

Educational administration has been described as "a way of ordering the world according to a set of values and beliefs" (Foster, 1986, p. 36). It is a complex activity that goes beyond being a mere managerial or technical skill. Foster has described educational administration as being composed of four contexts: managerial, political, leadership, and social/cultural. Delving into the social/cultural context most extensively, he concludes that school administration is a moral science that should concern itself with the larger context of "what it means to be human." As a moral science, administration is concerned with the "resolution of moral dilemmas" (p. 24). While there are certainly technical decisions that must be made in school administration, there are also important moral decisions that must be made as well.

William Greenfield (1995) offers a similar but more complex analysis of the practice of school administration. Like Foster (1986), he argues that there are multiple role demands made on educational administrators. In addition, Greenfield asserts that school administration is unique to any other kind of administration because of three contextual conditions of schools: The moral character of the school; the presence of a highly educated, autonomous work force; and the presence of regular and unpredictable threats to stability. He believes "it is the combination of and interaction among these three conditions that
distinguishes the demand environment of school administration from that of administrators in non-school contexts” (p. 62). This unique demand environment results in the need for the school administrator to assume a variety of roles. Greenfield argues further that the five interrelated roles (moral, social/interpersonal, instructional, managerial, and political) are pervasive, constant, at times subtle, and at other times obvious. These multiple roles continually make demands on school administrators.

Two points made by Greenfield (1995) are especially relevant to the present study: His conception of the moral character of schools, and his moral imperative. He asserts that the public school in the U.S. is a uniquely moral institution and bases this argument on the following characteristics: Teaching is highly normative by nature; children are required by law to attend school and therefore have no real choice about who will teach them or what they will be taught; and finally, schools typically try to socialize children to certain values, beliefs and skills (p. 63-64). Schools are like no other institution or organization -- perhaps the metaphor for schools should be schools. In addition, Greenfield points out that teachers have a moral obligation to “contribute positively to the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the children in their charge, and that the school administrator, as a professional educator, is morally obligated to support teachers in their efforts . . . “ (p. 64).

This latter argument is important because school administrators are at times so overwhelmed with other concerns that they overlook the moral obligations to the children in their care that are inherent in their role as principal.
In addition to providing analysis of the moral character of school, Greenfield (1995) describes the moral imperative as "... a concern with the rightness or wrongness of one's actions as an administrator; with what one ought to do as an ethical school administrator; and as one concerned with what is in the best interest of children and teachers" (p. 69). This moral imperative requires school administrators to reflect upon their actions and to concern themselves with the children and teachers they are morally obliged to serve. This is not an easy task, as schools are characterized by competing and conflicting values and standards. Consider the following quotation regarding the complexity of the moral dimension of schools:

It is a particularly complex dimension because of the multiple, competing, and often conflicting standards of goodness that might be applied by teachers, administrators, or others. Because the school is a uniquely moral organization, school administrators have a special responsibility to be deliberately moral in their conduct, that is, to consider the value premises underlying their actions and decisions as administrators (Greenfield, 1995, p. 69).

Although the moral dimension of schools is extremely complex, at the very least the school administrator has a moral obligation to reflect on the values that are at the heart of administrative action and decision making.

The activities of educational administration are conducted in a variety of different contexts. When these contexts are combined, they form a unity that impacts the school life of students, teachers, and all others in the school setting. The fact that educational administration impacts other people is one justification for claiming that it embodies an important moral
component, and it is this moral dimension of educational administration with which we are most concerned.

**The Concept of Morality**

At this juncture a discussion of the concept of morality aimed at developing a shared understanding of what is meant by the terms "moral" and "morality" in this study is presented. The concept of morality is sometimes difficult to pin down. William Frankena (1980) quotes R.B. Perry (1954) to illustrate the difficulty involved in grasping the nature of the moral:

... there is something which goes on in the world to which it is appropriate to give the name of "morality." Nothing is more familiar; nothing is more obscure in its meaning (p. 86).

The words "moral" and "morality" reek of ambiguity but a precise definition is elusive. For example, sometimes one speaks of the morality of an action or a certain kind of conduct in considering the rightness or wrongness of the action. The abortion issue is an example of a moral debate in which people take sides according to individual and personal views on the rightness or wrongness of the act of aborting a fetus. At other times we may view morality as a set of moral rules or beliefs shared by a group or society. Frankena (1980) succinctly states this view:

We are referring to a code or set of moral beliefs rather than to a pattern or quality of conduct or character - to something that ... a society has or subscribes to, rather than something ... it is or does (p. 17).

Following Frankena (1980), a "morality" then is something that a school should "have." Frankena points out, however, that morality as a set of beliefs need not lead us to embrace a radical subjectivism or relativism.
... a morality or moral value system is some kind of action-guide, some kind of standard for conduct, character formation, and life, something by which, together with the facts or what we believe to be the facts about ourselves, our situation, and the world, may determine how we should act or shape ourselves (Frankena, 1980, p.19).

A belief system is a morality, as, it informs action and provides insight into how humans beings should live in relation to one another.

Just as there are multiple belief systems available, there are multiple moral rules from which to choose; however, not all rules governing individual and social behavior can be said to be moral rules. Civil law and codes of etiquette are two examples of systems that offer guidance in making daily life decisions but are not considered moral rules. What distinguishes a moral rule from a nonmoral one is the reasons or justifications upon which the normative system is constructed. For example, a code of etiquette is not considered a moral system because it is based on considerations such as appearance or social status, and these considerations are not moral considerations. To be a moral rather than a nonmoral value system, Frankena (1980) argues that the principles involved must contain explicit mention of other persons. More importantly, a value system must give moral justification for thinking that something is right or wrong, good or bad. These reasons and considerations that lead to moral judgments are as important as the judgments themselves.

The questions are these: What is meant by moral justification? What kinds of considerations or reasons lead to a truly moral judgment? Frankena (1980) believes that evaluative
judgments must be made from a "moral point of view," explained as follows:

... a morality is a normative system in which evaluative judgments of some sort are made, more or less consciously, from a certain point of view, namely from the point of view of a consideration of the effects of actions, motives, traits, etc., on the lives of persons ..., including the lives of others besides the person acting, being judged, or judging .... I propose to call this the moral point of view, because I think this is the point of view we have in mind when we use the expression "from the moral point of view" .... (p. 26)

The moral point of view is concerned with how one's actions affect other people around him or her. In other words, a person has a morality if his or her life decisions are made from a moral point of view, and the decision making process is based on honest reflection about every decision's potential impact on others. This conscious awareness that "no man is an island" and that decisions and actions affect other people is the keystone to saying that one has a morality. It is a reasoned approach to morality, for much thought goes into making moral decisions. In addition, Frankena (1980) asserts that taking the moral point of view also involves making an honest effort to live by any decision made from this point of view, since having a morality includes not only thoughtful decision making but also action that reflects the decisions made. The goal of morality is to live by one's moral code.

To summarize, Frankena (1980) asserts that having a morality involves the following ideas:

- A morality is a set of moral beliefs that a society or group has or to which it subscribes to.
- To be a morality, this set of moral beliefs must inform action (e.g., conduct, character formation, or life).
To be a morality, a value or belief system must give moral justification for thinking that something is right, wrong, good, or bad. Moral justification insists that evaluative judgments be made from a moral point of view. To be moral, the effects of actions on the lives of others must be considered before judgments or decisions can be made.

If it is reasonable to believe that many moralities exist simultaneously, however, how does one determine which morality or belief system is the "right" one? Frankena asserts that a moral value system is the correct one if it is as rationally defensible as is possible from the moral point of view (p. 62). This assertion raises other questions about morality. What is or should be the content of morality? What moral principles or sets of beliefs should it recognize? What is right, wrong, good, or bad? Since normative ethics is concerned with these types of questions, a brief discussion of the variety of thought in normative ethics follows.

Ethics

In the field of ethics a debate continues regarding the superiority of an ethics of virtue versus an ethics of duty. Virtue ethics, which originated in the work of Socrates, Aristotle, Plato, and other ancient philosophers, asks the basic question: "What is the good of man?" The answer to this most basic question, according to Aristotle, is that "[t]he good of man is an activity of the soul in 'conformity with virtue'" (Rachals, 1993, p. 159). It follows that to be in conformity with the virtues one must have a knowledge of the virtues; thus the virtues came to be taken as the "subject matter of ethics" (p. 159), and reason was viewed as the source of practical wisdom. Consequently, the virtuous life was considered to be inseparable from the life of reason.
The coming of Christianity brought a different way of thinking about the good life. Reasoned thought about the virtues came to be distrusted in favor of a belief that righteous and virtuous living meant obedience to the divine commandments and to the theologic virtues of faith, hope, and charity.

After the Renaissance, moral philosophy became secularized again and Divine Law was replaced, not with the Greek virtues, but with the Moral Law. "The Moral Law, which was said to spring from human reason rather than divine fiat, was conceived to be a system of rules specifying which actions are right. Our duty as moral agents, it was said, is to follow its directives" (Rachais, 1993, p. 160). Thus modern moral philosophy asks "what is the right thing to do?" rather than the question posed by the Greeks: "what qualities of character make one a good person?" This led moral philosophy into a different direction in which theories of rightness and obligation began to be developed (such as Ethical Egoism, Utilitarianism, and Social Contract Theory).

The publication in 1958 of Anscombe's article, "Modern Moral Philosophy" fueled the ongoing debate between virtue ethics and duty ethics. Anscombe (1958) argues that modern moral philosophy is misdirected because concepts such as obligation, duty, and rightness, for example, are founded on the notion of a "law" without a lawgiver. She concludes that we should abandon the whole notion of an ethics of duty and return to the Aristotelian approach in which the concept of virtue takes a central place. The debate continues and can be detected in the two main types of ethical theory: teleological and deontological.
In general, teleological ethical theory is concerned with ends or the good rather than with moral obligation. An example of a teleological theory is Utilitarianism, which basically argues that "good" is the greatest happiness of the greatest number. In this case, the concept of good is closely associated with the concept of happiness. Teleological theory typically focuses on consequences of action rather than with moral obligation.

Deontological ethical theory, on the other hand, is concerned with moral obligation or the "right" rather than the "good." Moral obligation involves a necessity of doing a certain act even if it does not lead to the best consequences. Kant's formalism, an example of a deontological theory, is known for The Categorical Imperative which states, "[a]ct only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law" (Kant, 1785). Whereas teleological theory is concerned with ends and consequences, deontological theory is concerned with moral obligation and following rules and laws. The distinction between these two types of theory is often blurred. It is not uncommon to find elements of both the teleological and deontological in one ethical theory.

The above ideas represent theoretical concerns, but there are other practical issues being debated. "In the 1990s we are seeing the beginnings of a new character education movement, one which restores 'good character' to its historical place as the central desirable outcome of the school's moral enterprise" (Lickona, 1993, p. 7). Those involved in this movement argue that we must generate a broad theory of what good character is and then develop it. Lickona contends that schools must help children understand the
core values, adopt or commit to them, and then act upon them in their own lives (p. 9). The "character education" movement provides very specific recommendations concerning how schools should go about the task of assisting students in the formation of good characters. For example, a widely held belief in character education, going all the way back to the thought of Aristotle, is the idea that learning character is largely a matter of "habituation." This notion suggests that an important strategy to develop character is to plan of activities that will provide students the opportunity to practice the virtues of good character. Wynne and Ryan (1992) suggest activities such as older students tutoring younger students, service projects in the community, or ceremonies that transmit moral values to students.

The Content of Moral-Ethical

The brief overview of the variety of ways in which one can think about ethics provides a context within which the problem of determining the content of morality can be considered. How does one determine what the basic principles of morality should be? Morality is constructed when individuals seriously reflect upon the moral meaning of their lives. Once the foundation of one's morality is established, it must be applied on a daily basis. Determining the general beliefs that will serve as the foundation of one's morality requires a great amount of thought and reflection. It is as much a cognitive activity as it is an affective one. A satisfactory personal morality recognizes two basic principles:

1. Principle of Beneficence, which tells us to do good, prevent harm, and not to do evil;

2. Principle of Justice or just distribution, which tells us to treat people as equals (Frankena, 1980, p. 69).
These two principles seem to be ambiguously broad but yet specific enough to provide some boundaries. There is a problem with these principles, however, as one is left having to decide when we shall be beneficent and when we shall be fair. The work of Wilson (1993), represents a significant shift of perspective and provides some assistance in this area.

Wilson (1993) argues that all people have a common moral sense. It is this common moral sense that makes the discussion of moral issues possible. Consider the following explanations:

... [W]e are bound together both by mutual interdependence and a common moral sense. By a moral sense I mean an intuitive or directly felt belief about how one ought to act when one is free to act voluntarily (p. xii).

The fact that you can discuss morality with practically anyone suggests to me that the word "ought" has an intuitively obvious meaning and that people are, in the great majority of instances, equipped with some moral sense (p. xii).

The notion of a common moral sense shared by all suggests that it may be possible to live by the Principle of Beneficence. This is so because theoretically all people share a common but approximate sense of what is good or evil. It would then follow that all school administrators share a basic moral sense regarding what is good for their students or what is not good. Without the development and refinement of a moral point of view, however, it is questionable whether or not Wilson’s notion of a common moral sense is sufficient.

Frankena’s (1980) ideas about the nature of morality can easily be applied to the work of school administrators who
constantly make decisions that affect many people. On a daily basis, a school principal comes in contact with students, parents, bus drivers, teachers, secretaries, janitors, cafeteria workers, salesmen, and others in the general public. Foster (1986) makes this argument:

When administration is considered as a moral science, administrators must deal with moral dilemmas. Each decision carries moral, rather than just technical implications. This realization distinguishes the administrator from the technocrat. Each administrative decision carries with it a restructuring of a human life; this is why administration at its heart is the resolution of moral dilemmas (p. 33).

Foster's claim that administration is a moral science that has an impact on every human life is compelling.

Following Frankena (1980), an administrator has a morality if decisions are made from a moral point of view. This implies that administrators must be aware of the power of their decisions over the lives of others. Much of what Frankena says about morality suggests that it requires a commitment to a process or to a way of thinking about one's life and the lives of others. A similar notion has been applied to leadership by Mitchell and Tucker (1992) who suggest: "Perhaps it is time to recognize that leadership is less a matter of aggressive action than a way of thinking and feeling - about ourselves, about our jobs, and about the nature of the educational process" (p. 30). Mitchell and Tucker make an interesting claim. Perhaps it is time to recognize the principal's job as a way of thinking and feeling - - - about ourselves, about our jobs, and about the nature of schools and the people who spend 180 days a year working and playing in them. To this way of thinking, having a morality is a rational process - - - principals
must begin to reflect on the moral and ask themselves questions like these: What kind of morality do I want for my school? What kind of moral atmosphere do I want to create at my school? What kind of example do I want to set for my teachers, children, and staff members? These are important questions that must be asked.

While many scholars in the field of education have provided useful conceptualizations of educational administration as a moral enterprise (Purpel, 1999; Foster, 1986; Greenfield, 1995), there are others who have offered insight regarding what should be done to improve public education in regard to the moral dimension. Some argue that we must recover lost virtues and put them back into schools (Kilpatrick, W., 1992; MacIntyre, A., 1982; Lickona, T. 1991). For example, Kilpatrick (1993) a proponent of character education, argues that character education is "based on the idea that there are traits of character children ought to know, that they learn these by example, and that once they know them, they need to practice them until they become second nature" (p. 15). Traits of character refer to such virtues as honesty, courage, kindness and compassion. Lickona (1991) argues that schools must take an active role in the moral and ethical development of young people in this country and stresses two great values.

The natural moral law defining the public school's moral agenda can be expressed in terms of two great values: Respect and responsibility. These values constitute the core of a universal, public morality. They have objective, demonstrable worth in that they promote the good of the individual and the good of the whole community. ... Respect and responsibility are the "fourth and fifth R's" that schools not only may but also must teach if they are to develop ethically literate persons who can take their place as responsible citizens of society (p. 43).
Others argue that we should "reclaim educational administration as a caring profession" (Beck, 1994), as proposed in this statement:

Caring - as a foundational ethic - addresses concerns and needs as expressed by many persons; that it, in a sense, transcends ideological boundaries; and that a commitment to care - especially for youngsters in our schools - may be able to provide a common focus around which we can come together and begin to build schools that are genuinely good, happy, healthy, and productive places (p. 3).

This perspective offers as a common focus, a commitment to care for children. This differs from most commonly held views on the focus of education, which typically center on ends such as achievement test scores. A perspective that emphasizes an ethic to care is one that highlights intuition or psychological attitude of the educator more than the overall moral nature of the school.

**Aesthetics**

In addition to suggestions that emphasize virtue and caring, some argue that school leadership should be considered with an aesthetic eye based on the norm of quality (Maxcy, 1995; Duke, 1986; & Eisner, 1985). Duke writes that "rather than riveting attention to what leaders achieve, an aesthetic perspective on leadership would be concerned with the meaning attached to leaders and what they do" (p. 16). An aesthetic perspective challenges one to pay attention to leadership on a much deeper level, suggesting that one take notice of the overall character of the doer and not merely the deeds done. Eisner (1985) argues that the aesthetic is not confined to fine arts and literature, "All things made, whether in art, science, or in practical life, possess form. When well made these forms have aesthetic properties. These aesthetic properties
have the capacity to generate particular qualities of life in the competent percipient” (p. 28).

This thought can be applied to educational administration because a large part of what administrators do is attempt to create for everyone a school life that has positive aesthetic qualities. Eisner (1985) elaborates on this idea as follows, “To form is to confer order. To confer aesthetic order upon our world is to make that world hang together, to fit, to feel right, to put things in balance, to create harmony. Such harmonies are sought in all aspects of life” (p. 29). Eisner points out a difference between order and aesthetic order, arguing that aesthetic order feels right and offers those involved a pleasurable experience. To create a school atmosphere in which aesthetic order, as opposed to order, is achieved is quite an accomplishment. For a school to be run in an orderly fashion guarantees that not everyone can have their demands met. The challenge to create aesthetic order involves the ability to tell certain groups no and do it in a harmonious manner. At the heart of such a challenge is the necessity to treat all persons and all ideas, demands, or feelings with respect.

Schools as Moral Spaces

While morality has previously been discussed as rooted in the person and formed through reason and intuition, there is yet another way to view the moral-ethical realm. This view of the moral is grounded not in reason or intuition but in space. Schools may be taken to be moral spaces in which individuals interact with each other resulting in a complex web of moral decisions and actions.

Jackson, BOOSTROM, and Hansen (1993) provide an interesting perspective on the moral and on the school as a moral space.
Jackson et al., (1993) assert that there is a subtle but complex moral atmosphere that exists in schools of which practitioners are largely unaware. Adults working in schools have a powerful moral influence on students but they are not "always fully aware of the moral potency of their actions" (p. xv). Consider the following excerpts from The Moral Life of Schools (1993) that illustrate this perspective:

To anyone who takes a close look at what goes on in classrooms it becomes quickly evident that our schools do much more than pass along requisite knowledge to the students attending them . . . They also influence the way those students look upon themselves and others. They affect the way learning is valued and sought after and lay the foundations of lifelong habits of thought and action . . . They contribute to the growth of character and, in some instances, they may even be a factor in its corruption . . . Moreover, and here is the important point, they do much of it without the full awareness and thoughtful engagement of those in charge (p. xii).

Jackson et al., (1993) see the problem as a lack of awareness and thoughtful engagement on the part of leaders and have as their purpose to make practitioners more aware of the moral implications of their actions. They believe that when the moral complexity of schools comes into focus, it reveals "how shortsighted it is to think of schools as institutions whose sole function is to equip students with the knowledge and skills they will need to get by in the world" (p. xii). Other writers have drawn a similar connection between reflection, consciousness, and morality. Following an interpretation of Jung's (1954/1960) Answer to Job, Hitchcock (1991) writes "Here he makes it clear that without a 'reflecting consciousness,' morality is out of the question" (p. 74). In other words, a morality cannot exist until one is aware of it and spends time thinking about it. One must be conscious of the moral
significance of his/or her experience in order to make judgments about it. In this regard, Jackson et al., may be correct in claiming that a “heightened moral sensitivity” of teachers and school administrators may be the first step toward the overall improvement of practice.

Key Assumption and Limitations

Assumptions

There are a number of assumptions upon which this study is based:

• Schools are moral institutions.

• Principals contribute to this moral environment.

• A qualitative approach is the most appropriate means of studying this issue.

• Careful attention to previous research during the formulation and design of this study ensures that its findings will add to the body of knowledge of schools as moral institutions.

Limitations

This study is also bound by a number of limitations:

• The abstract nature of the issues being studied make absolute predictions or statements and findings impossible.

• The qualitative research method used will not contribute to the quantitative or experimental body of knowledge.

• The dearth of similar studies in the literature contributes to the exploratory nature of this project.

• Field research can always benefit from more time in observation; boundaries were set in the interest of completing this project in a reasonable amount of time.
Outcomes and Future Research Issues

It is expected that the results of this research project will give us a better understanding of schools as moral institutions. The results of this study will be especially important in that they will bring us closer to understanding exactly what principals contribute to this moral environment. Future research will benefit from a more substantial foundation upon which to base later work.

- It may be fruitful to take each aspect of this research separately (community, gender) to study it in greater detail.
- Although it appears that principals directly affect individual students' morality only minimally, there is evidence that suggests there may be a "trickle down and around effect." This must be explored more fully.

Overview of Chapters

This section outlines the arrangement of chapters for the dissertation as well as presents brief descriptions of each.

Chapter One -- Introduction

This chapter introduces the problem and general research questions that guide the project; discusses the justification for the study, presents key assumptions, limitations, and research issues; and provides an overview of chapters in the dissertation.

Chapter Two -- The Problem

Chapter two addresses the problem in more detail and is divided into discussions of separation of church and state, diversity, and the legacy of positivism. The research problem is addressed in greater detail and more specific research questions are formulated.
Chapter Three - - Review of the Literature

This chapter provides historical reviews of the values regulating scholarship in education as well as the role of women in educational administration. Also reviewed is pertinent literature in the following areas: The feminist critique of traditional educational administrative theory, feminist ethics, gender and school leadership, the concept of community, and the ethic of care.

Chapter Four - - Research Design

This chapter outlines the procedures involved in the collection and coding of the data as well as considerations of importance regarding the analysis of the data. The main sections included in this chapter are: Assumptions, case study design, field procedures, and data analysis.

Chapter Five - - The Principals and Their Schools

The purpose of Chapter Five is to acquaint the reader with each principal and their school. The following information about each principal is included: the reasons that they pursued a principalship, the path that he or she took to become a principal, a description of each school setting and student population, and interview data describing how teachers view their school and principal.

Also included in this chapter is a discussion of observations that were guided by a modified version of Jackson’s et al., (1993) “Taxonomy of Moral Influence”. The following topics are discussed: Principals Views of Morality, Rituals and Ceremonies of a Moral Nature, Visual Displays in the Office with a Moral Content, Spontaneous Interjection of Moral Commentary into Ongoing Activity, School Rules and Regulations, and Summary.
Chapter Six - - The Ethic of Care, the Question of Gender, and Administrative Practice

The question of whether or not the gender of the principal has any relationship to the degree to which a principal practices an ethic of caring or an ethic of justice is explored in Chapter Seven.

Chapter Seven - - The Experience of Community in the Elementary School

This chapter explores the following questions: Do principals promote a sense of community within their schools? If so, how is this revealed?

Chapter Eight - - Conclusions

Chapter Nine will discuss each specific research question and address the theories that this study explored: Jackson’s Taxonomy of Moral Influence, Gilligan’s Ethic of Care and Ethic of Justice, Noddings’ notion of “care,” and Sergiovanni’s call for community.
CHAPTER TWO -- THE PROBLEM

The underlying problem that drives the present study is twofold: There is a disturbing sense that the moral well-being of this country is in a downward spiral, and there is also the feeling that contemporary American culture has lost its ability to make important moral decisions. There is convincing evidence that suggests that we are indeed in moral trouble; for instance we are regularly told by news media, editorials, commentaries, and the like that we have "lost our collective moral compass" (Louden, 1992, p. 4).

The following quotation illustrates the first part of this two sided problem:

... [Society] is faced with a range of... issues and problems such as poverty and growing social injustice, racism and sexism, and other forms of exclusion; the depersonalization of social and political life; the moral and spiritual decay of the culture; and the ecological deterioration of the planet (Shapiro & Purpel, 1993, p. xiii).

Lickona (1993) punctuates this insight when he writes that "increasing numbers of people across the ideological spectrum believe that our society is in deep moral trouble" and argues that the signs of moral decay are everywhere: The breakdown of the family, the deterioration of civility in everyday life, and rampant greed (p. 6). Moreover, trends in behavior of America's youth raise serious questions about the moral development of our young. For example, among leading industrial nations, the United States has the highest murder rate for 15- to 24-year-old males.
This rate is seven times higher than Canada's and forty times higher than Japan's (Lickona, p. 13). There are other equally troubling trends in the behavior of our youth such as stealing, cheating, disrespect for authority, peer cruelty, bigotry, bad language, sexual precocity and abuse, increasing self-centeredness, declining civic responsibility, and self-destructive behavior (pp. 13 - 19).

Coupled with the feeling that society is in moral trouble is the concern that a moral confusion exists within our national community. MacIntyre (1984) argues that the language of morality has passed from a state of order to a state of disorder. In Habits of the Heart (1985), Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton argue that Americans do not command a common moral discourse necessary to think through important moral issues.

For most of us it is easier to think about how to get what we want than to know exactly what we should want (p. 21).

Bellah et al., (1985) found that individuals seem to have difficulty articulating issues such as the nature of success, the meaning of freedom, and the requirements of justice. They believe that these sorts of difficulties are "created by limitations in the common tradition of moral discourse they - and we - share" (p. 21). Consequently, we have a problem delineating the kinds of moral problems that we face as a society. Louden (1992) concurs and describes the problem as follows: "Current academic as well as
popular discourse reveals a great deal of talk about morality but little reflection concerning what it is we are talking about when we profess to be talking about morality" (p. 4). Clearly, the subject of morals, ethics, and values is one that can be characterized by confusion. While Bellah et al., (1985) are concerned with the language of morality, Kreeft (1992) argues that contemporary society has no substantive knowledge about morality.

But though we are not weaker in morality, we are weaker in the knowledge of morality. We are stronger in the knowledge of nature, but weaker in the knowledge of goodness. We know more about what is less than ourselves but less about what is more than ourselves (p. 25).

A condition of moral illiteracy seems to prevail as many individuals lack the most basic moral knowledge necessary to discuss important moral issues of the day. At a time when there are signs of moral decay everywhere, such a situation only adds insult to injury. We are left feeling helpless. Schools as institutions of society are profoundly impacted by this double-edged problem.

The American public educational system must function within the context of the larger society. In doing so, it faces the same complex problems as that of society; therefore, many of our social problems are also problems of our educational system. Hill and Ragland (1995) describe the situation quite accurately in the following passage.

Schools and schooling have taken on the ills of our entire society. If there is a problem, education is expected to fix it. After years of responsibility solely for academic needs, schools now handle health,
welfare, and family responsibilities. If no one in the home will teach or model responsibility and values, schools assume the job. If no one is available to baby-sit, the schools open from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. . . . If the community is strangled in violence, the school strives to provide a safe haven and a center for mediation. The school as a microcosm of the community is shouldering the community’s problems in ever changing patterns (p. 6).

The effects of society’s problems are dramatically changing the environment of schools. In terms of violence in schools, the following statistics are frightening:

An estimated 525,000 attacks, shakedowns, and robberies occur in public high schools each month. Each year nearly three million crimes are committed on or near school property - 16,000 per school day. About 135,000 students carry guns to school daily; one fifth of all students report carrying a weapon of some type. Twenty-one percent of all secondary school students avoid using the rest rooms out of fear of being harmed or intimidated (Kilpatrick, 1992, p. 14).

Violence is not the only social problem that has had an impact on schools. The decline of the family is another example of a social trend that has had serious implications for schools. Schools are asked to become the family living room and administrators and teachers, surrogate fathers and mothers.

Consider the following:

Across the nation, principals report a dramatic rise in the aggressive, acting-out behavior characteristic of children, especially boys, who are living in single-parent families. Moreover, teachers find that many children are so upset and preoccupied by the explosive drama of their own family lives that they are unable to concentrate on such mundane matters as multiplication (Whitehead, 1993, p. 47-84).

Family disintegration impacts schools in at least two ways:

Schools, now more than ever, feel a need to teach the values that children were previously taught at home; and schools, in order to conduct teaching and learning, “must become caring moral
communities that help children from unhappy homes focus on their work, control their anger, feel cared about, and become responsible students" (Lickona, 1993, p. 8). This situation suggests that in order for teaching and learning to happen, schools must change their environments and perhaps their methods as well.

As moral uncertainty in this country begins to affect people directly and personally (violence in schools, for example), public reaction becomes urgent and the educational system is looked to for answers. "If there is a problem, education is expected to fix it" (Hill and Ragland, 1995, p. 6). The appropriate role that public education should assume in teaching morality and values has been debated throughout history.

Society has repeatedly turned to the institution of the school and school leadership to play an instructive role in the moral development of children and hence the moral uplift of the nation. In curriculum this area has been referred to as moral education, character education, or values education. "Character education is as old as education itself. Down through history, education has had two great goals: To help people become smart and to help them become good" (Lickona, 1993, p. 6). The emphasis placed on moral education as well as the form and content of the curriculum have varied throughout the history of education, yet the moral has always been a situated discourse. Schools have always connoted morality. For example, during the 1920s and 1930s,
"virtually every school in America was responding in some way to the educational goal of developing character" (Leming, 1993, p. 63). By 1950, however, character education had all but disappeared; by 1966, a new period of interest began as values clarification became the dominant approach used in the moral education of students across America. Most recently, curricula dealing with character-related student behavior have taken the form of sex and/or drug education programs. A new angle on character education has been introduced that concerns the relationship between school atmosphere and student behavior. Examples of these types of programs are cooperative learning strategies, the just community approach, and community service programs (Leming, 1993). The rationale behind these types of programs is the idea of "habituation" that suggests if schools want children to be caring and compassionate, then activities must be planned that give them the opportunity to practice and experience being caring and compassionate.

While the focus and methods of moral education programs have varied, schools have always been viewed as symbolic moral spaces. It is typically assumed that "schools and classrooms are places where one goes to receive help, to be made more knowledgeable and more skillful. Schools and classrooms are designed to be beneficial settings. This implies that those people in charge care about the welfare of those they serve and only ask them to do things that are
expected to do them good" (Jackson et al., p. 25). The assumption that schools are worthwhile places in which only "good" is done further strengthens the claim that schools should be thought of as moral spaces.

The 1990s appears to be another time in history that direct moral education has become an important issue to society. Leming (1993) argues that "[w]ith striking similarity to the 1920s, the late 1980s and early 1990s have been a time of feverish activity with regard to character education" (p. 67). Problems in society have always spawned public outcry for schools to help and although considerable controversy still surrounds the suggestion that schools teach morality, there is a steadily growing conviction that:

Schools cannot be ethical bystanders at a time when our society is in deep moral trouble. Rather, schools must do what they can to contribute to the character of the young and the moral health of the nation (p. 5).

The interrelatedness of school and society make it necessary that schools be responsive to the needs of society. Dewey (1909) wrote "The moral responsibility of the school, and of those who conduct it, is to society" (p. 7). This statement may be as true in 1909 as it is now, as public education moves into the twenty-first century. Moreover, as schools begin to shoulder the problems of society by accepting a new set of responsibilities, the kind of leadership needed in schools is dramatically changed.

Circumstances surrounding leadership today demand that we shed stereotypical images and seek leaders who are .
skilled at pulling together resources, whether financial or human (Hill and Ragland, 1995, p. 6).

Public education has historically avoided the moral issue by claiming a position of value neutrality; however, it is impossible to hide behind such a position in a postmodern world. Nevertheless, there are several factors that have contributed to the neutral position that schools have assumed in regard to morals and ethics: Separation of church and state, the diverse nature of our nation, and the legacy of the positivist philosophical tradition in the social sciences. A brief discussion of these issues follows.

The Separation of Church and State

The appropriate role of religion in public and political life has been debated since before the founding of the United States. According to Kramnick and Moore (1996), two distinct traditions exist: The “party of the godless Constitution and of godless politics and the party of religious correctness” (p. 12). The “godless” position seeks to:

. . . [S]eparate the operations of government from any claim that human beings can know and follow divine direction in reading policy decisions. They did this despite their enormous respect for religion, their faith in divinely endowed human rights, and their belief that democracy benefited from a moral citizenry who believed in God (Kramnick & Moore, 1996, p. 12).

It wasn’t that the founding fathers had no respect for religion — they were trying to protect religion as well as government as is indicated in the following passage:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The creation of a godless constitution was not an act of irreverence. Far from it. It was an act of confidence in religion. It intended to let religion do what it did best, to preserve the civil morality necessary to democracy, without laying upon it the burdens of being tied to the fortunes of this or that political faction (p. 24).

Their point is well taken. Kramnick and Moore (1996) write that we should be very grateful to the drafters of our constitution for their wisdom and forethought.

The opposition, "the party of religious correctness," argues fervently that:

. . . [T]he United States was established as a Christian nation by Christian people, with the Christian religion assigned a central place in guiding the nation's destiny (Kramnick & Moore, 1996, p. 13).

Currently, this position has a great deal of support from groups such as the Christian Coalition. The following excerpts taken from The Godless Constitution (1996) provide good examples of the kind of rhetoric commonly heard among members and leaders of the "party of religious correctness:"

Ralph Reed proclaimed, before political realities modified his tone, that "what Christians have got to do is to take back this country" and "make it a country once again governed by Christians" (Kramnick and Moore, 1996, p. 22).

Pat Robertson uses the same imagery of return. "If Christian people work together," he urges, "they can succeed during this decade in winning back control of the institutions that have been taken from them over the past 70 years" (p. 22).

Each side of this debate makes a strong case for their respective beliefs. The inherent danger lies in the potential...
misinterpretation of either position. For example, although Kramnick and Moore (1996) believe passionately that the Constitution of the United States was purposely designed to be a godless document (and should be a godless document), they recognize that religion is important in American life.

There is a difference between reinforcing Jefferson's wall of separation between church and state and seeking to silence any expression of religious values in public life (p. 14).

They warn against overzealousness in the interpretation of the famous "wall." It is this notion of overzealousness that can interfere with an appropriate interpretation of the Separation of Church and State doctrine. Any overzealous interpretation of this doctrine could lead people to believe that it is intended to silence religion in our culture - which it is not.

Schools have inevitably found themselves in the middle of this ongoing debate between those who favor "godless politics" and those who further the cause of "religious correctness." The fifty years between the 1920s and the 1970s are characterized by persistent controversies over the private freedom of parents to guide and direct the education of their children and the authority of the state to protect the public good. This debate centered around two issues: The use of public funds to aid religious schools, and the promotion of religious instruction within the public school system. Two opposing arguments were put forth with
respect to the question of religious instruction within public schools. On the one hand, religious groups argued that it was appropriate public policy to promote religious instruction because religion was the foundation of public morality and good government. On the other hand, opponents appealed to the First Amendment ("Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion . . . "). These arguments fell right along the lines drawn by Kramnick and Moore (1996). The funding issue was argued in a similar fashion.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the generally agreed upon interpretation of the "separation of church and state" principle was that "the best interests of the nation and of religion alike would be served if public funds were not granted to religious schools" (Butts, 1978, p. 287), and "sectarian religious instruction should not be promoted by the public schools if freedom of religious conscience and the separation of the church and state were to be preserved" (p. 295). This is precisely the position taken by the architects of the United States Constitution.

However, after World War Two the general public began to accuse schools of being "godless." In fact, "... it was charged that the neglect of religion had promoted not only indifference to religion but also active irreligion, both of which contributed to a decline of moral and spiritual values, which in turn led to positive juvenile delinquency" (Butts, 1978 p. 295).
Throughout the 1940s efforts were made to overcome the principle that public schools should be secular if they were to protect the public freedom. Some factions argued for released-time plans for religious instruction outside of public schools, while others argued that nonsectarian prayers should be acceptable in the public school. From the mid-1960s on, the courts struck down most attempts to inject religious instruction into the public schools. Consequently, most organized efforts gave up this battle and redirected themselves toward the goal of securing public funds for religious schools.

During the 1950s and 1960s almost "every conceivable variation of practice and of legal effort was dreamed up in order to try to circumvent the basic principle" and secure public aid for private and religious schools (Butts, 1978, p. 291). The courts consistently rejected the constitutionality of using tax dollars for direct aid to private and religious schools at the elementary level.

By the beginning of the 1970s the barometers of public opinion indicated that more and more of the population was turning again to religion. The Gallup poll saw 1976 as the start of a new religious revival in which religious schools by fundamentalist Protestant sects were rapidly multiplying and Catholic parochial schools were taking on a new burst of life (Butts, 1978, p. 298).

These private/religious systems have continually fought to
maintain, at the very least, assistance and services that were already in place.

Generally speaking, if permitted by state constitutions, public schools may provide transportation to religious schools as well as books and diagnostic services (if conducted on a religiously neutral site), and they may reimburse religious schools for administering and scoring state-required tests in secular subjects. Public schools, however, may not furnish support or instructional materials and equipment (other than books) to religious schools, provide religious instruction on school grounds; require school prayer, Bible reading, or children to salute the flag, or require that all students attend public schools (Webb and Sherman, 1989, p. 147).

Diversity

The United States is comprised of an increasingly diverse population. "The cultural landscapes of our country's major urban centers are now represented by a multiracial and multicultural mix of ethnicities, religions, cultures, and languages, the result of mass migrations from the developing world into the United States" (De La Torre, 1996, p. 316). Diversity has always been a part of our history. It has sparked great debates in education regarding exactly which values should be taught within the multicultural curriculum. De La Torre (1996) argues that this debate centers on two perspectives:
Conservatives such as Allan Bloom (1987), Diane Ravitch (1990), and Pat Buchanan (1989) argue that students should be presented with a multicultural curriculum teaching them the history, values, and virtues of what is seen as the common cultural heritage of the United States. Cultural assimilation is the major goal of education from this perspective, which centers on values, virtues, history, and institutions of Euro-Americans.

Conversely, progressive educators such as James Banks (1991), Christine Sleeter (1991), and Henry Giroux (1994) support a multiculturalism that places the students' distinct cultural and language differences at the center and not at the margins of the schools' curriculum. This perspective consists of defining the American experience by incorporating multiple cultural traditions . . . instead of using a single Euro-American cultural tradition. (p. 315).

This debate has been another factor which has contributed to the tendency of public schools to shy away from any discussion of values. One typical comment heard is: Whose values? This problem will have to be overcome as the United States becomes more and more diverse.

The Legacy of Positivism

The impact of positivism on educational theory and practice cannot be overstated. Logical empiricism, grounded in logical positivism, provided the bases for "separating fact from value and observation from theory, for employing the methodological constraint of operational definitions, and for seeing administration theory as a classical hypothetico-deductive structure with laws at the top and facts at the bottom" (Evers & Lakomski, 1991, p. 3). Consequently, logical positivism and its epistemological beliefs constrained administrative theorizing for many years. One major consequence of positivism has been the lack
of meaningful discussion about morals and ethics because of the positivistic claim that these concepts cannot be proven. Consider the following passage by Wilson (1993):

... . . . [O]ur reluctance to speak of morality and our suspicion, nurtured by our best minds, that we cannot "prove" our moral principles has amputated our public discourse at the knees. We have cut off the legs on which any serious discussion of marriage, schools, or mass entertainment must stand (p. xi).

Likewise, research and thought regarding the moral dimension of educational administration was almost nonexistent until the early 1980s when ideas of post positivism, postmodernism, and poststructuralism began to take hold within the field (Maxcy, 1994). Until this time, the consensus of all of our "best minds" was that values could not be proven and were therefore unscientific or purely emotional concepts.

It has been shown that several factors such as the separation of church and state doctrine, cultural diversity, and the legacy of positivism have indeed influenced the stance that public schools have taken in regard to morals and values in America. It is, in many ways, understandable that the position of neutrality was adopted by the public school system and generally accepted by the public. Any attempt to maintain such a position in a postmodern, poststructuralist world has thus far been doomed.

The Implicit Value Structure of Schools

Although schools have typically been considered neutral in regard to most value-laden issues, schools have an undeniable
value structure that influences all educational practices. Conley (1993) argues that "[a]lthough schools profess to attempt neutrality on issues of values and morals, all schools possess implicit value and moral structures" (p. 43). Educational practices are structured by choices that cannot be made without direction from a set of values, thus, all educational practices are imbued with value issues.

Educational practices result from choices. Choices cannot be made without reference to a value, set of values, criteria(on), or interests. Values are sedimented, . . . in the constitutive rules of practice. To the extent that values and interests are more or less integrated, they can be thought of, roughly, as ideology. Ideologies have both content and function (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 4).

The ideology of testing illustrates how values are hidden within the rules that structure practice. Cherryholmes (1988) argues that this ideology includes beliefs about the following:

(1) the importance of testing and evaluation, (2) how testing should be carried out, (3) the content of tests, and, last on this list but certainly not least in importance, (4) what test results mean (p. 4).

Embedded within each of these beliefs are conflicting values. For example, in regard to the meaning given to test results, Purpel’s (1989) analysis of the conflict between worth and achievement is pertinent:

This particular value configuration [Worth/Achievement] represents, I believe, the core of our moral crisis and anguish, for it reflects a glaring contradiction between our most deeply felt moral conviction - that which affirms the essential dignity of each person - and our most widespread social policy - that which demands that each person must achieve (i.e., that each of us has to earn our dignity) (p. 34).
Educational practice is not and never can be value neutral. Purpel (1989) reveals a conflict of values embedded within the practice of educational testing that gets right to the heart and soul of what it means to be human. This is interesting because educational testing is assumed to be a legitimate and absolutely necessary practice in public education. Academic excellence for global economic domination has become one of the most commonly held aims of American education, creating a system that must require high academic achievement.

In this chapter we have seen that the problems of society are the problems of schools. Unfortunately, there seems to be uncertainty about the ability of Americans to sort out the moral complexities that underlie most social problems. Therefore, the subject of morals, morality, and ethics is of crucial importance.

The present study is built upon the following beliefs:

- Social problems in America have once again brought reflection of the moral and ethical responsibility of schools to the center of a national discussion. Schools are facing a whole new set of challenges. School leadership must change to meet these challenges.

- Schools as well as school leadership can no longer claim to be value-neutral and get away with such a claim. They must embrace their inherent moral nature.

- Several factors have impeded efforts to deal with the moral and ethical dimension of public education. These problems must be overcome.
Put quite simply, the rationale and justification for the present research project is that morality is important. Louden (1992) puts it quite nicely:

Morality is supremely important not because it "stands above" everything else but because it is literally underneath, as well as continually embedded in, all human cognitive efforts (p. 6).

The next section outlines the development of the three specific issues this study investigates.

The Research Problem

The research problem emerged from three sets of personal experiences: a previous career as an elementary school teacher, school visits as a parent, and careful readings of the research literature. It was Jackson et al., (1993) who set out to "investigate the ways in which moral considerations permeate the everyday life of schools and classrooms" (p. xiv); this idea stimulated my own interest. While the Jackson study was done exclusively with classroom teachers, I wondered if the same conclusions would be drawn following observation of principals doing their work.

Since it is exploratory in nature, this dissertation rests on no single formal definition of morality. However, a common sense understanding that moral has to do with desirable discourse/practice plus personal qualities was the basis of this study. Like Jackson et al., (1993), I sought to go into the field
looking for the "moral." The following passage from Jackson et al., illustrates the predicament I felt at the beginning of this study:

Imagine a trio of researchers setting out to visit a school or a set of classrooms scattered over a number of different schools with the express purpose of studying the moral significance of what is going on there. Where would they begin? What would they look for? That was the situation we faced at the beginning of our work. Prior to starting our observations we had explicitly declared ourselves to be interested in anything at all that might have the remotest chance of leaving a moral mark of some kind on those present. . . . That sounded like a reasonably clear statement of purpose to us . . . Yet despite the straightforwardness and all-inclusiveness of our objective, it left us unprepared for what we might find when we got there. More importantly, it did not provide a clue as to how we should go about looking for what we were interested in seeing. In the absence of such guidelines, all each of us could do when he settled down at the rear of the room on the first day of his visits to one of the eighteen participating classrooms was to keep his notebook handy, his pencil poised, and his eyes and ears open, and hope for the best. (p. 1)

This description is testimony to the difficulties inherent in studying the subtle world that embodies the moral space of schools. Jackson et al., (1993) visited classrooms with a general notion of the meaning of "moral" and, following many hours of observation, were able to develop what they refer to as a "taxonomy of moral influence within the classroom."

This taxonomy is composed of two distinct sets of categories: Moral Instruction and Moral Practice. The first set consists of activities that are "avowedly moral," making them easy to observe. Set two, on the other hand, is composed of activities that "embody the moral" and are extremely difficult to bring into focus and are considered the more important set "with respect to
their possible moral impact on students." They help us see how morals might be "caught, not taught," as the old adage says (p. 11). A discussion of the main areas touched by this taxonomy will now be presented. These areas are: Moral atmosphere, moral development, and moral community.

**Moral Atmosphere**

The significance of the creation of this taxonomy is that, after hours of observation, researchers were able to isolate certain patterns of activity that were considered morally significant to those present in the classrooms. As a doctoral student pursuing a degree in educational administration, I had a special curiosity about the role of the principal and the "moral atmosphere" of the school. Bennis and Nanus (1985) have made this claim: "The leader is responsible for the set of ethics or norms that govern the behavior of people in the organization. Leaders set the moral tone" (p. 186). Is this true? Does some kind of moral mood, tone, or atmosphere filter out and around from the leader of the school? Does the principal have anything to do with the moral atmosphere of the school? Since the work of Jackson and his colleagues had been done exclusively in classrooms with the focus on teachers, it seemed possible that a study conducted with the principal as the primary unit of study might add something to their findings. Thus, this study explores the relationship between the
moral discourse/practice of principals at work and the moral atmosphere of their school.

**Moral Development**

Coupled with an interest in the general moral atmosphere of the elementary school was an interest in the work of Noddings (1992), Beck (1992), and Gilligan (1982/1993). In the groundbreaking book, *In a Different Voice* (1982/1993), Gilligan challenges traditional thought about the moral development of boys and girls. At issue with Gilligan are the conclusions of empirical studies based on Kohlberg’s stages of moral development that suggest that girls are less morally advanced than boys. She argues that girls are no less morally advanced than boys but that men and women construct the moral problem differently. This results in dual modes of moral development: One that is based on an ethic of justice and the other on the ethic of care. Typically the justice/fairness ethic is associated with a male morality while the care ethic is associated with a female morality. Gilligan explains the differences between a conception of morality as fairness and a conception of morality as care as follows:

.. [I]n this conception [care ethic], the moral problem arises from conflicting responsibilities rather than from competing rights and requires for its resolution a mode of thinking that is contextual and narrative rather than formal and abstract. This conception of morality as concerned with the activity of care centers moral development around the understanding of responsibility and relationships, just as the conception of morality as fairness ties moral development to the understanding of rights and rules (1982/1993, p. 19).
Gilligan's work essentially opened up a new line of inquiry as scholars began to consider more fully the notion of an ethic of care. Noddings (1992) and Beck (1992) have both done extensive work in this area. Noddings argues that we must reconceptualize the fundamental purpose of education to one that is grounded in human life. She argues further that it is a mistake to think that the sole purpose of schools is intellectual development. She writes:

At the present time, it is obvious that our main purpose is not the moral one of producing caring people, but, instead, a relentless - and, as it turns out, hapless - drive for academic adequacy. I am certainly not going to argue for academic inadequacy, but I will try to persuade readers that a reordering of priorities is essential. All children must learn to care for other human beings, and all must find an ultimate concern in some center of care (1992, p. xii).

The idea that the moral development of men and women may lead to a second focus that examines the question: Is there a difference between the moral behaviors of male principals and female principals? Do they approach moral problems in distinctly different ways? Is the moral problem constructed differently? Can Gilligan's claims be observed in the talk and behavior of elementary school principals at work? Are female principals more caring than their male counterparts? Are male principals more justice oriented than female principals? Questions of this nature constitute a second area to be explored within this study.
Moral Community

The third and final area of concern regards the notion of community. Sergiovanni, in *Building Community in Schools* (1994), argues that the metaphor for schools should be changed from "organization" to "community." He believes that the loss of community in our schools and in society itself is a major problem facing educators today. "If we want to rewrite the script to enable good schools to flourish, we need to rebuild community. Community building must become the heart of any school improvement effort" (p. xi).

Likewise, Conley (1993) argues that we must examine the degree to which our schools are genuine and healthy communities for young people, warning that what we discover may not be pleasant. He suggests that we restore schools to a human scale. The question of whether or not schools were ever true communities, as implied by Conley and Sergiovanni, is a question that will not be undertaken in the present study. However, it is argued that schools are based on structural designs that were adopted in a time when students were expected to have their needs for affiliation fulfilled primarily through other institutions in the community (e.g., extended family, church, and other social groups). These institutions no longer seem to meet these needs of young people; therefore, the notion of community building within schools may be more of a necessity than an ideal.
The contention made by Beck (1994) that we reclaim educational administration as a caring profession involves the notion that community building in schools is crucial to their success. This is so because Beck (1994) argues that the context of caring is community. There is a direct link between the ethic of care and community. Caring is dependent on a special kind of relationship between persons that can only be found in environments that stress a sense of community (p. 11).

In regard to the notion of community, there have been assertions in the feminist literature that suggest that the female notion of ethics may be more suited for the task of community building than the notion of male ethics. Allison Jaggar (1991) has written that one consequence of Gilligan's work is:

her claims have encouraged the revival of neo-Aristotelian approaches to ethics - approaches that seek to broaden the Enlightenment tradition's perceived focus in individuality, impartiality, and reason to include an appreciation of the moral significance of community, particularity, and emotion (1991, p. 83).

Individuality, impartiality, and reason are associated with a male notion of ethics while community, particularity, and emotion are associated more strongly with a female ethic. Does this necessarily imply that a female principal would be more able to understand the importance of community and therefore be more able to build community?

Agnes Heller (1980) has made similar arguments about the female experience and the notion of community noting that "within
the framework of their small world, women had to learn how to
manage a community. It was a painstaking but peaceful occupation
which required enormous tact, a great ability to smooth away
conflicts, as well as devotion and sympathy" (p. 210). Raising
small children and keeping the peace throughout perpetual sibling
rivalries would theoretically lead the caregiver to learn how to
manage communities. Heller argues that traditionally this
caregiver has been the mother, so women have become good at
managing communities. Whether right or wrong, Jaggar’s and Heller’s
suggestions are interesting and worthy of investigation.

Therefore, the third focus of this study concerns the sense
of community within schools and leads to the question: Do female
principal foster a community spirit within their schools that is
different than that of male principals? Are female principal
better at managing communities within schools than male principals?
Can differences be observed? If so, what is the nature of these
differences? These questions will be investigated within this
study.

Summary

This chapter elaborated the research problem and articulated
three areas in which the study will focus: Moral atmosphere,
moral development, and moral community. Chapter Three, the Review
of the Literature, grounds this study in relevant work.
CHAPTER THREE — REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will begin with a historical review of the values regulating scholarship in educational administration followed by a brief history of the role of women in education. A feminist critique of traditional thought in educational administration will then be presented to show how the female experience has been largely left out of the literature. Following this presentation of developments within the field will be a review of the literature on the following topics that are relevant to the present study: Feminist ethics, gender and school leadership, the concept of community, and the ethic of care.

The Study of Educational Administration: A Brief History

There have been numerous accounts written of the development of knowledge on the leadership of schools (e.g., Callahan, 1962; Cuban, 1988; Culbertson, 1988; Griffiths, 1988; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). One way to organize the development of the field is around historic periods: Scientific Management, The Human Relations Era, The Theory Movement, and 1970s . . .To the Present (Bolman & Heller, 1995).

**Scientific Management**

At the turn of the century a major event occurred which led to significant changes in the American way of life: The birth of the modern industrial corporation (Bolman & Heller, 1995). As corporations such as Sears Roebuck, duPont, and H.J. Heinz began to achieve unprecedented levels of efficiency, the
pursuit of maximum efficiency became an American obsession that eventually found its way into educational thought. Men like John Franklin Bobbitt, Elwood Cubberley, and George Strayer began to preach the value of scientific management to public education. These influential scholars believed that running an educational system was much like running a business organization and that the principles of scientific management should be applied to public schools. The goal was efficiency. (Callahan, 1962)

Scientific management was based on a set of principles designed to find the best way to do a job, thus improving workplace efficiency. The application of scientific management principles to education resulted in practices still present in schools today such as standardized tests, Carnegie units, bells and schedules, and tracked curricula. Although scientific management was and continues to be extremely influential in education, by the 1930s researchers began to question the formalism of scientific management. (Foster, 1986)

The Human Relations Era

The human relations movement refers to a theoretical perspective generated by a series of research projects conducted by the Western Electric Company. The patterns of social relations in a work setting were found to be of major importance to the success of the organization. As a result of this study, the idea of informal group structures and informal leadership structures entered the social sciences. The significance of this era was that its theory provided a necessary antithesis to the
formalism of Taylorism by pointing out the importance of the human factor in organizations. (Foster, 1986, p. 41)

A second major conceptual development occurred during this period with the publication of Barnard's *Functions of the Executive* (1938). This book was, at the time, the most comprehensive effort in English to develop a theory of organizations (Bolman & Heller, 1995). Barnard (1938) argued that organizations were cooperative systems held together by the shared goals of the participants in the enterprise. "Barnard had the foresight to examine the total organization as a complex system made up of interdependent parts (Foster, 1986, p. 42)."
The work of Barnard can be considered part of the early evolution of the field of educational administration toward the theory movement. In a desperate attempt to bring rigor, respect, and identity to the field, scholars turned to the social sciences for assistance. The search became what is typically referred to as "the Theory Movement."

**The Theory Movement**

Within the profession of educational administration, scholars began to fear that research in the field was in trouble because it was atheoretical, nonrigorous, noncumulative, and too focused on solving local problems instead of building general principles (Bolman & Heller, 1995, p. 327). At roughly the same time Herbert Simon wrote the classic, *Administrative Behavior* (1957), in which he presented a scientific theory of administration. This book had a tremendous impact on scholarship in educational administration. It was published at a time when
desire within the field to develop a scientific theory of educational administration was very strong. The feeling within the field is expressed in the following quotation:

... if the study of administration is to become scientific, administration must assume the characteristics of a science. Inquiry in administration must come to be characterized by objectivity, reliability, operational definitions, coherence or systematic structure, and comprehensiveness. (Griffiths, 1959, p. 45)

Researchers and scholars in the field began to study educational administration 'scientifically,' modeling their research methods after those utilized in the social sciences. Thought in educational administration was profoundly changed. Theories were mindlessly borrowed from other disciplines resulting in a failure to develop theories grounded in schooling realities. (Riffel, 1978) The result was a total domination of the structural functionalism paradigm over all others in educational research.

According to Evers & Lakomski (1991), theorizing in educational administration has been constrained by the exclusive use of structural functionalism in at least three ways:

1. Theory has been broadly structured into lawlike generalizations and testable consequences.
2. A premium has been placed on operational definitions. This requirement of acceptability has made it difficult to study concepts that are hard to define operationally such as moral or value.
3. Fact has been separated from value, eschewing values from administrative theory altogether. (p. 73)

The third constraint is of particular relevance to this study. The distinction between facts and values and subsequent removal
of values from the study of educational administration has stunted the growth of the field for a very long time.

1970s . . . To The Present

In 1974, a revolution occurred in the field when Thomas Greenfield launched a major assault on the dominant philosophical and methodological assumptions guiding theory and research in educational administration (Evers & Lakomski, 1991, p. 76). This event has been characterized as "a major turning point, perhaps the death knell of the theory movement" (Bolman & Heller, 1995, p. 329). Greenfield's critique was among the first to challenge the exclusive use of traditional scientific methods in educational administration.

Greenfield's major propositions about organization and administration are summarized as follows:

- Organizations are socially constructed entities. They are not objects "out there" to be dissected and studied as is done in other sciences. Greenfield's subjective view ran counter to the prevailing objectivity of the theory movement.

- We live in separate realities. The organization, then, is perceived in different ways by different individuals.

- To fully understand an organization, we must understand what motivates the individuals who create the organization.

- An attempt must be made to understand individual values.

Greenfield (1986) brought the issue of values front and center. Up until his assault on the field, the fact/value distinction and exclusion of value considerations had gone unchallenged. However, he argued that values cannot be ignored or partitioned
out of administrative theory by way of dichotomy. The last proposition is particularly pertinent to the present study. A useful analysis is provided by Bolman & Heller (1995):

Greenfield challenged the idea that neither leadership nor research on leadership could be value free. He argued that every theory hinges on biases and assumptions of one sort or another. By reifying the school bureaucracy and insisting on rationalistic management, said Greenfield, the movement denied that administrators make moral choices. It encouraged them to act as cogs within a machine, removing them from responsibility for the consequences of their actions. It tried to sanitize the difficult, human, willful nature of decision making, as though it were simply a matter of pulling strings and levers. (p. 329)

Greenfield’s propositions turned traditional thought in educational administration upside down. While researchers and scholars in the field busied themselves ruminating over Greenfield’s critique, other innovative ideas were being put forth in the study of educational administration.

In the 1970s a group of theorists offered a unique and provocative perspective on school organization. For instance, the rationality of school organization was put into question by arguing that cultural rather than functionalist imperatives actually dominated the school organization (Meyer, Scott, & Deal, 1981). Likewise, traditional thinking about decision making was also challenged, as universities were described as “organized anarchies” and the metaphor of “garbage can” was used to describe how decisions were actually made (Cohen & March, 1974). Weick (1976) argued that educational organizations are “loosely coupled” systems rather than the notion held so dear that schools are rational, efficient, and tidy structures. These
ideas were considered radical, for they were presented at a time when the field was dominated by structural functionalist thinking.

These new ideas reflected elements of two different lines of attack on the theory movement: The qualitative/pragmatic position and the constructivist/critical position (Bolman & Heller, 1995). The qualitative/pragmatic position argued that the complexity of the world of educational administration is lost by research efforts that focus exclusively on the quantitative measurement of narrowly focused variables. As a result, research methodology in educational administration began to be examined and qualitative research methods were beginning to be considered by some as a legitimate research paradigm.

The second position, the constructivist/critical strand, insisted that "the world of human affairs, unlike the natural world, is not an objective world that waits passively to be understood but a socially constructed one that is inevitably shaped by the values and assumptions that we bring to it" (Bolman & Heller, 1995, p. 331). Constructivists deny that the world of human affairs is an objective world and critical theorists challenge the claim that theory can ever be objective. They argued that theory reflects the hidden values of the person who constructed the argument. This condition makes it necessary to deconstruct the text to reveal what the author may be trying to hide. Both positions have done much to bring into focus the complexities of the human world.
Most recently, postmodern ideas have begun to appear in the educational administration literature. Postmodernists offer a new view of schooling. Instead of considering schooling to be an object in need of management, they view it as a social text to be engaged in dialogue. Johnston (1994) describes the postmodern approach to schooling as social text in the following quotation:

The view of schools as text reflects a view of an administrator oriented toward facilitating conditions under which transformative educational discourse and practices may emerge; a view in which social order/text is continually written and revised by those who live that order/text. (p. 127)

One striking feature of postmodernism is the acceptance and even encouragement of a kind of administration and schooling that is fluid, dynamic, and transformative as opposed to a kind of administration that is in search of The Grand Theory.

Ways of thinking about educational administration have undoubtedly come a long way since it was once believed that there existed one most efficient way to perform each and every task. Clearly, educational administration is going through a period of "theoretical chaos" (Bolman & Heller, 1995, p. 333). In addition to the "postmodern arena" (Bolman & Heller) of "paradigm diversity" (Griffiths, 1988) already described, the feminist movement has begun a critique of research in educational settings which has generated a great deal of introspection within the field.
Women in Educational Administration

Although women predominate as teachers in the United States public school systems, they are a distinct minority in administrative positions. In the 1981-82 school year, women constituted only 25% of all positions (Schmuck, 1987). The history of women in education reveals that "women's presence in school administration is increasing at an evolutionary pace" and that "a look at the number of women in school administration since 1905 uncovers a consistent male dominance in all positions except in the early days of the elementary school principalship" (Shakeshaft, 1989, p. 21). This situation is the result of an interesting history of cultural and social thought concerning men and women.

In Colonial America, the teaching of basic skills in reading, writing and arithmetic was carried out by women either in their homes or in dame schools. Both girls and boys attended these dame schools. However, the next level of education, the grammar school, was intended primarily for boys who were taught by male schoolmasters.

Although there were some isolated examples of women teaching grammar school in America, most formal contractual agreements were with men hired to teach boys seven years or older. At the time the United States was formally constituted in 1776, it was not considered appropriate or desirable to hire women as teachers except for the very youngest children. (Schmuck, 1987, p. 75)

However, this situation changed dramatically with industrialization.
Growth in industry and business provided better job opportunities for men thus creating a shortage of male teachers. At the same time, an increase in population due to immigration created a need for more teachers. Women were "... sought for teaching because men were unavailable" (Shakeshaft, 1989, p. 25). From 1830 to 1900 women became more identified with teaching. By 1980, over 57% of the teachers in the United States were women. That number had risen to 70.1% by 1900 (Woody, 1929/1966, p. 499).

In the early days of public education, the teacher did everything including administration. However, as bureaucratization was imposed on schools, the functions of administrator and teacher became more specialized. By 1918, teaching and administration were two separate professions, and a hierarchy of roles had been established. The separation of work in schools between teaching and administration had serious implications for women.

Typically this reorganization followed the principles of scientific management in which a manager oversaw and number of teachers who, in turn, instructed several hundred students. The belief at this time was that "women should be teachers while men should be retained as principals and superintendents" (Tyack and Strober, 1981, p. 141). Scientific management helped keep women out of administrative roles as the belief in male dominance made it easier for both males and females to view women as natural followers and men as natural leaders (Shakeshaft, 1989, p. 31-32).
Between 1820 and 1900, very few women held administrative positions. However, women began to secure positions in school administration through political activism and social reform. As a result, the years between 1900 and 1930 are sometimes referred to as the "golden age" for women in school administration (Hansot and Tyack, 1981). This golden age would not last, however, and by 1928, about 55% of all elementary school principals were women (Haven, Adkinson, & Bagley, 1980). That percentage has decreased yearly to 18% in 1978 (Pharus & Zakariya, 1979). The number of women elementary school principals rose slightly to 23% in 1985. This decrease in numbers of female elementary school principals is attributed to several different causes:

. . . the increase in men in elementary teaching after World War II, when the GI Bill gave financial aid to veterans returning to college; the consolidation of many school districts into one larger district (and women who were the heads of small rural schools were replaced by men, who were put in charge of larger buildings); the increased certification requirements for administrative positions, which necessitated a return to graduate school; and the increasing sexual stereotypes in most organizations, including education, that management was a "man's job." (Schmuck, 1987, p. 36-87)

In addition to being in the minority of administrative positions, there is also an obvious historical pattern of paying women less than men. Additionally, there is an over exclusion of women in the history of education. Even though women did participate in education in the United States, the absence of women has "distorted history, created false illusions about women's roles schools, and has been conceptually false.
Education has not been the exclusive province of men" (Schmuck, 1987, p. 91).

The purpose of this brief history of women in education was to provide the reader a way to put the female elementary school principal in historical perspective. The development of thought in educational administration will now be reviewed.

The Feminist Critique

Feminist theorists have begun to question the way that educational and administrative research has been conducted as well as the conclusions that have been drawn from this research. Shakeshaft (1989) writes:

The traditional literature in school administration largely ignores women. It tells us little about their past or present lives, nor do we hear of their struggles. Only in the past decade has there begun to be a literature about women in school administration, and only in the past couple of years have scholars begun talking about examining current theory and practice for the impact of gender. (p. 9)

Essentially, the traditional literature in educational administration has left women out almost entirely. However, Dunlap and Schmuck (1995) write that the situation in education is beginning to improve.

In the last few decades, women’s invisibility and silence as educators have been abridged with a new feminist consciousness. In education we have gained a new understanding of women who were important as leaders and teachers in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries . . . . Since about 1970 there has been a growing literature on women in administration . . . . These books have been written to document and understand women’s experience in schools and to explain why women have been underrepresented in school leadership posts. (p. 3)
Recently, efforts have been made to learn how women lead, how they view their roles, and what inspires them to pursue leadership positions in education (Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995; Regan & Brooks, 1995; Edson, 1987; Hill & Ragland, 1995). Interest in the female experience and how it may differ from the experience of males has been the catalyst for the production of much of this work. What follows is a feminist critique of traditional theory in educational administration. It will be shown that traditional theory in educational administration is incomplete because it has left out the feminine voice.

Shakeshaft (1989) offers two methodological critiques of theory in educational administration. First, she is critical of the fact that educational administration relies on organizational theory that is based on research conducted in settings that differ from educational settings in many important ways. Again, the mindless application of theory developed in other social sciences to education is questioned.

Second, Shakeshaft (1989) is critical of the bias of androcentrism that plagues research in educational administration. The term androcentrism is used by Shakeshaft to refer to "the practice of viewing the world and shaping reality from a male lens" (p. 150). All research inevitably reflects a particular worldview, however, a problem arises when we study male behavior and assume that the results are appropriate for understanding all behavior (p.150). Regan and Brooks (1995) agree as revealed in the following quotation:

The problem does not lie in women learning about school leadership through the perspective of men's
experience but rather in being told and believing that that's all the knowledge there is. How false, how immoral this is, and what a loss to everyone, women and men alike. Just as we believe that all people, women and men, can learn from the experience and interpretation of experience of men, so too we believe that all people, women and men can learn from the experience of women. (p. 18)

Most women currently in leadership positions have gone through the traditional preparation programs in educational administration found in most universities. Therefore, they find themselves in a precarious position. Regan and Brooks (1995) refer to this situation as the discovery of "the point of rupture." Smith (1987) calls this experience the uncovering of "fault lines." These two terms refer to the discovery of the disjuncture that exists between "what traditional knowledge tells women they experience and what women actually experience in their everyday lives" (Gosetti & Rusch, 1995, p. 15).

Realization of this discrepancy allows women to take seriously their own experiences. Women begin to consider their experiences to be as important as the male experience. Furthermore, it becomes evident that the female experience has much to offer to our knowledge base in educational administration. Awareness of "the point of rupture" was an impetus for the creation of feminist ethics. What follows is a review of the development of the field of feminist ethics. Also included in this review is a lengthy discussion of the work of Carol Gilligan because her work is of significant importance to the present study.
Feminist Ethics

The term ‘feminist ethics’ emerged in the late 1960’s, the result of an “unprecedented explosion of feminist ethical debate” (Jaggar, 1991, p. 80). The eruption of this debate has been described as follows:

It erupted first among the general public but soon filtered into academic philosophical discourse. Actions and practices whose gendered dimensions hitherto had been either unnoticed or unchallenged now became the foci of public and philosophical attention as feminists subjected them to outspoken moral critique, developed sometimes dramatic strategies for opposing them, and proposed alternatives that nonfeminists often perceived as dangerously radical. (Jaggar, 1991, p. 80)

Feminist ethical work focused on two main interests: contemporary ethical issues such as abortion, equality of opportunity, domestic labor, rape, the portrayal of women in the media, pornography, reproductive technology, surrogate motherhood, the environment, and many other social issues; and the critique of traditional ethical theory that revealed numerous examples of male bias. For example, the claim that women are incapable of being full moral agents, a claim originally made by Aristotle and further refined by the likes of Rousseau, Kant, and Hegel, was questioned within the emerging field of ‘feminist ethics.’ Male bias was also discovered in the way that traditional ethical theory conceptualized the domestic realm. Jaggar (1991) points out some of the problems caused by this faulty conceptualization:

Feminist philosophers began early to criticize this conceptual bifurcation of social life . . . . These feminists argued that the philosophical devaluation of the domestic realm made it impossible to raise questions about the justice of the domestic division of labor (Okin,
1989), obscured the far-reaching social significance and creativity of women’s work in the home (Jaggar & McBride, 1990), and concealed, even legitimated, the domestic abuse of women (as well as children, especially girls) (Jaggar, 1983; MacKinnon, 1987). (Jaggar, 1991, p. 31)

It was these two parallel strands of feminist ethical work, that gave rise to the term ‘feminist ethics’ that came into general use by the early 1980’s. By this time there was serious doubt about the possibility of adequately addressing women’s issues within the existing framework of traditional ethical theory. For example, one criticism claimed that certain assumptions underlying traditional ethical theory were incompatible with what was beginning to be claimed as a “distinctively feminine moral experience or sensibility” (Jaggar, 1991, p. 81).

Feminists began to assert that “the problem with malestream ethics was . . . . that its fundamental understanding of moral competence was masculine; therefore, it formulated and resolved moral issues in ways that were claimed to be distinctively masculine” (Jaggar, 1991, p. 82). Feminist ethics, then, became not simply a matter of adding women and stirring them into existing theory, but an effort to rethink the deepest moral issues “in light of a moral sensibility perceived as distinctively feminine” (p. 82). Feminist moral theorists began to believe that there was a unique female experience that required analysis totally apart from traditional Western philosophical thought.

The work of Carol Gilligan (1982/1993) has been revolutionary in the field of feminist ethics. The general problem that she set out to study was the reality that women do
not fit the existing models of human moral development. For the purposes of this paper, Gilligan's evolving thought about the moral development of men and women will be divided into two main areas: her distinction between the ethic of care and the ethic of justice reflected in her book, *In a Different Voice* (1982/1993); and her subsequent rejection of this dichotomy in favor of the notion that a relationship exists between justice and care. She has described the relationship between justice and care as "related but independent melodies, with fixed rules of harmony that constitute a harmonious whole" (Hekman, 1995). This most recent articulation of the relationship between justice and care, has been proposed in the book, *Meeting at the Crossroads* (Brown & Gilligan, 1992). What follows is a brief summary of the evolution of Gilligan’s thought represented in the publication of her two books.

*In A Different Voice* (1982) was an empirical and interpretive study of the decision-making process of a sample of girls and young women confronted with both hypothetical and real-life moral dilemmas (Hekman, 1995, p. 1). The impact of this piece of work has been nothing less than revolutionary:

It does not overstate the case to say that Gilligan’s work has revolutionized discussions in moral theory, feminism, theories of the subject, and many related fields. *In a Different Voice* is unquestionably one of the most influential books of the 1980’s. It has been criticized and praised by feminists, moral philosophers, and moral psychologists. Gilligan’s work has been hailed both as the harbinger of a new moral theory and as the final blow to the exhausted masculinist tradition of moral philosophy. It has also been condemned as methodologically unsound, theoretically confused, and even antifeminist. Gilligan’s critics and defenders have cast her, respectively, as either villain or savior in the ongoing intellectual
debate of the 1980’s and 1990’s. Probably the only point on which they agree is that, more than a decade later, the moral, epistemological, and methodological ramifications of her work are still being explored. (Hekman, 1995, p. 1)

Gilligan’s work represents a challenge to the studies of Lawrence Kohlberg that concluded that women cluster at an inferior stage of moral development with very few attaining, what he defined as, the highest stage of moral development. Gilligan, questioned these findings and the interpretation of them, and set out to “define a separate but equal moral sphere for the different voice and thus reform Kohlberg’s theory by describing women as equals rather than inferiors” (Hekman, 1995, p. 1). Gilligan (1982/1993) argued that the women she interviewed articulated their moral dilemmas in a “different voice,” a voice of care. In her study, she found that women and men construct the moral problem differently. She describes this notion as follows:

When one begins with the study of women and derives developmental constructs from their lives, the outline of a moral conception different from that described by Freud, Piaget, or Kohlberg begins to emerge and informs a different description of development. In this conception, the moral problem arises from conflicting responsibilities rather than from competing rights and requires for its resolution a mode of thinking that is contextual and narrative rather than formal and abstract. This conception of morality as concerned with the activity of care centers moral development around the understanding of responsibility and relationships, just as the conception of morality as fairness ties moral development to the understanding of rights and rules. (Gilligan, 1982/1993, p. 19)

Gilligan (1982/1993) sets up two opposing moralities: a morality of rights (or justice) which is associated with the masculine; and a morality of responsibility (or care) which is
typically considered to be feminine. She describes the differences between the two as follows:

... the morality of rights differs from the morality of responsibility in its emphasis on separation rather than connection, in its consideration of the individual rather than the relationship as primary ... (p. 19)

Based on Gilligan’s work, one would assume that there is a masculine morality characterized by formal and abstract thought involving separated individuals and emphasizing rights and rules; and a feminine morality concerned with connection, care, contextual thinking, relationships, and responsibilities. Following a reading of In a Different Voice, one would further assume that these two distinct moral domains comprise a dichotomy. Although a dichotomy seems to be what Gilligan (1982/1993) was suggesting, her thought regarding the relationship between the justice perspective and the care perspective has changed since she published In a Different Voice. This evolution in thought has been analyzed by Hekman (1995). Consider the following passages which document the gradual change in the thinking of Gilligan:

In a Different Voice characterized this relationship as one of complementarity, of a dialectical interplay of two voices. (Hekman, 1995, p. 9)

... Gilligan claims that individuals can see moral conflicts in terms of either justice or care but not both at once. Moral problems are thus not resolved by balancing justice and care but by taking one perspective rather than the other. (Hekman, 1995, p. 9)

... Gilligan now asserts that the connection between gender and moral voice is complex, that “differences
cannot be reduced to questions of gender.” (Hekman, 1995, p. 10)

An emphasis on the particular, on the complexity of moral voices, characterizes Gilligan’s research in her most important work since In a Different Voice, her book with Lyn Brown, Meeting at the Crossroads (Brown & Gilligan, 1992). What Gilligan is exploring . . . . is the range of factors, including but not limited to gender, that constitute these voices. (Hekman, 1995, p. 10)

The evolution of Gilligan’s thinking about the relationship between the care voice and the justice voice has gone from thinking of them as two separate but complementary concepts that cannot be utilized in combination, to recognizing the complexity of these two modes of moral thought. In Meeting at the Crossroads (1992), Brown and Gilligan use musical metaphors to describe the relationship between justice and care. Consider the following analysis by Hekman (1995, p. 10).

The terms “counterpoint,” “harmony,” “harmonious whole,” and “double fugue” have provided her with a means of redescribing the moral realm that departs radically from that of the modernist tradition (Gilligan, Rogers, and Brown, 1990; Gilligan, Brown, and Rogers, 1990). She rejects the language of stages and steps employed by the masculinest development theorists for a musical language of counterpoint and theme. A counterpoint is a melody accompanying another melody; it involves not opposition but the addition of a related but independent melody (Gilligan, Brown, & Rogers, 1990). Employing these musical metaphors allows Gilligan to define the relationship of justice and care in a way that avoids the oppositional connotations implicit in her earlier formulation. She describes the two voices as related but independent melodies, with fixed rules of harmony that constitute a harmonious whole. They play together, she concludes, like a “double fugue.” (Gilligan Rogers, and Brown, 1990)

Gilligan’s thought about the relationship between these two voices has changed considerably throughout her writings.
However, Gilligan's claim, that there is not only one true moral voice but two voices, represented a radical departure from modernist moral theory.

Hekman (1995) has advanced Gilligan's theory by arguing that there are actually a multiplicity of moral voices. Hekman's critique of Gilligan's work seems to provide further refinement of Gilligan's moral theory. Consider the following by Hekman:

That our society possesses a hegemonic moral discourse seems indisputable; that this discourse is the "justice voice" that Gilligan identifies is also clear. What Gilligan argued is that there is another, "different" moral voice that the hegemonic voice has silenced. I have extended this argument to theorize a multiplicity of moral voices constituted by race, class, and culture, as well as gender. Moral voices are connected to moral persons, persons who are concrete rather than disembodied. To have a moral voice is to participate in a common discourse, to embrace a form of life. There is nothing arbitrary, anarchic, or idiosyncratic about this. It is, quite simply, what we do. (Hekman, 1995, p. 163)

Hekman's analysis broadens Gilligan's notion of voice even further than the metaphor of the double fugue. The value of Gilligan and Hekman's work lies in the fact that they have broadened the thinking in moral theory to include many legitimate voices. The ramifications of Gilligan's work in educational administration have been exciting. The application of her work to theories of school leadership has yielded a variety of exciting new ideas. Additionally, scholars have begun to take a serious look at the ethic of care. Following Gilligan's lead, this discussion will now turn to the notion of gender and school leadership.
Gender and School Leadership

Regarding how gender shapes what and how men and women "know," Luttrell (1993) suggests that there are three groups of theories that have been offered. One group (Chodorow, 1978; Gilligan, 1982/1993; Ruddick, 1989) makes the claim that "women construct and value knowledge in ways that are relational, oriented more toward sustaining connection than achieving autonomy and governed by interests to attend to others' needs." (Luttrell, 1993, p. 506). A second group of feminist theorists (Daly, 1973; Cixous, 1976; Irigaray, 1985) have invested "women with distinctive intuitive and/or emotional capabilities, citing women's exclusion from other ways of acquiring knowledge under patriarchy and locating women's knowledge in the body . . . (Luttrell, 1993, p. 506). This group represents the essentialist view that woman is born not made. Fuss (1989) explains that essentialism "is most commonly understood as a belief in the real, true essence of things, the invariable and fixed properties which define the 'whatever' of a given entity (p. xi). To this way of essentialist thinking, women are the way that they are because of simple biology and physiology and this condition is unchangeable. The third group of theorists, and the group that will be drawn from most in this paper, is the "feminist standpoint theorists" (Jaggar, 1983; Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984) who believe that gender is socially constructed based on experiences.

Within the field of educational administration exciting new work is being done which is based on the notion that gender
is a category of experience. Regan and Brooks (1995) argue that since gender is a category of experience men and women experience and interpret the world differently, hence they experience school leadership differently. It has already been shown that the experience of women in educational administration has largely been ignored, devalued, or hidden in our culture. Regan and Brooks (1995) argue that by analyzing women’s experience as school leaders new knowledge is created (p. 19). Currently, there is uncharted territory containing exciting possibilities that are waiting to be discovered within the female experience.

Regan and Brooks (1995) have proposed the metaphor of the “double helix” as a replacement for the “broken pyramid” which is the prevailing metaphor of school organization. In order to understand the double helix, it is first necessary to understand the metaphor of the broken pyramid. The broken pyramid is wide at the bottom and narrow at the top. A faultline runs through the center that serves to divide the pyramid into two sections (McIntosh, 1983). Above the fault has been described as follows:

. . . [it] is the world that operates competitively in an either/or mode. Either people move up the pyramid and gain more wealth, power, and prestige, or they do not. The movement of those going up by definition prescribes failure for others because there is room for fewer and fewer as they pyramid narrows at the top . . . mostly white males occupy this part of the pyramid, and the closer to the top, the more dominant their numbers. (Regan, 1995, p. 408)
Below the faultline, on the other hand, there exists an entirely different world inhabited primarily by women, people of color, and low-status white males.

Its organization is horizontal and collaborative; it is cyclical and repetitive. Most of daily life takes place here: doing the dishes, changing diapers, planting fields, teaching. These tasks must be done repetitively, cyclically. This is where caring and nurturing, relationship and community building happen. It is a both/and world. (Regan, 1995, p. 408)

The problem with pyramidal thinking, according to Regan and Brooks (1995), is that the life at the top is perceived to be more valuable while life at the bottom is considered of lesser value. A new metaphor was needed to convey the idea that attributes from each mode of life have value.

... life can be lived on both sides of the fault line, necessitating movement across it depending on circumstances, which in turn is an expression of the idea that both either/or and both/and behaviors are required for competent administering. (Regan and Brooks, 1995, p. 20)

The double helix metaphor was chosen to symbolize the concept of relational administering for it reflects the notion that balance is necessary between the above the fault (masculine) and below the fault (feminine) qualities of leadership. The power of this metaphor is revealed in the following passage:

As the antithesis of hierarchical organization, the double helix makes it clear that both genders need to move back and forth from the conceptualization of the world primarily associated with their gender to that associated with the other, and that both knowledge and praxis are incomplete if articulated through the perspective of one gender only. (Regan and Brooks, 1995, p. 21)
In order to move back and forth between the two interlocking strands of the helix (the masculine and feminine) one must have a vast knowledge of both conceptualizations. While there is a broad and deep literature grounded in men’s experience of school administration, a comparable wealth of detail about the feminist strand of the double helix does not exist (p. 25). However, Regan and Brooks (1995) have begun the inquiry into the feminine experience of school leadership by identifying five feminist attributes of leadership: collaboration, caring, courage, intuition, and vision (p. 2).

The implications of the double helix metaphor for leadership are exciting. Regan and Brooks (1995) propose a new model of leadership called relational leadership that “synthesizes the finer qualities of the masculinist and feminist perspectives and forms a new, stronger, and more balanced practice of leadership” (p. 18). Relational leadership is created by taking the best of both worlds and providing a balanced view of leadership. However, change in leadership will occur only when the value of women’s experience is affirmed and this new knowledge is applied to the administration of schools.

The Concept of Community

When most people think of community, feelings of friendship, connection, and support usually come to mind. Dewey (1927) described the notion of community in the following way:

Wherever there is conjoint activity whose consequences are appreciated as good by all singular persons who take part in it, and where the realization of the good is such as to effect an energetic desire and effort to sustain it in being
just because it is a good shared by all, there is in so far [sic] a community. (p. 111,149)

Dewey suggests that only through community can the "good" or the "good life" be realized. This idea goes far beyond the belief that community life is just more preferable to life in the Good Society. Dewey sees community as crucial to the building of a democratic society.

Sociologists have used the term community in essentially three ways: as a synonym for words such as prisons, religious organizations, minority groups, members of the same profession, and even military establishments; to refer to a moral or spiritual phenomenon; or to refer to those units of social and territorial organizations such as villages, towns, or cities (Poplin, 1979, p. 1). To think of community as just a locality or a name for the members of a certain profession is too narrow, as it also signifies important experiential qualities. Bender (1978) makes this point in the following passage:

Americans seem to have something else in mind when they wistfully recall or assume a past made up of small-town communities. This social memory has a geographic referent, the town, but it is clear from the many layers of emotional meaning attached to the word community that the concept means more than a place or local activity. There is an expectation of a special quality of human relationship in a community, and it is this experiential dimension that is crucial to its definition. Community, then can be defined better as an experience rather than as a place. As simply as possible, community is where community happens. (p. 6)

The experiential quality of human relationship seems to be a crucial element in the conception of community for community can happen or exist anywhere that a special quality of human
relationship flourishes. It can exist in one classroom in a particular school and not exist in the classroom across the hall. Community has no boundary.

Typological theories of social change have quite a long tradition in sociological thought. Societal evolution and its effect on personal relationships has been of interest to sociologists since Sir Henry Maine wrote Ancient Law in 1861. Of interest were changes in social relationships that occur as society evolves toward urbanization, modernization, or industrialization. It is Ferdinand Tonnies (1887/1963) who introduced into the sociological literature a typology that has proven to be one of the discipline's most enduring and fruitful concepts for studying social change. (Bender, 1978, p. 17).

Tonnies (1887/1963) conceptualized the beginning of capitalist industrial production and the urbanization of society as an evolution from a predominantly Gemeinschaft (community) pattern of social relations to one dominated by Gesellschaft (society). A variety of other distinctions has been offered and are generally subsumed under the community-society continuum. This fundamental distinction has become central to the study of community in urbanizing societies.

Tonnies' (1887/1963) made a distinction between two kinds of social relationship: Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society). Consider the following description of Gemeinschaft:

The Gemeinschaft of blood, denoting unity of being, is developed and differentiated into Gemeinschaft of locality, which is based on a common habitat. A further
differentiation leads to Gemeinschaft of mind, which implies only co-operation and co-ordinated action for a common goal. Gemeinschaft of locality may be conceived as a community of physical life, just as Gemeinschaft of mind expresses the community of mental life. In conjunction with the others, this last type of Gemeinschaft represents the truly human and supreme form of community. (Tonnies, 1887/1963, p. 42)

The 'community of mind' is supreme as it involves coordinated action for a common goal or a common good. Dewey was most concerned with this particular aspect of Gemeinschaft. Individuals living in Gemeinschaft share certain beliefs that give meaning and value to their community. On the other hand, Gesellschaft relationships are quite different as individuals participating within a Gesellschaft type of community are separated rather than united and individualism is the dominating orientation. Poplin (1979) describes Gesellschaft as follows:

The individual rarely takes action on behalf of the Gesellschaft itself. Rather, all actions are taken in light of their potential benefit for the individual. Because of this, the relationships that emerge between members of the Gesellschaft are contractual and functionally specific, and frequently involve the exchange of goods, money, or credit and obligations. (p. 128)

Individuals living within Gesellschaft feel no connection to each other or to the community. There is no shared value placed on the community. People relate to one another because they have to in order to complete a task. Individuals "need" each other in the most minimal sense of the word.

While Gemeinschaft is characterized by cooperation for a common goal, Gesellschaft is dominated by rampant individualism in which personal goals are pursued exclusively. The distinction
between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft has, at its center, the problematic dyad of individual versus society.

The Problem of Individual versus Society

It is a commonly held view that 'individual versus society' represents a dialectical relationship "of internal conflict in which two opposites (thesis and antithesis) struggle to finally emerge with a compromise (synthesis) between them" (Loewy, 1993, p. xvii). This model suggests that the individual/society dyad remains in a dualistic struggle and, more importantly, each side is working toward its own particular goal. However, Dewey denied that such a duality existed.

Dewey (1916) denied the inherent conflict between individual and society. He viewed the relationship between them as one of mutual construction by locating the individual within the life of community. (Noddings, 1992) Dewey rejected strict individualism by stressing the absolute necessity of individual's participation in the life of community. The community was to provide the means for individuals to achieve their full potential (Westhoff, 1995, p. 41). Likewise, without the active participation of individuals within the community, society would never be able to function democratically and would likely lose its way. Therefore, a democratic society is only constructed through individuals participating in community.

Following Dewey, Loewy (1993) uses the metaphor of homeostasis to characterize the individual/community relationship. The tension between individual freedom and community are not actually in opposition. Rather, they are
mutually supportive of each other. Biological homeostasis illustrates the tension between the forces of individual and community.

When one looks at an organism's mechanism for maintaining its biological equilibrium a tension between various forces exists: but it is a tension which is not the same sort of struggle as the dialectic would offer. The forces are not, in the same sense at least, opposed to each other; they are, even if at first glance opposed, mutually supportive for the common end of keeping the organism functioning and alive. (p. xvii)

According to this view, the two forces must literally 'come together' in order for the organism to survive. Loewy (1993) writes that "the relationship between community and the individual is quite similar to biological homeostasis: means and ends become largely if not entirely enmeshed" (p. xvii). Individual and community need each other in order to flourish and for each to realize its greatest potential. To consider them in conflict connotes destruction which would not be good for either.

Perhaps the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) had the right idea about the proper relationship between individual and community when they wrote the following in their pastoral message on education:

. . . The educational efforts of the church must therefore be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny but also to the destinies of the many communities in which he lives. (1972, pp. 3-4)

The formation of persons-in-community seems to be what Dewey and Loewy have proposed.
Schools as Communities

Sergiovanni (1994) has written that the root metaphor for schools must be changed from "organization" to "community." He believes that most schools are now too *gesellschaft* and must move in the direction of *gemeinschaft*. He believes that "changing the metaphor for the school from organization to community changes what is true about how schools should be organized and run, about what motivates teachers and students, and about what leadership is, and how it should be practiced" (p. 217). It is doubtful that such a change would occur so easily, however, it is an interesting notion that raises the question: Why would we want to change the metaphor for school from organization to community?

At the heart of Sergiovanni's (1994) argument is the importance of the quality of relationship that exists within schools. Consider the following quote:

> With community as the theory, we would have to restructure in such a way that the school itself is not defined by brick and mortar but by ideas and relationships (p. 223).

Undoubtedly, there are important differences between the types of relationships that exist within a community and those that exist within an organization. For example, in an organization, the ties among people are instrumental and calculated. Sergiovanni (1994) writes that most relationships in schools are motivated by self-interest and are contractual. "Each person acts separately in negotiating a settlement with others and in negotiating a settlement with the organization itself that best meets her or his needs" (p. 216). These kinds of relationships
are very different from the types of relationships that comprise a community. Communities are structured around relationships that are based on commitment to a "shared idea structure."

Sergiovanni (1994) describes the social structure of a community as follows:

Communities are socially organized around relationships and the felt interdependencies that nurture them. Instead of being tied together and tied to purposes by bartering arrangements, this social structure bonds people together in special ways and binds them to concepts, images, and values that comprise a shared idea structure. This bonding and binding are the defining characteristics of schools as communities. Communities are defined by their centers of values, sentiments, and beliefs that provide the needed conditions for creating a sense of we from a collection of I's. (p. 217)

A community can only be created if its members share a common "idea structure" and if each group member begins to feel a true sense of we rather than strictly participating in their world from an I point of view. Consider Sergiovanni's (1994) definition of community:

Communities are collections of individuals who are bonded together by natural will and who are together bound to a set of shared ideas and ideals. This bonding and binding is tight enough to transform them from a collection of Is into a collective we. As a we, members are part of a tightly knit web of meaningful relationships. This we usually shares a common place and over time comes to share common sentiments and traditions that are sustaining. (p. 218)

Not only is it pleasurable to participate fully within a community, Dewey would argue that it is necessary if both individual (student) and community (school) are to fully realize their respective potentials.
In addition to these arguments, there are others who argue that schools must become more caring places (Noddings, 1992). Beck (1994) argues that the ethic of care must be practiced within the context of a community. Therefore, any school attempting to build community must be caring and any school attempting to practice the ethic of care must first build community.

Lickona (1991) has pointed out the reality of children coming to school so troubled by home life that schools must create and provide a caring community environment so that learning can happen. Brendtro, Brokenleg, and Van Bockern (1990) have suggested that a loss of community and consequently a loss of belonging has led teenagers to turn to dysfunctional and distorted substitutes in the forms of gang membership, sexual promiscuity, and participation in cults of various kinds. There seems to be a growing consensus that the social structure of the learning environment within schools should strive to become more like Gemeinschaft communities.

Although there seems to be promise in Sergiovanni’s (1994) argument that the metaphor for schools must be changed from organization to community, it is unlikely that simply changing the metaphor will change the theory enabling schools to become communities. Simply changing the metaphor of schools from organization to community will not likely solve all the problems facing public education. Nevertheless, it may be possible to expect that notions of community put into practice may have some degree of positive impact on schools.
The Ethic of Care

Care has been described as the very Being of human life (Heidegger, 1962). Noddings (1992) argues that "to care and be cared for are fundamental human needs. We all need to be cared for by other human beings... We also need to care, but not all of us learn to care for other human beings" (p. xi). Our world can be a cruel world, no doubt. Our culture is in need of care.

Although "care" has a very broad meaning, the relational meaning of care is with what we are presently concerned. Noddings (1992) defines a caring relation as "a connection or encounter between two human beings -- a "carer" and a "cared-for" (p. 15). She further specifies that a relation is not a caring relation unless both parties contribute to the relation in characteristic ways. The consciousness of both participants in the relation is of import. The consciousness of the carer must exhibit engrossment and motivational displacement. Reception, recognition, and response are primary characteristics of the consciousness of the cared-for. (p. 15) Engrossment and motivational displacement do not tell us what to do; they simply characterize our consciousness when we care. For example, engrossment means having an "open, non selective receptivity for the cared-for" (p. 15). Failure to contribute to the relation on the part of either party blocks completion of caring and although there may still be a relation it is not a caring relation (p. 15).
No matter how hard teachers try to care, if the caring is not received by students, the claim "they don't care" has some validity. (p. 13)

One cannot say, "Aha! This fellow needs care. Now let's see - here are the seven steps I must follow." Caring is a way of being in relation, not a set of specific behaviors. (p. 17)

For a relation to be a caring relation both parties must respond to each other sincerely or it is merely an encounter. Noddings (1992) argues that it is clear that there is a challenge to care in schools. "The structures of current schooling work against care, and at the same time, the need for care is perhaps greater than ever" (p. 20).

In terms of leadership, an ethic of care has four major components: Modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation (Noddings, 1992, p. 22). Modeling requires that we show others how to care in our own relations with "cared-fors." Principals can show students how to "care" in a number of ways. They can "care-for" teachers and they can show students how to care by creating caring relations with them (Noddings, 1992, p. 22). Modeling is important because it not only shows students how to care by being cared for, it also provides the necessary experience of care. In order to "care" one must experience being "cared-for."

Dialogue involves a "common search for understanding, empathy, or appreciation (Noddings, 1992, p. 22). It is an ongoing search for knowledge about students that serves as a guide to our responses to their needs.

It [dialogue] connects us to each other and helps maintain caring relations. It also provides us with
the knowledge of each other and forms a foundation for response in caring. Caring (acting as carer) requires knowledge and skill as well as characteristic attitudes. (p. 23)

Principals who participate in an open dialogue make the effort to find out what is going on in the lives of their teachers, staff member, and students. For example, if a teacher is going through a nasty divorce and the principal knows this, then the principal can respond to the special needs of the teacher in a caring way. Likewise, if a child is going through a nasty divorce, the same is true. Without dialogue, principals are ill equipped to respond to the needs of others in caring ways and are thus unable to model caring for others to experience.

The third component of caring is practice and is built on the notion that attitudes are shaped by experience. Noddings (1992) writes "if we want people to approach moral life prepared to care, we need to provide opportunities for them to gain skills in caregiving . . . " (p. 24). This idea is reminiscent of the Aristotelian notion of habituation. If we want children to be caring children, then we must care for them and give them opportunities to care for others. The principal of an elementary school is in a position to organize such efforts so that a schoolwide promotion of the ethic of care can begin.

Confirmation is the fourth component and has been described as an act of encouraging others to do their best. Noddings (1992) writes that:

When we confirm someone, we spot a better self and encourage its development. We can do this only if we know the other well enough to see what he or she is trying to become. Formulas and slogans have no
place here. We do not set up a single ideal or set of expectations for everyone to meet, but we identify something admirable, or at least acceptable, struggling to emerge in each person we encounter. (p. 25)

In order for confirmation to be authentic, a trusting relationship is necessary. Dialogue is especially important to confirmation because the "carer" has to really know the "cared-for." Relationships must be formed. Principals are in a position to confirm teachers and students. Teachers, as well as students, need someone to help them reach their greatest potential. The implications of the component of confirmation to the teacher-principal relationship are far reaching. If a principal could lift each teacher toward a better self, then what could each teacher do for each student?

To summarize, all four of Noddings' (1992) components of caring are interrelated and dependent on a the existence of a trusting relationship in which the "carer" has a vast knowledge about the "cared-for." These components provide a useful guide as to what is meant when we say principals should be caring. It means that they should model (or be) caring; they should make every effort to know each and every child and teacher well; they should communicate to the students and teachers alike an expectation of caring in the school; they should provide students and teachers with the opportunity to practice being caring human beings; and finally they should confirm the worth of every human being and guide them to being the very best that they can be.
Noddings (1992) is not alone in her call for care in schools. Other scholars have called on educators to recognize and practice the ethic of care (Brabeck, 1989; Gilligan, 1982; Beck, 1992). Marshall et al. (1996) argue that an ethic of care can provide administrators with a valuable perspective to guide decision making, however, they assert that the ethic of care by itself is not model of educational leadership. The real world imposes demands that must be considered in the running of a successful school. Consequently, the ethic of care is being found situated within broader leadership theories. For example, caring is one of five feminine attributes of leadership identified by Regan & Brooks (1995). Starratt (1991) joins the three ethics of critique, justice, and care to form a theory of practice which he believes “encourages a rich human response to the many uncertain ethical situations administrators face every day in their work” (p. 200). The ethic of care is beginning to be appreciated as absolutely essential to good leadership.

Beck (1992) has challenged educational administrators to “reclaim their profession as a caring profession.” She further offers a definition of caring that emphasizes the ways in which it might influence educational leadership. Since caring does not lend itself to an operational definition, Beck (1992) asserts that it can be understood in terms of its goals which she argues are: Promoting human development and responding to needs (p. 456). In terms of fostering the growth of others, Mayerhoff (1971) has written that “To care for another person, in the most significant sense, is to help him grow and actualize himself”
Undoubtedly, the goal of education is to enable each and every student to reach his or her fullest potential. To see to it that this happens, principals and teachers must care for their students.

A second goal of caring, the act of responding to needs of others, grows out of what Noddings (1992) terms "motivational displacement" linked with a commitment to the growth of the cared-for.

When motivational displacement and engrossment [commitment to the growth of the cared-for] are linked, the person giving care will find herself or himself "stepping out of one's own personal frame of reference into the other's . . . consider[ing] the other's point of view, his objective needs, and what he expects of us . . . Reasons for acting, thus, have to do with the [other's] wants and desires and with the objective elements of situations. (Beck, 1992, p. 458)

Beck (1992) points out that an ethic of care encourages consideration of both the subjective and objective elements of situations. In school administration, it is important that both the personal needs of the students and contextual demands are considered before important decisions are made. For these reasons, it can be argued that the ethic of care does indeed have much to offer the practice of school administration.

Beck (1992) summarizes the meaning of care by writing that "Caring . . . depends on a special kind of relationship between persons, one characterized by some measure of commitment" (p. 459). Relationships of this nature flourish within environments that stress a sense of community. Therefore, Beck (1992) has argued that the context for caring is necessarily community.
CHAPTER FOUR - RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter describes the procedures involved in the collection and coding of data, as well as important considerations regarding the analysis of the data collected. The main sections include: Assumptions, case study design, field procedures, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

Assumptions

The present study is an exploratory inquiry that is driven by questions of a moral nature. The case method has been selected as the most appropriate research approach. The following assumptions, relevant to this study, will be made: Realities are multiple, constructed, and holistic; knower and known are interactive and inseparable; only time- and context-bound working hypotheses are possible; all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping, so that it is impossible to distinguish causes from effects; and inquiry is value-bound (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The Case Study Design

The "case study" approach is defined as follows:

A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used. (Yin, 1989, p. 23)

With this definition in mind, this study will explore the moral discourse/practice of the elementary school principal. No attempt to separate morality from the context of school life will be made. This study follows in the tradition pioneered in education by Wolcott (1973) and documented in his classic work: The man in the principal's office. He explains the relationship between principal and context as follows:
as ethnographic inquiry into what a principal does as a principal cannot ignore the broader context in which an individual lives and works . . . Ethnographic accounts deal with real human beings and actual human behavior, with an emphasis on social rather than on physiological or psychological, aspects of behavior. (Wolcott, 1973, p. xi)

The phenomenon and context will be studied using multiple sources of information gathered through the use of observations and interviews.

Traditionally, case study research has been considered an emergent, unstructured form, in which the researcher enters the field tabula rasa. The case study, however, does not always have to be strictly inductive. "In principle it can be as pre-structured or emergent as you wish - or more accurately, as is appropriate for the purposes of your study" (Robson, 1993 p. 149). Moreover, a distinction can be made between the purpose of exploratory studies versus confirmatory studies. Exploratory studies propose to get some feeling of what is going on in a new situation while confirmatory studies usually attempt to verify an explanation of some phenomenon that has already been explained. In practice most case study work tends to fall somewhere on the continuum between these two extremes (Robson, 1993).

This study is predominantly exploratory as it delves into the moral realm of the elementary school -- a realm that has hardly been examined. The work of Jackson et al., (1993) will be used as an observational guide to explore the question: "Do principals exhibit the same kinds of explicit and implicit behaviors of a morally influential nature as that of teachers (as was found by Jackson et al.)?"
Other questions concerning the moral implications of the discourse/practice of male principals versus female principals will be explored. Is there a difference between the way male principals and female principals talk and behave within the moral realm? Also, questions concerning the relationship between the speech and actions of the principal and notions of community and community building are strictly exploratory.

Research design is the "logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study's initial research questions, and ultimately to its conclusions" and represents the plan that is followed to get from an initial set of questions to some form of conclusion (Yin, 1989, p. 28). The following three components of research design structure the study:

1. Research questions
2. Unit(s) of analysis
3. Criteria for interpreting the findings.

The Research Questions

This research project is built upon the assumption that people in schools have a moral influence on each other. The consequences of the moral influence on individuals may be both positive and negative. Three general research questions will guide this exploration into the moral realm of the four elementary schools participating in this study.

The first question was inspired by the work of Jackson et al., (1993) that concluded that schools seek explicitly as well as implicitly to have a moral influence on students in a variety of ways. They observed certain activities that were "deliberate
attempts to promote moral instruction and to encourage moral behavior" (p. 3) In addition to these explicit attempts, it was discovered that the moral influence that schools and teachers have is not limited to explicit efforts only but "it extends to what teachers say and do without consciously intending to act as moral agents" (p. 237). While Jackson’s et al. (1993) work was conducted entirely in classrooms with the focus on teachers, this study proposes to explore the role that the principal plays in the moral life of the elementary school. The "Taxonomy of Moral Influence" that emerged out of Jackson’s et al. work will be used as a guide to the observations of the principals at work for the purpose of answering this question: "In what ways do principals seek to explicitly as well as implicitly influence students morally?"

The second research question is constructed around two main ideas: Gilligan's (1982\1993) assertion of the existence of an ethic of care and an ethic of justice; and Noddings' (1992) four components of caring. Gilligan (1982\1993) has proposed that two moralities exist that give rise to two ethics: An ethic of care and an ethic of justice. An ethic of care is associated with the feminine while an ethic of justice -- the masculine. Gilligan found that women and men construct the moral problem differently. For women, "the moral problem arises from conflicting responsibilities rather than from competing rights and requires for its resolution a mode of thinking that is contextual and narrative rather than formal and abstract" (p. 19). Following this line of thought, the feminine morality is characterized by connection to others, care, contextual thinking, relationships, and
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responsibilities. The masculine morality, on the other hand, emphasizes formal and abstract thinking, rights of others, and obedience to rules and regulations.

Noddings’ (1992) four components of caring: Modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation will also be used to investigate this research question. These components will be used as an observational tool to determine the degree to which the principals in this study exhibit caring behaviors as outlined by Noddings.

Thus, the second research question explores the question: “Does the gender of the principal have any relationship to the extent to which the principal practices an ethic of care (feminine morality) or an ethic of justice (masculine morality)?”

The third and final research question concerns the sense of “community” that may exist within each school. It is built around three main ideas. First, “community” has been more appropriately defined as an experience rather than as a place (Bender, 1978). Second, Sergiovanni (1994) has emphasized the significance of relationships in community. Third, Dewey (1916) believed that the “community” must provide the means for individuals to achieve their fullest potential. In this view, “community” is a means to achieve a greater end. Therefore, this study will explore the experience of “community” as a cohesive group of people, strongly connected to each other in which the community experience enables each member to reach his or her potential. The question asked is this: “Do principals promote a sense of community within the school? If so, how is this revealed?”
Units of Analysis

This study will use a multiple-case, holistic design with two male and two female principals as the primary units of analysis. Each principal will be the primary focus of the case and the school setting will provide the context within which the principal operates.

Selection of Sample

Purposive random sampling was used in this study. Two decisions about the kind of sample needed in this study were made prior to the selection process. First, it was decided that the work of two male principals and two female principals would be analyzed; therefore, the gender of the principals was specified to this degree. A second decision made was to study principals of one race rather than studying principals of differing races. The rationale behind this decision was based on the notion that all racial groups have distinct histories, cultures, and social institutions that may affect each member’s behavior, making it very difficult to make generalizations across racial lines. For example, the black male principal reflects an entirely different experience than that of the white male principal, just as the experience of a black female principal differs from that of a white female principal and so on. The participants chosen for this study were all white, but no universal claim will be made about all men or all women because issues of race and class make such a claim problematic. The fact that this study does not include black women or men or principals of other ethnic and economic backgrounds is one of its limitations.

From the beginning of this study, it was decided that the sample must consist of two white men and two white women. The goal
of the purposive sampling was to locate four public elementary schools (pre-K - 5th grade only) in East Baton Rouge Parish that were as similar to each other as possible according to the following set of characteristics: 1) black/white student ratio; 2) percentage of students receiving free lunch; 3) percentage of attendance; 4) LEAP Scores, 93-94, Grade 3, Language Arts; 5) gender of principal; 6) race of principal; and 7) school size. All parish schools were rank ordered on each characteristic and the median school of each list was identified. Using the median school of each list as a starting point, then moving up two positions and then down two positions from that middle point resulted in a median cluster of five schools for each characteristic. Every attempt was made to include schools that shared a median cluster position for each characteristic.

One weakness with regard to the selection of the sample was that this particular school system employs many more female principals at the elementary level than male principals. More specifically, for the 1994-1995 school year, 26 of the 35 pre-K through 5th grade elementary schools had female principals while only 9 had male principals. These numbers were especially problematic because 3 of the male principals contacted refused to participate.

Initially, two male and two female principals were contacted by the researcher. A meeting was set up with each principal at which time the study was explained to them in general terms and they were then asked to participate. Of the first four principals contacted, one male principal and one female principal agreed to participate and one male and one female principal declined the
offer. One male principal who refused to participate said, "Don't take this personally, but I'd rather not participate." The female principal who chose not to participate took several days to think it over. She said that she just had too much to do and that since she had an administrative intern for that particular semester her office would get a bit crowded. At this point, two principals had agreed to take part in the study and two had declined. Two more principals were contacted -- one male and one female. The male principal refused to participate saying that he would like to participate but his schedule was not good for something like this. He also stated that it was too short of notice for him to participate. The female principal who was contacted by phone agreed to participate in the study by telling the researcher, "Yea! You come on down. My schedule is in and out but come on!" The fourth male principal contacted simply "declined this time." Finally, the fifth male principal contacted agreed to participate. This particular principal had a Ph. D. and indicated that he knew the complexities of writing a dissertation.

It is clear from the description of events that led to the selection of the sample that it does not reflect the most perfect sample. Three out of five male principals and one female principal contacted refused to participate. Fortunately, the characteristics of each school within which each principal works are quite similar. Data on the characteristics of the four selected schools is represented in Figure 1.
In addition, all of the schools in this study were located in rather close proximity of each other.

Field Procedures

The field procedures for this study involved the following data collection activities: Participant observation and interviewing. Before explaining these procedures, however, it is necessary to discuss two basic processes that served as guides to both the collection of data and the analysis of that data. These processes represent my mindset as I entered the field and are extremely important for understanding the findings of this study.

Due to the moral nature of this project, it was necessary for observation to go beyond merely noting what was seen and heard in schools. Searching for the moral became quite a complex process, demanding that I adopt two basic approaches to my observational technique: The development of an outlook called "expressive awareness," followed by a commitment to the ongoing activity of "reflecting and ruminating" on the expressive (Jackson et al., 1993). What follows is a brief explanation of these approaches as they were used in this study.
Expressive Awareness

Expressive awareness is a perspective that looks beyond the easily observable by asking, "What, in terms of the moral, could this mean?" Looking beyond the easily observable requires us to remove layer after layer until the meaning embedded within the obvious becomes clear. The expressive refers to a kind of artistic way of viewing the world. Consider the following explanation:

. . . [W]e share with artists everywhere the underlying conviction that the world abounds in meaning. Turn where we might, there is more to be seen and heard than meets the eye or the ear, or any other senses for that matter. (Jackson, et al., 1993, p. 269)

The seemingly mundane details of everyday life are of significant importance in conveying the moral subtleties that exist in every aspect of our lives. Jackson et al., (1993) argue that this can only be true when the details are treated as symbols. Like artists, we must look for symbolic meaning in all that we experience. When applied to educational settings, developing expressive awareness requires one to look for meaning in objects or activities that otherwise might go unnoticed. Jackson et al., (1993) assert that everything teachers and students say and do together can be examined expressively. Consider the following excerpt from The Moral Life of Schools (1993) in which the writer describes a classroom setting. In this passage, there is an ongoing questioning of what it all could mean:

The crooked window shades, the unwatered plants, the dustballs under the teacher's desk - all hint of someone's indifference to his or her physical surroundings, an indifference that may appear to extend to living things as well. Whose indifference is it? the observer starts to wonder. The teacher's? The janitor's? The students' perhaps? And is it really
indifference or might there be some other explanation?
The frayed and curled corners of the pull-down wall
map, the tiny clusters of thumbtack pictures in the
bulletin board display, and the scored desktops with
their carved initials and penciled graffiti tell a
story of objects that have weathered years of use.
(Jackson et al., 1993, p.255)

When details such as these are considered within the broader
context to which they are but a part, they have great symbolic
power. Accurate analysis of these details requires a great deal of
reflection. In fact, Jackson et al., (1993) consider the end
product of such an effort an “open work” because they believe that
by doing so:

... the initial statement or document becomes
enriched through continued thought. Our understanding
of it deepens. (p. 49)

In short, any piece of work that is left open can only get better.

Furthermore, tuning in to the moral subtleties of everyday
school life requires more than sensitizing our way of thinking or
altering our way of seeing. Jackson et al., (1993) write:

We must also reflect on what we have seen and persist in
turning events over in our mind’s eye long after they have
disappeared from sight, drawing from our memories of them and
from reflecting upon those memories whatever moral
significance the events may be found to contain. (p. 45)

This process is referred to as the “process of reflecting and
ruminating on the expressive” (p. 45), which must accompany the
development and subsequent use of “expressive awareness.”

Reflecting and Ruminating on the Expressive

One way to begin to understand this process is to consider
the meaning of the word “ruminate.” According to The American
Heritage Dictionary, it means to chew cud or to meditate at length.
The image of a big, slow cow standing in a field chewing cud ever
so slowly, patiently, and steadily provides a helpful way to
understand what it means to ruminate. In much the same way, I ruminated over the data collected — meditating on it at great length.

This process is quite complicated as it involves a continuous dialectic between thinking about and writing about — thinking about and writing about what has been observed. This to and fro movement can go on indefinitely. The process involves two phases, the descriptive and the reflective. These phases are described as follows:

The descriptive phase takes place while sitting in the classroom . . . and consists of jotting down whatever strikes one as noteworthy, without worrying unduly at the time about its potential moral significance. Later, those notes can be expanded . . . in order to fill in some of the detail that is still remembered but was not jotted down. It is then that the reflective phase begins. (Jackson et al., 1993, p. 46)

Both of these phases involve interpretation. Consider the following explanation:

Classrooms, as we have come to understand them, are not places whose buzz of activity fits neatly within a single descriptive framework. They are too crowded and too much goes on within them. Therefore, every description that might issue from such a complex, crowded environment is a selection from among many that could possibly have been given. That selection is inevitably the result of an act of interpretation on the part of the observer regarding what is worth noting and the way it should be noted. (Jackson et al., 1993, p. 46)

Recognizing the inevitable necessity of interpretation leads to a further distinction between the objective and the subjective. For example, there is quite a difference between listing the major activities that occur in a classroom (e.g., seatwork, discussion, testing) and describing the manner in which a teacher handles a sensitive situation (e.g., a child returning to school after a death in the family). Although the concepts objective and
subjective are commonly used to describe this distinction, Jackson et al., (1993) consider these terms problematic chiefly due to the ontological assumptions underlying them. The terms open and closed are deemed more useful.

As Eco (1989) uses the terms and as we would like to employ them here, a description or report that is open is one that invites further reflection and commentary; one that is closed does not. The invitation to continued exploration may at times result in a discrediting of what was said or written, which may turn out to have been shortsighted or insensitive. But more typically, at least in our experience, the initial statement or document becomes enriched through continued thought. Our understanding of it deepens. We begin to see within it aspects that were not apparent at first. What was said or written may undergo change as well . . . In short, the process is an evolving one. (p. 49)

The process of reflecting and ruminating is an ongoing process in which readers are invited to join. The analysis is never finished. Such an outlook considers any piece of work to be a humble offering in which differing interpretations are not only viewed as valuable but are actually encouraged as well.

To summarize, the field procedures for the study were founded upon the notion of expressive awareness and the ongoing process of reflecting and ruminating on the expressive. These processes were as important during the data collection phase of the project as they were in the analysis phase. As mentioned previously, they represent my mind-set as I entered the field and analyzed the data. What follows is a more specific discussion of the field procedures that were employed.

Participant Observation

Participant observation was the primary technique used to gather data. Regarding the degree of participation in this study, I assumed the role of observer-as-participant.
When a researcher chooses the role of observer-as-participant, she identifies herself straight off as a researcher, but makes no pretense of actually being a member of the group she is observing. The researcher might conduct a series of interviews with teachers in the school, visit classes, attend faculty meetings, talk with students, . . . but she would not attempt to participate in the activities of the group than superficially. (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993, p. 384)

I did precisely what has been described above. Two consecutive weeks were spent in each school at which time I shadowed the principal, following him or her wherever he or she went. There were times, however, when I was asked to leave for confidentiality reasons. Most of the teachers in each school knew that I was an LSU student working on my dissertation. In some schools, the teachers and staff exhibited an interest in my work and in some schools my mere presence seemed to make them nervous.

This study observed what goes on in schools, school offices, hallways, classrooms, and other moral spaces that are created as principals go about their work. The work of principals is characterized by brevity and fragmentation. Principals spend a great deal of time away from their desks and out of their offices. For these reasons, moral spaces exist where they are created as principals go about their work. For instance, a moral space may be spontaneously created in the hall as a teacher stops the principal as he or she walks by the classroom door; therefore, the observations collected in this study were typically caught "on the run." Moreover, most of the observations are very short and fragmented in much the way that the work of principals has been characterized as fragmented.
The first research question necessitated the use of an observation guide. I modified and used the taxonomy generated in The Moral Life of Schools Project by Jackson et al., (1993) as a guide to determine whether or not principals exhibited the same kinds of morally influential behavior as teachers (See Appendix A). This information was used to get an idea of the role that the principal played in the overall moral atmosphere of the school.

The second research question required that I focus my observations on two broad areas: the way that each principal constructed the moral problem and the degree that each principal exhibited Noddings' (1992) four components of caring.

The final question dealt with the experience of community within each school. I, as an observer-as-participant, was alert to incidents that occurred or comments that were made that would provide some insight into the nature of the community experience within each school.

**Interviewing**

The purpose of the interviews was to discover how the principals think and feel about the moral issues that they deal with regularly. In addition, interviewing was one way that I could check the accuracy of the impressions raised through observation. Is what the principal does and what the principal says he does in congruence? Interviews were conducted with the principal, various teachers and students.

Principal interviews were conducted in the principal's office and tape recorded. The initial interview lasted about an hour and the follow-up interview lasted about thirty minutes, depending on
the principal. The focus of the interviews with the principals was on their views of morality and their notions of community.

The teachers interviewed were those with whom I was able to ask for an interview. Some of the teachers asked were very willing while others were hesitant, almost fearful, about being interviewed. Nevertheless, I was able to get a satisfactory number of teacher interviews in each school. The purpose of the interviews with teachers was to get some sense of the community experience at each school. I conducted no follow-up interviews with teachers.

Student interviews were usually conducted on a playground and were very short in duration. The focus of these interviews was on getting an idea about how the students felt about his or her school and principal.

Three interview protocols were employed in this study. One protocol was used to guide the interviews with the principals, a second protocol was used for the teacher interviews, and a third interview guide was used with students (See Appendix B). Each protocol was developed following Patton’s (1980) general interview guide approach that “involves outlining a set of issues that are to be explored with each respondent before interviewing begins” (p. ). The issues in the outline were not taken in any particular order and the actual wording of questions to elicit responses about those issues were not determined in advance. The interview guide simply served as a basic checklist during the interview to make sure that all relevant topics were covered. I used each protocol to guide the interview, ensuring that each question was posed to each principal. This procedure gave me and the principal freedom to discuss other issues that may have surfaced during the interview.
Data Analysis

The general analytic strategy upon which the present case study was organized is the development of a descriptive framework for each principal and his/her school in the study. All data used to construct the case studies emerged from actual incidents witnessed during observation. A synthesis chapter was developed by comparing and contrasting data from each case. Finally, some conclusions were drawn from the synthesis of the cases in an effort to present the perspective that was developed by the researcher.

The field notes collected in this study were analyzed inductively.

... patterns, themes, and categories of analysis come from data; they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis. (Patton, 1980, p. 306)

Once the significant patterns, themes, and categories were identified, they were then coded and a coding scheme (see Appendix C) was developed. The system of categories was developed after I pored over field notes repeatedly looking for emerging themes and patterns.

Trustworthiness

A research design represents a logical set of statements that should withstand judgment according to certain logical tests (Yin, 1989). Patton (1980) refers to this as the issue of trusting the data. In other words, how much confidence can be placed in the findings of the analysis of the data?

Patton (1980) makes a distinction between studies that present the Truth and those that provide a perspective. He writes that "... in the end, all we can provide is perspective. The
perspective gained through careful qualitative analysis is not arbitrary, nor is it predetermined, but it does fall short of being Truth" (p. 327). This distinction between Truth and perspective is important since this study proposes to provide a perspective on the moral atmosphere of the elementary school.

Although this study offers a perspective and does not make the claim to have discovered the Truth about the moral realm of elementary schools, the perspective that is offered must be credible. In other words, the perspective presented must "hold up under careful scrutiny" (Patton, 1980, p. 327). One strategy that was used in this study to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings involved triangulation of qualitative data sources. This method involves comparing and cross-checking the consistency of information derived at different times and by different qualitative research methods. It means

. . . (1) comparing observational data with interview data; (2) comparing what people say in public with what they say in private; (3) checking for the consistency of what people in a situation say about this situation over time; and (4) comparing the perspectives of people from different points of view. (Patton, 1980, p. 331)

All of the above methods of cross-checking were employed in an effort to triangulate all forms of qualitative data gathered through the use of observations, scheduled interviews, and informal discussions with teachers, students, janitors, and others.

Criteria for Interpreting Findings - An Open Work

The description and commentary that constitute this case study are offered as an "open work" and are intended to provide a perspective on the elementary school principal from a moral point of view. This notion of an "open work" is based on the work of Eco.
Furthermore, no claim to the discovery of Truth, in regard to the moral, is made here. While much work and reflection went into this study, it is viewed as an evolving piece of work. Jackson et al., (1993) assert that:

... the process is an evolving one. It is also one that has no proper terminus. We stop reflecting when we become temporarily tired of doing so or when new ideas are no longer forthcoming. But a fresh start on a different day may yield additional insights and someone else may well find food for thought in material that we had given up on. (p. 49)

Without question, the perspective offered here is open to further interpretation. It is hoped that by being an open document the interpretations, conclusions, and impressions described can be enriched.

Ethical Considerations

Before the study began, each principal signed an informed consent document. This document explained that participation in the study was completely voluntary and that participation could be discontinued at any time. Complete confidentiality was guaranteed. Pseudonyms were used in the case study to insure anonymity.

This chapter has laid out the research plan for the present study. In the next chapter each principal will be introduced. A brief description of each school will be presented as well as a discussion of the moral discourse/practice of the principals.
CHAPTER FIVE - - THE PRINCIPALS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

The purpose of this chapter is to briefly discuss the work of principals and to acquaint the reader with each principal and his or her school. Four case studies are presented that tell the stories of Elizabeth Smith and Sullivan Elementary School, Doris Tabor and Princeton Elementary School, Charles Davis and Grant Elementary School, and Bobby Samuel and Vista Elementary School.

Each case study tells a unique story. All four cases, however, are organized similarly to enable readers to make comparisons and contrasts across the studies. Each case study will begin with the following information about each school and each principal: Information regarding what motivated each principal to pursue a principalship, the path he or she took to become a principal, a description of each school setting and student population, and interview data that describes how teachers view their schools and principals.

The second section of each study will present data collected from principal interviews that describe each principal's views on morality. It has been argued that without a "reflecting consciousness" there can be no morality (Hitchcock, 1991, p. 74). It is important, therefore, to explore the ways that principals think about issues of a moral nature. All four principals were asked two general questions: (1) "How would you define morality?" and (2) "Do basic issues of morality have a place in schools?"

The final section examines the work of principals through the lens of Jackson's et al., (1993) taxonomy of moral influence. The discussion in this section is framed by these two related
questions: (1) "In what ways do elementary school principals influence students morally?" and (2) "Do elementary school principals consciously seek to influence students morally? If so, how?" Some of the specific categories of the taxonomy were used to guide observations in the field. They were: visual displays with moral content, moral instruction from the principal, spontaneous interjection of moral commentary, expressive morality around the school, and rituals and ceremonies of a moral nature.

Before each case is presented, a brief discussion about the nature of the student - principal relationship will be presented. Principals generally have little direct contact with students, unlike teachers who have a captive audience. Teachers either have the same group of students all day or they meet with several different groups of students each day. Thus, they have the attention of a whole class for at least an hour a day. Principals, on the other hand, rarely have the attention of the whole school at one time. Some principals address the entire school in the morning during an assembly and some address the student body over the public address (PA) system. One activity that emerged in two of the schools as a regularly occurring ceremony is what I have named the "morning announcement ritual." Each morning the principal got on the PA system and made the morning announcements. At GES and VES students participated by reading either a "Thought for the Day" or a little paragraph about the "Topic of the Week." Typically these thoughts and topics sought to foster attitudes of a moral nature. Consider the following passages from my field notes:

VES - Mr. Samuel:
Mr. Samuel walks to the PA. "Good morning. May we have your attention please?" [he then steps aside to
let the child have the microphone] One child reads the pledge of allegiance. Another child reads the VES school pledge and gives the thought for the day, "The greatest knowledge is the knowledge of God." That was it. Mr. Samuel didn’t have any announcements to make.

GES -- Mr. Davis:
Mr. Davis did the morning announcements. Then he said (to the girl, not into the microphone), "Announcement lady come on down." Then he said into the microphone, "Please stand for the pledge." The student read the pledge and then read the topic of the week: "Choices are made everyday. It is important that we make good choices . . ." When the student was finished, Mr. Davis made a few more announcements.

On another day at GES:

Mr. Davis begins the announcements, "OK boys and girls. Listen to the morning announcements." A student led the pledge and then read the topic of the week: "Setting a good example. We must remember to set a good example when . . ." Then Mr. Davis made a few announcements: "All library books need to come in starting Monday or you will lose your morning recess."

The “Thoughts for the Day” and “Topics of the Week” have moral messages that are easily identified but I wondered why the students rather than the principals read these moral messages. Was the principal hiding behind the student? Would it be more powerful and effective if the principal spoke to the student body about such matters? Perhaps it is better to involve students in this ritual. I am not sure what to make of this ritual. Other than assemblies, the PA system is the only way for the principal to communicate with the entire student body. If the principal intends to influence the students morally it seems that they would take advantage of the PA system - but not one principal in this study did. In fact, two of the schools did morning announcements that contained nothing moral in nature. Consider the following example:
Mrs. Tabor: Bell rang at 8:45. We watched the kids go into the classrooms. Mrs. Tabor waited a few minutes then made announcements over the PA. She speaks very quickly when she does the announcements. "Mrs. Hudson will not be here today. 4-H won a trophy this weekend - congratulations to them. The Talent Show will be May 17. Have a good day!"

In this example, which is representative of most of the morning announcements I observed at PES, nothing of a moral nature can be found. What are we to make of some principals who allow students to read moral messages over the PA and others who don’t? Is there any kind of moral intent going on here at all, in either case? Are the children and teachers in the classrooms even listening? Would it make a difference if the principal took a few minutes each morning to discuss different issues with the children such as the meaning of respect? What if the principal said something like, "Today we will all work on showing respect for our school grounds by picking up any trash we may see. I will be outside to help you at recess." Would communication from the principal to the students be of any consequence? These are difficult questions. I found that the principals never offered moral guidance to the entire student body.

Principals also visit classrooms and speak to individual classes at times, but these encounters are typically short in duration. Most one-on-one interaction that occurs between the elementary school principal and students has to do with the resolution of a rule infraction. In other, words, most of the students that the principal interacts with on an individual basis are in "trouble." This situation is significant to the questions at hand. It begs these questions: "How can a principal be a moral
leader when there is little direct contact between the principal and his or her “followers?” and “Is it necessary that the principal communicate with his or her students if any kind of morally influential activity is to occur?” This condition also makes the way that principals handle discipline problems important.

All four elementary school principals who participated in this study were employed by the same school system and were all on the “drop program,” which means that they could retire at anytime. These four principals are all at similar places in their careers; they can choose to remain in their positions as principal or retire. Bobby Samuel at VES had made the decision to retire after one more year. The other principals all made comments such as, “I could walk out of here tomorrow.” These kinds of comments suggest that these principals are remaining in their positions by choice.

Mrs. Smith - Sullivan Elementary School

Mrs. Smith is a soft spoken woman, in her mid-fifties, who projects a feeling of warmth and concern in her manner. She is an attractive women standing around five feet four inches tall. On most school days she is professionally dressed in a skirt and blazer or dress. She always wears comfortable shoes. Her strawberry blonde hair is cut short and neatly kept. Mrs. Smith is married and has two grown sons. During my visit, her oldest son was going through a difficult divorce. His wife left him with two small children (Renee, 3 years and Michael, 18 months old). Mrs. Smith and her husband helped her son with the children as much as they could and on certain days she was exhausted. When I returned one year later to do a follow-up, I asked her how her grandchildren
were doing. The oldest grandchild, Renee, was having a terrible
time adjusting to the divorce. She was having seizures and the
doctors could not determine the cause. They were beginning to
think that it may be the stress of the divorce that was causing her
problems. In many ways, this experience seemed to strengthen Mrs.
Smith. I heard her say to the faculty at a meeting I attended that,
"I never thought I would be going through this. You all would not
believe what problems at home can do to these children." She was
referring to her granddaughter, Renee.

The outer office of SES is nicely done and projects a feeling of order. The following passage, taken from my fieldnotes, provides
a thick description of the outer office area.

The office is painted a lavender color. The carpet is a
tweed with lavender and gray in it. When you walk in,
there is a small area with a table (checkout forms,
check in forms are on it), two chairs, an aquarium, a
huge Xerox copier. On the counter that separates the
reception area from the secretary's office is a McGruff
dog, two baskets for mail, and a display with pamphlets such as Fetal Alcohol Effects, Divorce in the
Family, etc. There is a large banner on a wall that
says EDUCATING EVERYONE TAKES EVERYONE! Also there is a
framed Acadian Odyssey poster hanging over the
aquarium. There are several well taken care of plants
in the outer office.

The banner that reads, EDUCATING EVERYONE TAKES EVERYONE! turned out to be a theme that ran through the activities at SES. This
banner reflected a belief, held by Mrs. Smith, that parents must be
evened in the education of their children. This was the
reasoning behind Mrs. Smith's practice of calling parents to school
and asking them to sit in the classroom with their children.

In regard to Mrs. Smith's private office I noticed that Mrs.
Smith had several displays in her office that gave some indication
of what she believed to be important.
I noticed the wall in her office. She has several plaques and framed certificates on the wall. One small plaque says, Trust in God, Believe Yourself, Dare to Dream. There is a needlepoint picture that says, The Best Thing You Can Give Your Child Is Time.

Religion seems to play an influential role in the belief system of Mrs. Smith. On more than one occasion, reference was made to her Baptist faith and her Baptist friends. This leads to the question: Does the decorations that people put on their walls send messages to others that reveal their basic beliefs? I believe that they do indeed. It is possible to get some idea of what a principal believes to be important by examining the displays and artifacts in his or her office.

During our interview, Mrs. Smith told me what motivated her to become a principal. Although her parents hoped that she would be a fine arts major, she went into education because that “was what she wanted to do.” Mrs. Smith taught elementary school for 13 years, spent 1 1/2 years on the Instructional Team, and has been the principal at SES for 16 years. When asked how she became a principal she said:

I became very angry with the Governor when he refused to give us a pay raise. I decided if you won’t give me a raise, I will get my own raise. So I decided to go back to graduate school and get my plus 30 in administration.

Mrs. Smith’s determined nature is revealed in this passage. Her will to succeed was observed in other ways as well. In addition to her goal of a raise in pay, Mrs. Smith indicated that her decision to pursue a graduate degree in administration was based on her experiences while working towards a master’s degree in elementary education. She explained this as follows:
While I was in the elementary master’s program, I would get so upset with these teachers that would come to class and tell us that they had no supplies for anything and the horrible working conditions that they were in... I had a wonderful setup. I had anything I wanted. I had a wonderful principal who was supportive, and I did not realize that everyone did not have this. I decided I can make a difference with more children if I move into the administrative role because there’s no reason for things to be that way.

Mrs. Smith apparently received support and inspiration from the principal for whom she worked. She pursued a position in administration because she believed that she could make things better for teachers and children. Mrs. Smith continued to talk about the support she felt from the first principal that she worked for:

I decided that I had worked for this one principal for 11 years in 2 locations and that I had to make a move to see if I could really make it on my own. I wanted to see if I was really as good as the parents and principal told me I was.

So she set out to see if she could make it on her own. This is what happened:

Well, I went out there and I was real successful so I decided, you know I really can make a go [of it] and it’s not the principal that’s pushing me and it’s not just my reputation with the parents there. Then I went on the [instructional] team - but I had always planned on being a principal.

I was offered a job when my oldest was 1 1/2. I would worry to death about my baby and told them no because when my babies are sick I want to be home with them. Not my mama.

At that time in the school system, it seems that service on the Instruction Team was a kind of prerequisite to a principalship. When the principal at SES retired, Mrs. Smith moved into that position and has been there for the last sixteen years.
SES has experienced many changes since Mrs. Smith became principal. At that time, the school was quite large (600-650 students) and the student population was 15% black. Since then the school’s enrollment has dropped to around 400 students and the percentage of black students has risen to 65%. Because the school system strives to be racially balanced, SES no longer accepts black children unless there are some white students to balance them out. The problem arises out of a change in the surrounding neighborhood.

Mrs. Smith explains:

The change in the community has increased our ratio . . . When people sell their homes, white families are moving out and black families are moving in . . . It has also affected the size of the school. The school has gotten much smaller. Today we’re only 398 kids.

SES is a school that is in transition due to the changing demographics of the neighborhood that surrounds the school.

As I drove up to this school for the first time my impression of the neighborhood was that it is a lower-middle class area. What was striking to me, however, was that the school itself is extremely well maintained. The contrast between the condition of the school and the condition of the neighboring homes was significant. As one of the teachers put it, “It’s [SES] one of the best kept secrets in this town.” The following passages, taken from field notes of my observations, provide a description of the school.

This school is well kept. Mrs. Smith said it was her responsibility to either do it or see to it that it gets done. All of the classrooms, halls, lounge, appear to be recently painted. The school looks “cared for.”
I noticed how nice the school yard looks. Pine needles are neatly raked around the trees. The curbs are freshly painted a bright yellow.

Another very good description of the school was provided by a first grade teacher at SES who, at the time of the interview, had been a teacher at the school for nine years:

It's a fairly small school. We have fewer than 500 kids. Some of them are pretty rough inner city kids. We're a real tight faculty as far as people go. A lot of us have been here for 10 years or longer together. Our school, the actual plant, is very clean, well maintained, and we give a nice presentation when people come. People have asked, "Did ya'll clean up for us?" and I say, "No, you're not important enough for us to clean up for. We keep it like this all the time."
It's a wonderful place to work.

As a researcher visiting SES, my observations support the comments made by this teacher. It is an exceptionally well maintained school and all people who work there make an effort to greet visitors.

Due to the subject matter of this project, it is important to get an idea of the way Mrs. Smith conceptualizes the "moral." When asked to define "morality" she said:

Everybody has their own definition. No agency has the same definition of morals . . . I don't know how I would define it. It's one of those things that is very difficult to define.

Mrs. Smith had difficulty finding the words to define "morality." To read her answer one might think that she had not thought too much about morals and morality. But this is not the case. Mrs. Smith exhibits strong conviction in her work and is an active member of a Baptist Church. It is not that Mrs. Smith did not know what "moral" means or that it is not important to her. She simply
could not verbalize a definition when asked. Bellah et al., (1985) found similar situations in their study.

[w]e found them eager to discuss the right way to live, what to teach our children, and what our public and private responsibilities should be, but also a little dismayed by these subjects. These are important matters to those to whom we talked, and yet concern about moral questions is often relegated to the realm of private anxiety, as if it would be awkward or embarrassing to make it public. (p. xi)

Mrs. Smith seemed to struggle with the same issues discussed by Bellah et al.

Mrs. Smith had more to say when asked, "Do basic issues of morality have a place in schools?" She believed that they do as indicated in the following quotation.

Yes, that's why we have the problems we have today because we have taken so much out of the schools as far as moral values -- telling the truth, respecting other people's property and their feelings. We've got a very selfish generation of parents, not so much children as parents. They're interested in what they can get for themselves, no matter how they do it; and they're not very ethical either . . . these children are getting double standards; consequently, I've had to tell them you have a school vocabulary and you have a home vocabulary. At school, there are certain ways that you behave; there's certain rules you follow. You tell me the truth no matter what - under any circumstances, you better tell me the truth. Now that's up to your mother and daddy what to do at home. I'm not trying to undermine them, but there are certain standards that we have here because we're a family and we have to get along and we have to look out for each other and take care of each other and make sure we're all safe.

Mrs. Smith locates part of the problem in the parents. Rather than giving up and saying, "There's nothing we can do with these kids," she does her best to communicate to the children her expectations of honesty, truthfulness, and caring for each other. These qualities (honesty, truthfulness, caring) represent the "stuff" of morality to Mrs. Smith. Her reference to the school as a "family"
suggests that Mrs. Smith, as the principal and head of this family, sets the standards of behavior for the students.

Little direct moral instruction from the principal was observed in the schools that I visited. Mrs. Smith provided an exception, however. One day when I was at SES the Gideon representative, Mr. Patton, came to distribute Bibles to the fifth grade classes. Mrs. Smith introduced us and explained to Mr. Patton what I was doing at the school. He said to Mrs. Smith, “Is she liberal or what?” leading me to believe that he was a little uneasy about my presence. Mrs. Smith escorted and introduced him to each fifth grade class. This is what Mr. Patton said to one of the classes:

I belong to an organization called the Gideons. We try to win others to Christ and we love to give Bibles to fifth graders all over the world. If you think your parents don’t want you to carry it, don’t raise your hand. I want you to do three things with these Bibles: Put your names on it, don’t lose it, and read it.

Mrs. Smith never really said anything to the students about the Bibles except that if they thought that their parents did not want them to have one then they should not take one. On our way back to the office I asked Mr. Patton if he is invited into all of the public schools to distribute Bibles. He said that there are three schools in the school system that will not let the Gideons in. Obviously, this is an accepted practice in most schools in the system.

This is the only instance in which I saw a principal have contact with a whole class in which a moral lesson was delivered. Although her role was minimal she served as a host to Mr. Patton as
well as conveying to the children, by her presence, that she approved of what he was offering them. She did not have to escort him to each classroom. He could have gone alone but her presence sent a moral message to the students.

One theme that emerged from my observations, regards the tendency of principals to rarely deliver direct moral instruction of any kind to students. Mrs. Smith never addressed the entire school about moral matters.

One category, taken from Jackson’s et al., (1993) taxonomy, that provides an interesting lens from which to observe the work of principals is the category called “Spontaneous Interjection of Moral Commentary.” As was mentioned previously, it was discovered that in most cases, principals only interject moral commentary into the handling of discipline problems. Three incidents that illustrate the way that moral commentary was sometimes interjected into the handling of discipline problems at SES will now be discussed. Before these are presented, however, it must be pointed out that Mrs. Smith does not handle every discipline problem in this way. That would be virtually impossible in an elementary school. The circumstances that surround the problem seem to dictate her response.

I will begin with the story of Peter. Peter is an active child who takes medication to help him sit still in school, do his work, and be successful. He has a rather long history of problems. Mrs. Smith told me a little about his background. This is what she shared with me:

The mama is crippled. Mrs. Smith said, “She knows I’m going to look after her and her children”... She then told me how they got Peter on medication. “The
mama wanted to and the Daddy didn’t want to [put him on medication]. The straw that broke the camel’s back was when he slapped a girl in the face. I suspended him. I told his parents that he came back wild. He was just bad. They couldn’t even test him. Just as wild as a March hare."

Peter had obviously been quite a discipline problem at one time. Mrs. Smith seems to take an interest in this child and his family. The suspension probably helped the parents make the decision to try medication. Mrs. Smith’s comment, “She knows that I’m going to look after her and her children,” suggests that a trusting relationship exists between Mrs. Smith and Peter’s mother.

One day as we were working in her office, Peter came to the door. I am not sure why he came. I don’t know if she called for him or if his teacher sent him to the office. When Mrs. Smith saw him she said, “Come here, Peter.” He walked over to her. She told him that she was checking report cards. The following interaction took place between Mrs. Smith and Peter:

Mrs. Smith: What do you think you made?
Peter: A’s.
Mrs. Smith: In conduct?
Peter: A’s.
Mrs. Smith: In work habits?

They begin to look over the report card and discuss it.

Mrs. Smith: ... you brought your F up, huh? How many x’s did you have? The only thing we have to work on for the honor roll is discipline. You almost made the honor roll. What does it mean to practice self discipline?

Mrs. Smith then explained to him what it means to practice self discipline. She said, “There are four things we are going to work on ... When Picadilly comes (to recognize honor roll students) I want Peter to be up there.” She then said, “I wanted to show it to you because I’m proud of you.” From a moral perspective, what are
we to make of this exchange between Peter and Mrs. Smith? Had he not been a discipline problem in the first place, this incident would probably not have occurred. Mrs. Smith seized the opportunity to try to teach Peter about self discipline and then "confirmed" (Noddings, 1992) his improvement by telling him how proud she was of him. What are we to make of this? Does this kind of attention make a difference in the lives of children?

A second story that exemplifies the interjection of moral commentary into the handling of a discipline problem concerns a little boy named Justin. The story began when the P.E. teacher brought him into the guidance counselor's office (where Mrs. Smith and I were talking with the guidance counselor). We found out that Justin hit another child for a pencil. Justin was very upset. Consider the following excerpt paying close attention to the way that the focus moves from the fight eventually to Justin's difficulty in school.

Mrs. Smith said to Justin, "Why did you take the pencil?" (Justin had his head down on the table) "You don't have a pencil? You need money to buy a pencil. How can Mama give you money if she doesn't work. You have to do what to get money?" (just doesn’t answer)

From a moral point of view, what are we to make of this lesson about the importance of working for money? Upon my first reading of this interaction between Justin and Mrs. Smith I wondered if it sounded as if she was being judgmental or even critical of Justin's mother. Since I was there and observed the incident, I know that she was kind to Justin and did not intend to be judgmental or demeaning in any way. I think she was trying to teach Justin that we must work for our money. When I considered Justin’s background
it seemed that this may be a very important lesson for him to learn.

Mrs. Smith then refocused the discussion onto the difficulties that Justin was having doing his work. This is what she said to him:

Is the work hard for you? Are you reading like the other kids? You are having a hard time aren’t you? And we will help you. Does your mother help you? We really have to sit down and talk to Mama if we are going to help you. We may have to make a home visit.

What’s going to happen to you this year in second grade? Do you know? You’re going to have to repeat. We need to get you some help because Justin doesn’t feel good about Justin when he doesn’t do well in school.

Justin was brought in to see Mrs. Smith because he got into a fight with another student. Mrs. Smith’s reaction was surprising. She never reprimanded Justin for fighting. Instead, she interjected a moral lesson about the fact that we must work to get money. She also took the opportunity to express her concern for him, show him that she cared about him, and tell him that she will help him.

From a moral point of view, what does this mean? She most certainly considered Justin’s point of view in the whole matter. If she had handled this problem by giving him a detention and sending him back to class what would have been different? These are interesting questions.

The final incident that will be discussed began when Mr. Wilson came to school to tell Mrs. Smith about an incident that had allegedly occurred the preceding day: Supposedly another child threw his son, Ashton (pre-K) into a garbage can and then put the lid on it. His daughter Ashley told him that this had happened.
This began a whole series of events that became a "search for the truth" more than anything else. Consider the following description of events:

Mrs. Smith responded to Mr. Wilson’s report by saying, “I have to be very careful because Ashley creates all kinds of things and I have to check things out. I will check it out and I will call you and let you know.” Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Wilson continued to talk about Ashley. Ashley told a teacher that morning that her mother was going to have surgery. Mrs. Smith told Mr. Wilson that the teachers at school didn’t know whether or not to believe her because she is known for “carrying tales.” Mr. Smith called Ashton out of class and asked him what happened. He said, “They threwed me away yesterday.” Ashton’s teacher, Mrs. Barry, then came into the office and Mrs. Smith asked her if Ashton got put in a trash can yesterday. Mrs. Barry says, “No. That did not happen here. Mr. Wilson, I can’t believe any of your children.”

Mrs. Smith, even after questioning the teacher, was still not satisfied. She decided that maybe we should ask Armond (the older brother) what happened. When Armond came into her office this is what happened:

Mrs. Smith said, “Armond, tell me about Ashton being put in the trash can. Put your book sack down and get your hands out of your face. I want to see your eyes.” She then folded her arms and stared at Ashton.

Mrs. Smith was determined to find out the truth. By folding her arms and staring into Ashton’s eyes she sent a very strong message to him: “You better tell me the truth.” She decided to go find the trash can that Ashton got “thowed away” in. We all marched out of the office to find it. As we were all leaving the office, Mrs. Smith said, “Are you telling me the truth? You better not be lying to me. Come this way, I’m going to check it out.” We went to the “trash can” and looked at it. Mrs. Smith said to Mr. Wilson, “There are no lids on the barrels.” She then continued:
When they holler wolf and not even tell an adult at school. I'll keep checking on this. I'm not going to drop it. First of all I want to know if it happened. They I want to know if they are being truthful with us. These kids have got to learn to tell the truth. We need to get to the bottom of this -- so we can get somebody some help. I don't know what's going on Mr. Wilson.

Mrs. Smith then assured Mr. Wilson that she would call him when she "got to the bottom of this" and he left.

Later that same day, we did some more detective work about the trash can incident -- we checked with teachers who were on duty and checked with other children supposedly involved. Mrs. Smith spent a great deal of time dealing with this situation. Finally we called Ashley, Ashton, and Armond to the guidance counselor's office. It was an interrogation of sorts. This is what happened:

Mrs. Smith (in front of Ashley and Armond): Ashton, what happened to you at school yesterday?
Ashton: Nothing
Mrs. Smith: Who threw you away? (Ashton points to Ashley)
Ashley: Don't lie.
Mrs. Smith: Somebody here is not telling the truth. We have a real problem. We've got some people here who are not telling the truth.

At this point, Mrs. Smith had to leave to go do an observation. We left the children with the guidance counselor.

What are we to make of Mrs. Smith's reaction to Mr. Wilson's allegations? She was determined not only to find the truth but to "get help" for the individual who did not tell the truth. I got the impression that Mr. Wilson and his children have a long history with Mrs. Smith. Perhaps this explains her reaction. This is an interesting case because Mrs. Smith could have easily dropped the whole issue after talking with the teacher. What message does her
actions send to Mr. Wilson? Ashley, Aston, and Armond? the
teacher? To my way of thinking the message is: "You better be
honest and tell the truth at this school."

These three examples presented all illustrate the way Mrs.
Smith interjected moral commentary into the way that she handled
Peter, Justin, and the Wilsons. Issues of self discipline, the
value of hard work, and the importance of truthfulness and honesty
all became the focal point of Mrs. Smith's discussions with these
children.

There are other examples of gestures and action taken by Mrs.
Smith that can be interpreted expressively. Jackson et al., (1993)
argue that "expressive morality includes but is not limited to the
range of facial expressions and gestures of teachers and the moral
messages they convey" (p. 32). The following story was relayed to
me by Mrs. Smith. It concerns two students who used to come to
school smelling very badly.

Mrs. Smith said that she'd call their grandmother and
say, "Anna Belle, your kids smell and I'm bringing them
home. You've got to keep those kids clean. You're
putting them in a bad situation because nobody wants to
sit by 'em." Then she said that she told those kids,
"This is what I'll do so you kids won't be embarrassed.
Every morning you come in my office (you don't have to
tell anyone why you are coming) and give me a hug and
if you smell bad I'll send you home." She said that
they came in every morning and gave her a hug.

From a moral perspective, this gesture of a hug unquestionably
conveys to these children "care." My experience with Mrs. Smith at
SES convinced me that a principal can affect the moral atmosphere
of an elementary school. By performing these kinds of gestures
through the years Mrs. Smith has created a school in which kindness
and respect for others has become the norm. This "trickle down and
around effect" seems to take many years to make a difference in a school.

Mr. Davis - Grant Elementary School

Mr. Davis is a friendly man who is easy to talk with. He is always on the move, seeing to the details of running his school with enthusiasm. Mr. Davis is a big man, physically fit, standing about six feet 3 inches tall. Usually he is dressed casually in khaki pants and a knit shirt. He's the kind of man that, when he holds a can of diet coke -- the can looks unusually small. Mr. Davis is married and has two children in college. He spoke of his son more often than his daughter. His wife is a teacher at a private Baptist school.

As I walked into the office at GES, I experienced a feeling of "crowdedness."

The office at GES is rather small. As you walk into it there is a small waiting area. There are a few pictures on the wall of pastures and country roads but nothing of a moral nature. The secretary's desk is located behind a counter. To get to Mr. Davis' you have to walk behind the counter and through the secretary's area. There are very few "visual displays with a moral content" to be found in this office. Mr. Davis has several plaques on his wall that recognize his service to the Eagle Scouts and he has a copy of the Bible sitting on his desk.

The Eagle Scout plaques and the Bible reveal important things about Mr. Davis. His experience in the Scouts has had a tremendous influence in his life. In terms of the Bible, he attends the Baptist church and made reference to the fact that he was taking a week off in the summer to chaperone a Church Camp. Anyone who takes time off from work to chaperone a Church camp is probably quite active in the Church. Does a Bible sitting on a principals desk send a moral message to all those who see it? I made some
I assumed that he believed in what it said, that he read it, and that it was a part of his life. It seems that there is a relationship between the visual displays and artifacts found in a principal's office and his or her basic beliefs.

During my interview with Mr. Davis, we discussed his path to the principalship. He has been the principal at GES for 18 years. Mr. Davis said that he got into education through scout work. He was an eagle scout, a junior camp counselor, and finally a counselor.

I just had a knack for it I guess . . . Fooling with kids and I liked it . . . And, it's not work. It's more of a game to me. I know that sounds pretty silly but it is . . . it's something I like.

Mr. Davis got into education for the simple reason that he enjoys working with children. Like Mrs. Smith, Mr. Davis also worked for a principal who played an influential role in his career.

When I finally finished [school] and started teaching, I was lucky enough to work for a little lady that was probably one of the, outside of my mother and father, probably the biggest influence in my life as a principal.

This principal began encouraging Mr. Davis to become a principal very early in his teaching career. She taught him to fill out annual reports and convinced him to go to graduate school. Without her influence Mr. Davis says that he would have remained a teacher. "I would have stayed in education but I probably would have been working in camps over the summers." Mr. Davis worked for this principal for six years until she retired. He eventually left that school to work for another principal who wanted him to run the
sports program at his school. Mr. Davis seems to go the extra mile for children. Consider his comments about the years he spent running the Junior Sports program.

So I inherited the program . . . not because I liked it but because the kids were upset about not having football, basketball, and track. So I would up in that and we had a big school . . . 600 or 700 kids back then. We started a girls softball and a girls track team and it was really stupid 'cause we were making $325.00 a year. That was your stipend? Yea. And all we had to do was football, basketball, and track. And we added softball and track for the girls so we wound up doing five teams when we only had to do three.

Mr. Davis worked with the Junior Sports program until the principalship opened at GES, at which time he went to his principal and said, "I want to get that school." Mr. Davis was not interested in the principalship at just any school for he feels that the fit between the principal and the community is important. Mr. Davis aggressively sought the principalship at GES. Consider the following:

I called the school board member. Real old man . . . nice fella . . . he had been a school board member for 30 or 40 years out in this area. I just went to his house one afternoon . . . and I just told him I know that community and I know they type of people who are there and I think I can work there. I grew up in an area with that type of people . . . mostly blue collar workers, shift workers, plant workers, I said I can work with 'em. He said we have 5 other openings coming up this summer. Would you take one of them? I said, I won't take any of them. I'd rather stay where I am until something I feel like I can fit into and work with properly [comes open]. That's one I think I can work with.

Mr. Davis got the principalship at GES. His determination and insistence that he be assigned a school in which he felt that he could succeed reveals a great deal of wisdom. Mr. Davis was not as much interested in becoming a principal as he was in becoming a
successful principal. He knew that to be a good principal he had to be able to work with the people in the community. At the time he became principal, he had 9½ years of experience as a teacher and 2½ years of experience as a guidance counselor.

As I drove up to GES, I noticed how nice the school yard looked. I have visited many schools, and it is interesting how a well kept school yard stands out. It is a relatively rare occurrence that school yards look exceptionally nice. I wondered if a well kept school yard has any relationship to the amount of pride felt among the members of the school community. The following comments, taken from my field notes, will provide some idea of my impression of the school:

I noticed that the campus has beautiful trees growing everywhere. Mr. Davis said that every Arbor Day he used to take out each class and they would plant a tree. Now they have so many trees that he's going to have to drop down to maybe one tree a year.

An interesting point, and one that reveals a lot about Mr. Davis, is that each class didn't just go out with their teacher and plant a tree on Arbor Day. Mr. Davis took them out and he planted the tree with them. He is a very hands-on principal who is not afraid to get his hands dirty.

GES also has an outside science center. It has a pond, gardens, weather station, a sun dial, two rabbits (one black and one white), and minnows. It is very impressive. Mr. Davis got the Boy Scouts to dig out the pond one summer. He seems very involved in the care and upkeep of the outside science center. He plans to buy some picnic tables for the science center so the teachers can have class outside.
In terms of the student population, Mr. Davis says that "with redesign the students come to GES from all over the parish." Fifty percent of the students come from the surrounding neighborhood and fifty percent are bussed in. Consider the following description of the school by the guidance counselor.

It's a mixture. We have kids who come from low socioeconomic, we have kids from middle socioeconomic situations. As far as race wise, we're about 50-50 pretty much. We have about 480 kids and they are pretty well disciplined because we believe in a pretty disciplined policy. We have a school-wide discipline policy and all teachers follow through with this, so therefore the climate is positive and the kids know what they're supposed to be doing. They're in the classroom; they're not roaming around; it's just a good situation.

My impression of this school is that Mr. Davis is very involved in every aspect of the school and is a hard worker. For example, he told me that in the summer he comes to school to mow the grass on Sundays because the grass grows so fast in the summer.

Mr. Davis, like Mrs. Smith had difficulty finding the words to discuss his notion of concepts such as "morals" or "morality." When I asked him, "How would you define morality?" he said, "Middle class, Christian morality. I don't know." Although he could not provide a concise definition of the term, he had strong beliefs about the subject. He, like all of the principals, had more to say when asked, "Do basic issues of morality have a place in schools?"

Oh yea! You can't run a school without that. And that's why some schools have more trouble than others. You've got to have respect and ethics. You've got to respect the rights of others. You've got to have honesty and decency. I don't like to label myself. I guess middle class knot-head. I don't know. I made a statement one year. A radio station was recognizing teacher week or something and someone had nominated one of our teachers and they . . . wanted to interview me and wanted to know why I considered her an outstanding
teacher. And I said, "She's a fine Christian lady." And it was just a big dead [pause]. He [had] taped it and he played it back. He said something like . . . "I've never heard that before" and I said, "Well, that's a shame." And he said, "What do you mean?" I said, "Well, she's a Christian. She's a loving, caring person who feels for every individual. And she treats them all alike and she's very honest and open. She's not ugly to anybody and she doesn't expect anyone to be ugly to her or to anyone else in her room." And I said if every class was like that and every school was like that -- we wouldn't have any problems . . . that's one of the things we try to teach them - how to respect the rights of one another and I guess that's ethics, morality . . .

In one sense, Mr. Davis views basic issues of morality in schools instrumentally. In other words, morals are needed to run a school much like tax dollars. He equates morality with the respect for the rights of others and he protects the rights of his students by providing strict discipline in his school, assuring that all children will have an opportunity to learn.

Rituals and ceremonies were found to be morally influential by Jackson et al., (1993) because of "the attitude they sought to engender" (p. ). I had the opportunity to visit GES on the day of the DARE graduation. DARE is a drug prevention program sponsored by the Sheriff's department that teaches kids to make good choices. Mr. Davis was wearing his DARE graduation t shirt when I arrived and I later found out that the students also had to wear their shirts or they could not have refreshments. What are we to make of this requirement? Does this mean that Mr. Davis believes so strongly in the purpose of the DARE program that he insists that the students participate fully? This principal was extremely involved in seeing to it that the program went well. Consider the following excerpt from my field notes that illustrates the degree of Mr. Davis' involvement:
We discussed the DARE graduation. Mr. Davis said that he ordered the cakes from SAMS. Then he said, "All we need now is something to drink. We have three punch bowls and now three ladles because I bought some new ladies. I typed up the agenda like the other one -- it's on the computer.

Mr. Davis was involved in the preparation of the auditorium for the graduation and I could tell that he really wanted it to be nice for the children. The auditorium was set up very nicely. They had chairs set up for the parents, a podium placed on the stage, a DARE poster on the stage, and plants lined up along the front of the stage. It was obvious that a lot of work had gone into decorating the auditorium for the graduation.

Mr. Davis and I stood and looked at the auditorium. Mr. Davis said they should have gotten more plants. He thought the stage looked skimpy. "Oh yea. I have to rearrange those buckets. I don't like the way they look." (They had two buckets with poles in them to hold up the DARE banner.) He went on the stage to rearrange them. I thought the stage looked very nice. You could tell that a lot work went into this celebration.

Mr. Davis worked very hard on this program. Did he do it because he cares about the kids and he believes in the DARE program or did he do it because the Sheriff was coming to the program? Did the active role that he took in the production of the program send any kind of moral message to the students? My view is that he wanted the graduation to be nice for the children because he believes strongly in the message of the DARE program which is to stay off drugs.

As mentioned previously, most interactions between principals and students occur with students sent to the office to be disciplined. It is interesting to analyze the way that principals handles these kinds of situations. Mrs. Smith often took the
opportunity to try to teach the children a moral lesson. Mr. Davis handles discipline problems differently -- in ways that emphasize obedience to rules and regulations. The following excerpt illustrates this comment.

This incident involves two kindergarten boys who had been sent to the office several times in one day. The teacher brought them into the office and gave the secretary a note which she promptly delivered to Mr. Davis at his desk. Mr. Davis read the note and the following ensued:

"Throwing rocks? That's ridiculous - the teacher can't be making 'em sit down." Mr. Davis then looked up the discipline cards on these two kindergarten students. He found that both sets of parents had signed the card giving their permission to Mr. Davis to paddle their children. Mr. Davis said, "I guess I'm going to have to do this for the rest of them if not for them."

Mr. Davis wrote something on their cards, got his paddle, and walked into the outer office where the two boys were sitting. He said to the boys, "Let's go. Ya'll forgot about these cards that your Daddy's signed. What happened to your eye (to one of the boys)?" He looked at it very closely. We all walked to the classroom. Mr. Davis then said to the boys, "How many of these is it going to take for you to understand that you have to listen? You didn't tell the truth did you?" He brought the boys right by the classroom door so the other kids would be sure to hear what was going on. He then made the boys bend over and he stood right behind them. He put his hands around the first boy's neck and leaned down and said something right into his ear. Then Mr. Davis paddled his own leg. He scared the boys to death and then sent them back into the classroom.

This passage sounds like something a prison guard would do to prisoners. We see that Mr. Davis felt that it was important to use these two boys as examples for the others. From a moral perspective, this offers a contrast to Mrs. Smith who tended to focus on the children who were in trouble, rather than the other
students. Mr. Davis believes strongly that children must behave in order to learn and that it is not fair for any student to infringe on the right of others to learn. He does whatever is necessary to ensure good discipline in his school. The incident described above was not the last time that Mr. Davis saw these two little boys that day. Consider the following:

Mr. Davis is given a note. It is from the kindergarten teacher about the same two boys. Mr. Davis reads the notes and then says, "That didn't last long." He got his paddle and we went back to the kindergarten classroom and got the two boys out of class. Mr. Davis said to them, "We're not fooling around this time. Bend over." He gave each little boy three licks."

Mr. Davis is determined to prevail. I found out the next day that one of the boys had been sent to him for the third time the previous day and Mr. Davis had paddled him again. In reference to this Mr. Davis said that he felt that something was wrong and had sent a note home. Mr. Davis says he usually only has to paddle one time and then the student's behavior improves. From a moral perspective, this type of discipline seems to rely heavily on external control rather than self discipline. Mr. Davis, however, may be doing the only thing that he can do to create a school in which learning can take place. But what does paddling children teach them?

Mr. Samuel -- Vista Elementary School

Mr. Samuel, principal of Vista Elementary School, is a very kind man who laughs a lot. He is a short man standing about five feet six inches tall. His hair is gray and he is a bit bald on the top of his head. Mr. Samuel typically wears knit pants, a dress shirt, and a VES wind breaker to school. The father of three grown children, he is married to a retired teacher and appears to be a
"family man." His daughter, Mary, sends her two children to VES so she was in and out quite often. On teacher appreciation day she left a card for him on his desk. When he came into his office, he picked up the note, read it and said, "What a nice surprise. To my all time favorite teacher. How do you like that? It's from my daughter Mary. I taught her in the sixth grade twenty-four years ago. I'm going to get teary eyed here this morning." Mr. Samuel seems to have a good relationship with his children and grandchildren. His wife retired from teaching at a private Baptist school.

It is confusing when you walk into the office at VES. As you walk in the secretary's desk is located to the left behind a long counter. Teachers mailboxes are to the right. Mr. Samuel's office is located way down the hall which is unusual. Typically the secretary and the principal's offices are in close proximity. Consider the following description, taken from my fieldnotes, of the outer area of the office.

As you walk into the office there is a sitting area with two chairs and a table with a lamp on it in between them. Displayed over the chairs are two large portraits of the former principals of the school. I wasn't sure what to make of these portraits. I finally decided that they represented a display of gratitude and respect to these two principals. Also posted on the wall is the architect's proposed drawing of the school.

Mr. Samuel's office was not decorated at all. There were two "almost dead" plants on the counter and three dirty coffee cups by the sink. The rug was badly worn and there were no curtains on the windows. What are we to make of this? The teachers' lounge, on the other hand, was furnished with the kind of furniture that people have in their homes rather than the avocado Danish modern
furniture usually found in teachers' lounges. There were two nice sofas, two rocking recliners, two lamps, and a coffee table. I made a comment about how nice the teachers' lounge looked. Mr. Samuel said,

A woman principal took my place for one year while I was on sabbatical. You know how women are. They want things to look nice. They got all this furniture from an auction. See this office [referring to his private office] -- Next year it will have curtains and all. I don't care.

I found this to be an interesting comment. Mr. Samuel said that he "did not care" and I believe this to be true. The question that occurred to me was how much does he not care about? Does he just not care about the way his office "looks" or does he not care about other important things like instruction, for example?

Very few visual displays of a moral content were found in the principal's office or the outer office area. What are we to make of this absence? Is it symbolic of the principals' lack of attention given to moral issues? These are interesting questions that should be pondered. It seems that Mr. Samuel does not care about these things. He considers decorating and making things look nice feminine activities.

Mr. Samuel, like the other principals in this study, is in the school system's drop program and plans definitely to retire at the end of the 95-96 school year. According to Mr. Samuel, there are three kinds of principals: "Good" principals, "mediocre" principals, and "drop" principals. He is a self proclaimed "drop" principal and has been a principal for 22 years in two different schools. Most of his years as a principal have been at VES. Unlike the other principals, Mr. Samuel had a variety of experiences in
the working world before entering education. He worked several years on construction jobs and as a lineman climbing poles. He decided to go to college on the G.I. Bill and try teaching because his wife seemed to enjoy it. These reasons for entering the teaching profession seem to lack passion, although Mr. Samuel seems to like children genuinely. Mr. Samuel described his initial interest in the field of education as follows:

I was considered a Korean veteran so I went on the G.I. Bill and my wife supported it [the decision] because she was teaching at the time. . . . I really enjoyed teaching. I think it's a good thing to do. . . . every job you have is aggravating and I know that because I've been on different jobs.

Mr. Samuel taught the sixth grade for ten years and then became a principal. When asked how he became a principal Mr. Samuel said that:

Once I started teaching I wanted to become a principal or a supervisor basically because I needed the money, you know. And it does give you a chance to make some decisions and to offer leadership and play a leadership role. . . . and . . . to have an influence in how children are taught.

Apparently when Mr. Samuel was ready, he was promptly moved into a principalship in the system. He did not mention a mentor or time spent on the Instructional Team. The motivation to become a principal (or supervisor) seems to have been primarily financial. At least, this is the only reason that he gave for aspiring to become a principal.

The student population at VES is made up of students from all over the parish. Mr. Samuel describes the effects of redesign on VES as follows:
The cluster assigned a lot of black [kids] here which we didn’t have before. What happened was that the balance started going predominantly black and it was up to 70% almost 80% black because there weren’t any white kids in the neighborhood. So the redesign program allowed us to bring in enough white kids to balance it out to 50%. I guess the neighborhood is still an affluent area but we draw kids from areas that are not affluent . . . The white kids come from everywhere and the black kids too.

Most of the residents in the surrounding neighborhood have grown older so there are few children from this neighborhood attending VES. Therefore, the majority of children attending this school are bussed in from all over the parish. Children come and they go and this situation invariably impacts the sense of community within VES.

The following description of VES by a third grade teacher with 11 total years of experience and 4 years at VES is offered to help the reader get some idea of what this school is like:

I don’t know. It’s a friendly place. I mean everybody works together real well. Most of the teachers here have been here for many years and a lot of them have children who went to school here so they have been here a long time. It’s sort of an older faculty that is looking toward retirement. So most of it is straight instruction from the textbook and not a lot of hands on kind of stuff but we do have some younger teachers coming in filling vacancies that are doing more of these kinds of things . . . We do get a lot of kids bussed in because this is an older neighborhood and there aren’t a lot of children living here so in that way it’s kind of unique. There are no children in this neighborhood really.

Generally speaking, my impression of VES is in agreement with the description provided by this teacher. The teachers were friendly to each other, however, I never felt that they were very friendly to me, as a researcher. They seemed to be intimidated by my
presence. Most of the teachers are older and they do seem to prefer to stick to the textbook rather than trying new ideas.

Mr. Samuel and I discussed his view of "morality" in my interview with him. I asked him the same question that I asked the other three principals, "How would you define moral or morality?"

He thought for a moment and then said:

Morality. It's the standards by which most of the people in a particular community live. But uh . . . morality . . . and that's a good question here because we have different standards. We have people who have real high standards coming to this school and we have some with hardly no standards. And we have some with a lot of parental guidance and then some with almost no parental guidance . . . But the morality . . . you've got to have some things in common. Like you don't cuss out your teacher. That should be common to everybody . . . But morality is what's acceptable to most people in that community. But it makes it a little bit harder in a school like this.

Mr. Samuel views morality as a set of beliefs that are shared by all members of a community. He views diversity as a problem, particularly in his school. He had more to say when asked, "Do basic issues of morality have a place in schools?"

Oh. I think so. I think you can get some common ground. I think there's some things you can agree on. Like I said, you don't kill anyone at school, you don't bring a knife to school, you don't violate established parish policy. That's pretty general . . . so those common things . . . when you get past those stated things then you have to be careful cuz you don't want to . . . uh . . . it may not be bad for some things to happen . . . what I'm saying is . . . you do have parameters you can work in though. You do have some things . . . some things are just wrong to do. It is wrong to cuss somebody out. It is wrong to just badger a teacher until you get 'em mad or something but I think that's wrong. There's some common ground. You can't agree on everything but there is some common ground. You can hear 'em say well whose standards are you talking about but there's some standard things that people shouldn't do.
Mr. Samuel believes that there is some common ground upon which we can all agree on certain moral issues. When he says basic he means basic. Certainly we can all agree that we should not kill anyone at school but are there other moral beliefs that can be agreed upon that have more substance -- moral beliefs that govern things we should do as a people rather than just things we shouldn't do? Mr. Samuel dwells on the should nots. This tendency, to emphasize what students should not do rather than suggesting what they should do, seems to be common among principals and raises the question: Does any substantive moral guidance occur when school only stress the things that students should not do?

Mr. Samuel seems hesitant to take moral stands in a public school for fear of unpleasant consequences. In his answer he discusses some of the common moral beliefs that we all share and then goes on to say, "... when you get past those stated things, then you have to be careful cuz you don't want to ... uh ... it may not be bad for some things to happen ..." Mr. Samuel represents the effort that public schools have sustained in trying to remain value-neutral. He is comfortable enforcing written parish policy but seems hesitant to move beyond a written code of conduct.

Jackson's et al. (1993) category of "spontaneous interjection of moral commentary" provided an interesting lens from which to peer into the daily activities of Mr. Samuel. I did not observe any interactions with students that could be described as having a moral thrust. A very close analysis of the discipline problems that were handled by Mr. Samuel also yielded nothing of an overt moral nature. Mr. Samuel typically asked that I leave the
office when he handled discipline problems so I was not able to observe many cases. What follows are three descriptions of the way that discipline is handled at VES that will provide a contrast to the ways that discipline was handled by Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Tabor. In each case the students are virtually invisible. Consider the following:

During recess Mr. Samuel and I were sitting in his office and a teacher came into his office with a "whole new batch of bus reports." Mr. Samuel and the teacher looked over the discipline reports. Mr. Samuel said, "What do you want to do with 'em?" The teacher said, "Throw 'em off." They talked about the students who were causing the trouble as they went through each bus report. The teacher said things like, "This is about the 52nd time," "This is a habitual offender. She mouths off to me everyday in line to the bus." Mr. Samuel gets two forms out of his desk drawer to suspend two children off of the bus. He then said to the teacher, "I'm going to sign them [the suspension forms] and you can fill in the dates." The teacher asks, "How many days?" Mr. Samuel answers, "Two or three."

Mr. Samuel goes through the stack of bus reports again. As he flips through them he says, "Clinic. Off the bus."

From a moral point of view, what are we to make of the way that Mr. Samuel handled these students? There was no contact between Mr. Samuel and the students. They were represented by pieces of paper. Would it had made a difference if he had called them to his office and talked to them? There was no effort on the part of Mr. Samuel to try to influence these students morally. Whenever possible, Mr. Samuel seems to choose the path of least resitence.

The second incident that will be discussed happened one day as Mr. Samuel was leaving to go home for lunch (which he did everyday). As he was getting ready to leave, a teacher brought in a student. The teacher was clearly upset. Mr. Samuel is very soft
spoken so I did not hear what he was saying. The following excerpt from my field notes describes what I saw:

I don’t know what Mr. Samuels was saying to the boy but he had him by the shirt collar. Mr. Samuels had both hands pulling his shirt up towards his neck. The boy said, "Leave my clothes alone!" I could not hear what was going on and did not want to move closer into Mr. Samuels’s office because he had been so funny about me being around when he handled discipline problems. I decided to take a walk.

When I came back to his office, Mr. Samuel had gone home for lunch. When he returned he told me that he had to put the boy up for expulsion and said, "There’s nothing you can do with a kid like that." We talked some more:

Mr. Samuel looked at his watch and said, "It’s only 2:10. Something like that [discipline problem] will just ruin your day." I asked him if he had talked to the parents. He said that he had talked to the Grandmother, Grandfather, and Mother. I asked if the boy had gone home. Mr. Samuel said, "I don’t know if he went home or not. If not, we’ll send him on the bus."

Apparently, Mr. Samuel had given up on this particular child. He was clearly upset about the incident. I thought it strange that Mr. Samuel did not know if the boy had been sent home.

The third and final incident that will be presented involved a boy named Marcus. Consider the following excerpt from my field notes:

A teacher came into Mr. Samuels office to tell him that Marcus was walking around the building. We got up and left the office to go see about Marcus. We met up with Bryce, the janitor. I guess he knew that we were looking for Marcus because he yelled, "Marcus! Hey Marcus! Mr. Samuels wants you!" Marcus was standing by the kindergarten classrooms. Mr. Samuels and I walked up to him and Mrs. Samuels said, "You either go back to class or you go home. You make up your mind." We escorted Marcus back to the auditorium where his class was and went back to Mr. Samuel’s office.
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When we get back to the office Mr. Samuels calls Marcus' mother. He said, "Mrs. Jones, we're having a problem with Marcus walking around the school so I'm going to send him home. Yea. The teachers can't do anything with him." When Mr. Samuels gets off the phone he says that he will get Bryce, the janitor to bring Marcus home.

What are we to make of this episode between Marcus and Mr. Samuels? I first thought it odd that Mr. Samuels just sent him home. He didn't spend much time with Marcus. I found out later, however, that Mr. Samuels and Marcus' mother had an agreement. Marcus has been suspended twice already so once more and he would be up for expulsion. Rather than kick him out of school, Mr. Samuels just sends him home for the day. Nothing is formally written down. Mr. Samuels is trying to help Marcus by protecting him from expulsion but what kind of moral message does this send to Marcus? Is this really helping him? Does Marcus feel cared for? It seemed to me that Mr. Samuels wanted to help the student but only in a way that required the least amount of effort on his part.

In summary, Mr. Samuels did not have much contact with students that were being disciplined. He did not interject moral commentary into his encounters with students. He just "handled" the problem.

The gestures and expressions of principals are important because they convey a moral message (Jackson et al., 1993) One way to think of gestures of principals is to consider the overall "presence" of the principal. For example, Mr. Davis is everywhere all the time at his school. He wipes cafeteria tables, fills the ice cream machine, paddles children at the end of recess, and gives
Special Education students the “high five” when he sees them. What does all of this mean in terms of moral meaning? Does it show them that he cares for them? Mr. Samuel, on the other hand, is hardly visible at all. Take for example the following comments made by Mr. Samuel:

We are sitting in his office and Mrs. Samuels says, “It’s recess now. If we can make it through this time with no discipline problems we’ll be doing good.”

“Let’s go take a little walk through the fourth and fifth grades. I don’t really want to go in a classroom. We’ll just walk around.” We walked down the hall and he said, “[w]ell everything is quiet today.”

What does the absence of Mr. Samuels around the school express to the students morally? Maybe nothing. When this kind of absence is contrasted to a principal who has a “presence,” however, it raises some questions.

Mrs. Tabor - - Princeton Elementary School

Mrs. Tabor is a humorous woman who loves to talk. She has a quick wit so one must listen carefully to what she says. I got the impression that the teachers enjoy talking with her. Mrs. Tabor is in her early sixties, stands about five feet four inches tall, and has silver hair. Some days she was dressed very professionally and other days more casually. Mrs. Tabor’s husband passed away a year ago. The mother of nine children, she has a large family to rely on.

The office is located right at the entrance to the school. As you walk through the front doors you are standing in the lobby. This lobby area is described as follows:

As you walk in there are two bulletin boards (one on the left and one on the right). On this particular day
they were both blank. There are two smaller bulletin boards too. One has bus schedules and the other has a poster with presidential challenges on it. There is a sign over the office window that says: PES Where Children Are Treasures. To the right of the office door is a very pretty mural of Louisiana painted on the wall. Cypress trees, agricultural products, etc. Nicely done. On the wall to the left as you walk into the school and in between two classrooms is a large mural painted on a bed sheet that says, PES Don’t Take The Bait You Might Get Hooked urging students not to get hooked on drugs.

The visual displays described here are located right outside of the secretary’s office and are visible as you walk into the school. One display urged students to stay off drugs and the other conveyed the feeling that children are valued at this particular school. Both displays have a moral content. Do these kinds of displays make a difference in schools? Who is responsible for creating these displays? Did Mrs. Tabor ask someone to put them up or did a teacher voluntarily put them up?

Mrs. Tabor began her college career as a math major. Upon her fiancé's return from the service in Korea, Mrs. Tabor got married and switched her major to elementary education.

To be honest with ‘ya it was because it was easier. I love math but I kind of knew I like to work with young children.

Mrs. Tabor had nine children and stayed at home with them while attending LSU on a part time basis. She describes this time in her life as follows:

Anyway, I had nine children. So I was in and out of school during all of those births and I did not work for 18 years after we married . . . Well, anyway, when my youngest child started kindergarten I went back to school . . . got my teaching certificate, and started teaching. At that point I was 34 or 35 years old.
Prior to her first teaching assignment, Mrs. Tabor says that she did all of her student teaching in an all white professional public school and had done some substitute teaching in the Catholic schools "but just as a favor to the good sisters." Then, she says, they sent her to Dudley Elementary School to be a sixth grade teacher.

I had 38 black kids and I had never taught a black child. I had never taught a child who was reading below level and I had a lot of kids in that class who couldn't read. It was interesting because it showed me when you're working with high risk kids, whether they're black or white, it has to do with economic and educational background as much as race. You either can do it or you can't do it. If you can do it you can get better - if you can't do it you might as well go find something else to do. That's the way I feel about it. Obviously I could do it. But I knew I had to go back to school so I immediately went back to graduate school because I didn't know how to teach reading. I'd never had to teach reading -- who ever heard of teaching sixth graders to read?

She got her degree in reading, stayed in the classroom for a few more years and was then asked to apply for a reading position as a helping teacher. She worked on the Instructional Team for 3 years and was encouraged to return to school to get the certification required to become an elementary school principal.

Well, my supervisor and my boss wanted me to go back and pick up the required administrative things, which I did as a plus 30. As soon as I got finished, they appointed me principal and I've been a principal since, then which has been 17 years. Something like that.

Mrs. Tabor, unlike the other principals, was the principal of several different schools before settling in at PES. She filled in for the principal at PES for one year (the year that the teachers went on strike) and then went to Madison Elementary and then to
Rheem Elementary. She returned to PES in 1987 and has been the principal since that year.

PES is about 21 years old and is situated within a subdivision in transition. Mrs. Tabor describes the neighborhood as follows:

This used to be a white middle class neighborhood . . . This subdivision is an aging subdivision in terms of its white residents. Their children are grown and as the older people have either died or moved on . . . . they have sold their houses to mostly minorities. So this neighborhood is in the process of transition — middle class black school teachers, people who work for the state, very well maintained homes, active civic association. But we don’t pull very many kids from this neighborhood to this school — I probably have 50 or 60 children out of three hundred.

PES is located within a middle class neighborhood but very few of the students live in this neighborhood. Thus, we have another instance in which the students are bussed in from all over the parish. Again, this has implications for the sense of community within this school.

The general appearance of the outside of this school can be described as average. The yard was mowed but not manicured. There was a flag pole but no flag. My initial impression as I drove up was that the school was not run down nor were the grounds exceptionally maintained or “cared for.” It looked okay. I had seen better, and I had seen worse. The inside of this school is nice. Everything is inside. All of the classrooms are built around the cafeteria and auditorium. At one time, each school in the system had an “enhancement” designed to attract children to the school as a way to desegregate the system. Art was the “enhancement” at PES so there is more artwork found in this school than is typically
found in schools. For example, as you walk in there is a large agricultural map of the state painted on the wall. In the cafeteria there is a beautiful mural painted on all four walls.

When asked to describe your school, a third grade teacher with 8 years of experience at PES responded as follows:

I think it’s one of the better schools we have here in the system. The students are somewhat on a moderate level. The faculty here is cooperative. We have a very good administrator and support here. I would give it a B. In terms of administration, as I said before, the administration is supportive. With teachers, the students are not as well behaved as you would like and of course we are getting bogged down with paperwork . . . But for the most part I enjoy it. The kids are learning. Of course they can really test your spirit.

Mrs. Tabor has interesting views regarding schools and “morality.” When I asked her to “define morals or morality,” she said:

I think it’s just a person’s ability to treat [other] human beings and themselves with respect. And to have developed some sense of impropriety (I don’t know it that’s the right word) . . . you want people to do the right thing. I think if people are, children, adults, are doing the right thing, as they perceive it, then you’d be in good shape. Most of the time, my experience is, most people know what that means. And I’ll say, “Do you know what it means to do the right thing?” and they’ll say “Yes Ma’am.” [and I’ll say] “Well, then do it!” And not have to make an issue of religious . . . I think a lot of people mix the religion and patriotism into the moral issue.

Mrs. Tabor believes that we all share a “common moral sense” (Wilson, 1993) and that if we all did the right thing, as we perceive it, we would be in good shape. When asked, “Do you think schools have a moral impact on kids?” Mrs. Tabor said:

Yes. I think we do one way or the other. And I think that modeling is key. I think modeling is more important than what we teach. It’s what we do. Walk the walk, don’t just talk the talk. If children have an opportunity to see adults interacting with other
children, adults interacting with other adults, dealing with crises, dealing with problems . . . then they have a model they can bring with them as they leave us.

Yea. And if it's a good one then it's going to be good and if they see a lot of friction, if they see a lot of violence . . . I don't spank kids for that reason. I'm not going to do that. If they want to see a grownup whipping up on a kid -- they're going to have to go somewhere else.

Mrs. Tabor emphasizes the importance of providing her children with a "good" model of moral behavior that they can take with them as they move on to other schools. She considers the ability to interact with others in peaceful and productive ways an important moral lesson for her students to experience. Noddings (1992) would agree with Mrs. Tabor that children must experience positive moral behavior such as caring or getting along with others before they can be caring and cooperative. As Mrs. Tabor points out, "It's what we do," that teaches morality.

As has been previously discussed, most "spontaneous interjection of moral commentary" by a principal occurred as the principal handled a discipline problem. I noticed that Mrs. Tabor has a tendency NOT to tell students the truth at times. Instead, she tries to scare them by telling them that she is going to do things that I never believed she had any intentions of doing. From a moral perspective, what can we make of this? I will begin with the story of Damion.

A student came into the office to report an incident that had occurred in a classroom. Mrs. Tabor and I left the office to go to the classroom to take care of the problem. First, she got Lenoris out of one classroom and then got Germaine, Terrance, Damion, and Tamika out of another. She lined them up against the brick wall and said:
"Damion, did you throw a child's shoe at the door?" He answered, "Yes ma'am." Then she said, "Any one of these offenses is suspendable. I can suspend you, suspend you, revoke your transfer, send you back to where you're supposed to be, send you back ... (she goes down the lineup). This is going to be easy to solve." Mrs. Tabor then wrote something down. She said to the children lined up against the wall, "This says that inside you is something good to shine forth. You're a handsome young man (to Damion) but you don't act handsome. You remember Lawrence? He died. You remember Daniel? You beat up on that little girl and you'll go to jail. She's medically fragile.

In this episode Mrs. Tabor did two things: She tried to scare the children by threatening them with death, suspensions, and revocations of transfers and she took the opportunity to confirm (Noddings, 1992) Damion. What does this reveal about Mrs. Tabor? The reference to the death of Lawrence raises some questions. Was it an insensitive remark intended to scare the children or was it an appropriate remark when one considers the background of these students? Was it intended to make them think of the consequences of their actions? From a moral perspective, "intent" is important.

On another occasion, Mrs. Tabor handled a discipline problem in her office. The problem was between Lenoris and Tamika. When they walked in Mrs. Tabor said, (in a very loud and surprised voice), "Lenoris? Lenoris? Who was he fighting with? Lenoris, I have known you since you started school and you love to fight."

Mrs. Tabor then asked Tamika to tell her side of the story. When she finished, Mrs. Tabor begins her lecture:

You want me to call these witnesses. Stirring up mess and pushing up a fight means provoking a fight. You can get suspended. One-on-one is five days. Double teaming is ten days. Betty Jones at Shady Oaks Middle will put you in the back of her car and find your Mama.
Mrs. Tabor talked to Lenoris and Tamika for a long time — from about 11:40 to 11:55.

If you come back in here — you’re gone! Being evil and mean minded. Stand up. Let me look at you. Lenoris go back and ask your teacher for forgiveness. Tamika, you’ve been too ready to fight lately — you stay.

After the very long lecture, Mrs. Tabor ended the encounter by telling Lenoris to go back and ask his teacher for forgiveness.

What was she trying to teach Lenoris? Did Lenoris go back and ask his teacher for forgiveness?

The final example of the interjection of moral commentary by Mrs. Tabor into the handling of a discipline problem took place during recess in the detention room. Mrs. Tabor was sitting at a table with three kids talking at them. She said:

Let me ask you this. Do you want to take these four weeks as your vacation and let me send you to summer school? What street do you live on? Who did I bring home the other day (Mrs. Tabor is thinking out loud)? Ya’ll don’t hang around with Kenton do you? Why do you think I’m asking you if you play with Kenton? He’s a a nice boy but he does have some problems with the things he does. But you know he was never rude to me — NEVER. You better get your attitude together son. You are beautiful. You are the most articulate child in this school. You are a truthful child . . . scandalizing those third graders! You better pull yourself together. I have known your Mama since you were one year old. Don’t tell me that I don’t know what your mother’s expectations are. Ease yourself back to your classroom. You go tell your teacher you’re sorry.

In this episode Mrs. Tabor tells the student to “go tell your teacher you’re sorry.” What does this mean from a moral perspective? What would this transaction been like without the directive, “tell your teacher you’re sorry?” It would have been a totally different message. Perhaps in a violent world, where most
of the students at PES come from, these references to forgiveness are very important lessons. Mrs. Tabor indicated in an interview that she believed that modeling was important for the children. She feels that it is important for the children see teachers and herself getting along with each other. Perhaps she was trying to show these students a way to get out of a disagreement other than fighting their way out of it.

Summary

The goal of this chapter was to acquaint the reader with each principal and his or her school in this study. In terms of the location of each school and the makeup of the student population, all are very similar. With the exception of SES, all of these schools are located in aging, upper middle class subdivisions. Most of the children that attend these schools are bussed in from all over the parish. SES is surrounded by a poor, run down neighborhood and is the only school in this study that is not part of a cluster. It is considered a "neighborhood school."

Although these schools seem very much alike in the aforementioned characteristics, they are very different. This difference appears to be attributable to the difference in principals. While the principals are similar in some respects (they are all older and eligible for retirement) they are worlds apart in other ways.

All four principals had difficulty discussing the meaning of the word "moral" as Bellah et al., (1985) discovered in their study. Each principal articulated differing views on moral issues in their schools. They unanimously agreed that morals are important. They differed, however, on the finer details of what is
meant when we say, "moral." Mrs. Smith used words such as "telling the truth" and "respecting other people's property and feelings." A respect for the rights of others seemed to dominate Mr. Davis' conception of morality although he showed an appreciation for traditional Christian values such as love and kindness. Mr. Samuel believed that there are some common values that we all share but was hesitant to move beyond the most basic beliefs. Diversity seemed to be viewed as a significant hindrance to the "morality" of his school. Finally, Mrs. Tabor expressed a very general "morality" by suggesting that all people intrinsically know what it means to do the right thing.

In regard to the question of whether or not principals consciously seek to influence students morally, the observation that principals have little direct contact with students is significant. Most of the students that they do see are students sent to the office for disciplinary action. It is at this juncture that the principal may or may not interject moral commentary into the way that the child is handled. The female principals did and the male principals did not.

In regard to the question of whether or not principals implicitly influence students morally, I believe strongly that the principal sets the tone in a school. Their manner, attitude, beliefs, and values are all communicated to everyone at the school. I believe, however, that a study that focuses on the students' points of view is needed to fully address the question of whether or not principals play a significant role in the moral development of students.
This study does not attempt to generalize to a larger population. I only hope to offer a perspective and raise some questions about morals and the practice of school administration. The following ideas were discussed in this chapter:

- The principals in this study did not make explicit attempts to instruct students about moral matters.

- The visual displays and artifacts with moral content, that were found in the principals' private offices, seemed to reflect something about the principal's beliefs and convictions. The same was not true for displays found in the outer offices and lobbies.

- If these principals were found to "spontaneously interject moral commentary" into their interactions with students, it was done within the context of a discipline problem.

- Most actions of the principals were found to be loaded with expressive meaning. In this study, what some of the principals did not do became of interest.

In summary, the principal seems to indirectly influence students. They do not directly instruct students about moral matters. I argue, however, that if a principal desired to influence students morally that they could. They have the power to do so. Children look up to and admire the principal. It seems that Jung's (1954/1960) assertion that without a reflecting consciousness there can be no morality, is relevant. If a principal wants to provide a positive moral influence for his/her students, a conscious effort must be made. Most of the students that they do see are students sent to the office for disciplinary action. It is at this juncture that the principal may or may not interject moral commentary into the way that the child is handled. The female principals did and the male principals did not.
CHAPTER SIX -- THE ETHIC OF CARE, THE QUESTION OF GENDER, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE

This chapter addresses the question: Does the gender of the principal have any relationship to the extent to which the principal practices an ethic of care or an ethic of justice? According to early work by Carol Gilligan (1982/1993), the ethic of care has been associated with feminine behavior while the ethic of justice has been more closely linked to the masculine. The ethic of care is grounded in a morality that is centered around an understanding of responsibility and relationship. "In this conception, the moral problem arises from conflicting responsibilities rather than from competing rights, and requires for its resolution a mode of thinking that is contextual and narrative rather than formal and abstract" (Gilligan, 1982/1993, p. 19). The ethic of justice, on the other hand, is associated with a conception of morality as fairness and "ties moral development to the understanding of rights and rules" (p. 19).

Implied in Gilligan's theory is the notion that male principals and female principals behave differently because of their gender -- women operate from an ethic of care and men from an ethic of justice. This claim will be explored in this chapter as the work of two female principals and the work of two male principals is examined. Analysis will proceed using two
observational perspectives taken from Noddings (1992): The notion of "caring occasions;" and the four components of caring --modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation. In addition, Gilligan's (1982\1993) distinction between the ethic of care and ethic of justice will also be used in the analysis of the observational data.

Caring occasions are those brief, informal interactions between the principal and students that occur frequently each day. A main activity conducted when evaluating these events includes determining who initiated the interaction -- principal or student? A principal who makes the effort to greet the students and talk to individual students projects a different image than a principal who is rarely seen by students.

While caring occasions are brief encounters with students, the interactions that characterize the four components of caring, on the other hand, are longer in duration and occur less frequently. This study found that most of these episodes of caring usually occur between the principal and a child who is in trouble, as mentioned previously. This may be a condition that is inherent in the student-principal relationship. When principals spend time with individual students in an elementary school setting, these particular students seem to be the ones that teachers cannot handle -- why else would a child be sent to the office to see the
principal? Whether or not this is desirable is inconsequential, since this is the status quo in most elementary school settings.

Caring Occasions

The work of principals has been characterized as being made up of a very long string of brief encounters. "The greatest part of a principal's time is spent in an almost endless series of encounters, from the moment he arrives at school until the moment he leaves (Wolcott, 1975, p. 38). Their work is typically fragmented as they move from one task to the other; therefore, the possibility of caring occasions between the principal and students occurs many times in a single day. According to Noddings (1998), when a principal encounters another person (student, teacher, parent, secretary, janitor, or other), the parties must decide how they will respond to each other. It involves a negotiation of a sort: An initiation, a response, and a decision to elaborate or terminate (p. 222). For example, when a principal stands outside of school as children arrive or depart, does he or she initiate interactions with the students or does he or she merely stand silently by, watching the children? Do interactions with students occur at all? If so, does the principal or the student initiate the transaction? These are important questions because of the impact that caring occasions, initiated by the principal, may have on the moral atmosphere of the school. I assert that the principal has the power to set the moral tone in his or her school.
What follows is a selection of observations taken from my field notes that were coded as either "interactions with students," "greeting students," or "dismissal." The purpose of this presentation is to provide the reader an idea of the kinds and degrees of caring occasions that occur between principals and children. Again, these interactions are very brief in duration and typically happened on the run.

**Mr. Davis**

Mr. Davis is a highly visible principal. He interacts with lots of children as is shown in the following set of observations.

Mr. Davis watched kids load the buses. He hugged some of the kids. "Hey!" He took a ball away from a boy.

We walked by the fifth graders and Mr. Davis grabbed a girl by the nose and said, "Beep."

Mr. Davis hugged a little girl.

As we stood out on duty watching the buses unload, Mr. Davis said to a child, "Come on Pokey."

To a little boy Mr. Davis said, "Your shoes untied Grandpa."

To a student, "Scoot Grandma." To another, "What's up Spike?"

To a student, "What's up Pop?" Talked to another boy about his pig named Lucy.

Said to a child, "Slow down Grandma. You're going to have a wreck."

A child came up to Mr. Davis and said, "Mr. Davis, will you sign my yearbook?" He did.

A little girl said, "Hey, Mr. Davis." Mr. Davis bent down to get at eye level to listen to a little girl who is upset (Mr. Davis is very tall). The little girl is upset because she left her book sack on the bus. Mr. Davis says something to her. A little while later Mr. Davis said to the girl "Here it comes" [the bus]. Mr.
Davis got on the bus and got the book sack and a lunch box for the little girl.

To a student who walked into the office, "What's up Matthew?" The little boy showed him his sunburn.

To a young boy, "Charlie Brown." To another boy, "Percy. Is your Dad home or is he off playing music?"

A fifth grader stopped and asked Mr. D. to sign his shirt. He signed it. (Must be an end-of-the-year tradition.)

Most of these interactions occurred as children were arriving at school in the morning. Mr. Davis was usually outside the school building greeting the children. He initiated most of the encounters and the children typically responded by grinning broadly. What does this say about him as a principal? Is he showing the children that he cares about them? Do these caring occasions provide balance to his strict disciplining of the children?

I think that they do. He seemed truly to enjoy the children.

This observation supports what he said during my interview with him: "From the time I was fourteen till the time I finished college I was a camp counselor, Junior counselor. It was something . . . I just had a knack for it I guess. Fooling with kids and I liked it. And it's not work. It's more of a game to me." Mr. Davis displayed a passion for his work.

Mr. Samuel

The interactions between Mr. Samuel and students are different from those of Mr. Davis. Mr. Samuel tends to be more quiet and reserved and does not behave in a playful manner with the children as Mr. Davis did. Mr. Samuel initiated few encounters with children. Consider the following set of observations:
Mr. Samuel stood with his hands in his pockets and watched the kids dismiss. Some ran and some walked. The dismissal was kind of loud. Mr. Samuel said to me, "We stand here. Try to slow 'em down a little bit . . . " After all of the kids are on the buses and the second load children are the only ones left, Mr. Samuel said to me, "We'll let the duty teachers have 'em now."

Mr. Samuel said, "We gotta go load the buses up. Let's go so they don't have a stampede." Mr. Samuel stands in a certain spot and Sally [the guidance counselor] has a designated spot.

Some boys ran by. Mr. Samuel said, "Walk! Walk boys!"

Mr. Samuel stood on the breezeway with both hands in his pockets as the kids got off the buses. One little girl stopped and gave him a hug.

We went back outside and stood in the breezeway. Mr. Samuel said, "I think it helps to have your presence out here."

Mr. Samuel saw a child without a coat. He asked, "Where's your coat?"

One student said, "Hey Mr. Samuel." He said, "Good morning" (in a very kind way).

We walked by the kindergarten building and some children came out. One said, "Hello Mr. Samuel." Mr. Samuel said, "Well, good morning."

A student walked into the office. Mr. Samuel said, "Whatcha got Jerry?" The student handed him a note and left.

Mr. Samuel assisting in the loading of the buses evokes the image of a man standing outside with his hands in his pockets just watching what was happening around him. He did not really do or say anything at all. A story from my field notes will help explain what I mean by this observation.

One day, a bus driver came to his office door and frantically told him that a huge dog was on the school grounds and that the kids were hysterical. I thought she was exaggerating. Mr. Samuel very calmly got up and walked outside. There in the school yard
was a huge St. Bernard dog. This is what I wrote in my field notes this particular day:

Mr. Samuel got up, went outside, and looked. He didn’t say a thing. Huge dog it was - a brown St. Bernard. He watched as Ben, the custodian, caught the dog and walked him off campus. Mr. Samuel stood there and looked for a few minutes and then went back inside. The dog caused major excitement with the kids. Mr. Samuel never said a word.

Mr. Samuel’s silence throughout this entire episode struck me as being odd. He never said a word to anyone. The custodian took care of the problem for him. As long as everything was relatively quiet Mr. Samuel was satisfied. The purpose of the presentation of this story is to provide the reader with some idea of Mr. Samuel’s manner. He rarely initiated encounters with children. The sample of interactions presented above indicate that, in most cases, students initiated encounters with him. Mr. Samuel always responded in a very kind manner. What does this mean from a moral perspective? Does Mr. Samuel care any less for his students than Mr. Davis cares for his? How do the children feel about Mr. Samuel? These questions are difficult to answer but my impression was that Mr. Samuel lacked the passion that Mr. Davis had for his job. I believe that Mr. Samuel was ready to retire and was not as interested in his school as Mr. Davis. This thought crossed my mind several times during my two-week stay with him.

Mrs. Tabor

Mrs. Tabor interacts with the students quite frequently. From a moral point of view, however, the content of her remarks sometimes raises questions.

Joshua walked by and Mrs. Tabor said, “Hey Joshua. You gonna be in our talent show? You’re not a dancing machine like your brother.”
As she lets another small group into the hallway she says, "George were you nice on the bus?" Then she said to me that George gets in trouble 4 out of 5 days on the bus.

We walked around at recess. We watched some girls dance and Mrs. Tabor said, "That's the tootsie roll not the crazy man." A teacher remarked at how well the little girl could dance. Mrs. Tabor said, "I know she can dance. She can't read but she can dance."

A student walked into the outer office and said, "Ashley's going to beat me up." Mrs. Tabor said, "Nobody's going to beat you up. Go tell the duty teacher. She'll watch out for you."

Mrs. Tabor was standing at the outside door (her morning duty spot) when I arrived. She was letting children in a few at a time to go into the cafeteria. She said to one child, "Where's your coat?" Mrs. Tabor called what she was doing "crowd control" and said that it "is the most important thing we do. Duty is important because of potential lawsuits."

Mrs. Tabor let kids in a few at a time. She talked to the kids as they came through the door. She told me stories about them as they walked by. For example, "Those boys' mother is in prison" and "His mother is also in prison" and "Mother is also in prison."

These interactions are interesting as they uncover two issues: Apparent insensitivity and lack of direct encounters. The content of some of the interactions between Mrs. Tabor and the children is of concern. Comments such as "She can't read but she can dance," and "You're not a dancing machine like your brother" seem to indicate an insensitivity on the part of Mrs. Tabor. Is she purposely trying to hurt the feelings of these children? Is she just teasing them, meaning no harm to them in any way? From a moral perspective, the content of these interactions is troublesome. They were not necessary. Mrs. Tabor could have been more positive with the children. She could have "confirmed" them when she spoke to them. Instead, she criticized them.
The second concern regards Mrs. Tabor's tendency to talk about the children rather than to them during an encounter. This could have been because of my presence as a researcher. Perhaps if I had not been standing right there next to her, she would not have provided an ongoing commentary about the children. Again, comments such as, "His mother is in prison" seem a bit insensitive. How do statements like this make the children feel? Do they feel cared about by the principal? These questions are hard to answer, however, I assert that comments like this tend to set a negative moral tone in a school. If the principal can make comments to children that "model" insensitivity, then so can the teachers. If the teachers "model" a lack of care in the comments that they make to students then the children can do the same with each other. "Put-downs" become the norm rather than words of encouragement.

Mrs. Tabor and Mr. Davis both initiated interactions with the children. The content of Mr. Davis' comments were seemingly meaningless -- he joked with the children. He let the children know that he liked them. Mrs. Tabor's comments, on the other hand, contained negative messages and at times seemed counterproductive.

Mrs. Smith

Mrs. Smith's interactions with students occurred most often during the completion of some sort of task. She was always kind in her manner and she quietly spoke to everyone she encountered saying, "Good morning Jason," "Hello, Mrs. Jones," or "Hello, Hillary." Other interactions with teachers, parents, or students tended to be substantive, as opposed to being simple exchanges of pleasantries. Consider the following:
Charlotte, a Downs Syndrome child, came into the office. Mrs. Smith said, "What do you need Charlotte?" "Can you put it right up here (motions to basket on counter)? Follow Daniel back to class now."

We walked to the portable classroom . . . . While we are there Mrs. Smith talked to one of the handicapped kids: "Chris, I understand that you’ve been doing all kinds of crazy things with this walker. We don’t want you to get hurt. Miss Jones was really upset yesterday."

A student walked in late. Mrs. Smith said, "What do you need?" I’m late. "Why are you late?" The twins. "How old are the twins?" Eight months. "They are little." Mrs. Smith wrote the child a note and the child went to class. She seemed to understand the situation.

A child came in with some fund raiser stuff. Mrs. Smith said, "What do you need sweetie?" Very good. Thank you. Tell your homeroom teacher to put it in her envelope."

Mrs. Smith was standing outside greeting students as they arrived. She said to a student, "Hello, Miss Haley!"

These interactions with children were somewhat longer and more substantive in content than the interactions of Mr. Davis and Mrs. Tabor. For example, the caring occasion with Chris was initiated by Mrs. Smith. Not only did she indicate that she did not want him to play on his walker, she elaborated on this message. She indicated to him that other people were worried about him and that she did not want to see him get hurt. It was also brought to his attention that, by misbehaving on his walker, he was hurting his teacher by causing her to become very upset.

All four principals demonstrated different behaviors in regard to caring occasions. Of the four principals, Mr. Davis interacted with the children most often. His encounters were playful as he joked with the children often. Mr. Davis’ initiation of many caring occasions in a day provided a necessary balance to
his structured discipline policy. Without his participation in caring occasions, he would have presented a much different image. He would have been nothing more than a principal who paddles bad children. The fact that he made the point of interacting with students daily demonstrated for them that he "cared."

The Ethic of Care in the Practice of the Elementary School Principalship

The question of whether or not the female principals in this study operated from an ethic of care more frequently than the male principals will be explored within a framework built around the ideas of Gilligan (1982/1993) and Noddings (1992). Gilligan argues that an ethic of care is grounded in a conception of morality that is centered around an understanding of responsibility and relationship, whereas an ethic of justice centers on a morality that is closely associated with fairness, rights, and rules. Therefore, the discourse/practice of these principals was examined to determine which ethic served as a guide to their action. Did the action of the principal reflect an understanding of morality as fairness or care? In other words did their discourse/practice indicate a focus on relationships and responsibility or on the enforcement of rules for the protection of individual students' rights?

Noddings (1992) suggests that there are four components of caring: Modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation. The articulation and explanation of these components provided a useful tool in the search for "caring" behaviors by elementary school principals. A brief review of each component is necessary before
we proceed. "Modeling" requires that principals show others how to "care" by their own behavior in relationships with those they care for. This component is crucial because it not only shows students how to care for others but it also provides them with the necessary experience of caring. In order to "care" we all must experience being "cared-for."

The second component of care is "dialogue," which is an ongoing search for understanding, empathy, or appreciation (Noddings, 1992). Dialogue becomes significant as it exemplifies a principal's continuing interest in the lives of others around them. It is the belief on the part of the principal that he/she must try to understand, as much as is possible, the lives of the children.

"Practice," the third component, is grounded on the belief that children's attitudes are shaped by experience and that "if we want people to approach moral life prepared to care, we need to provide opportunities for them to gain skills in caregiving ..." (p. 24). Principals can provide these kinds of experiences for students in several ways. They can put programs into place that promote caring or they can expect children to treat each other in caring ways and to be truthful and honest. Expectations of truthfulness and kindness, for example, can go along way in shaping children's attitudes.

Finally, "confirmation" involves encouraging others to do their best. This component is extremely important in education.
After all, the goal is to help every child reach his or her fullest potential. Schools that provide praise for good behavior and academic achievement are "confirming" to their students.

Comparisons were made between two female principals and two male principals in an attempt to discover whether any conclusions can be drawn regarding gender and school leadership. Keeping in mind Noddings' four components of caring and Gilligan's distinction between the ethic of care and the ethic of justice, stories collected during my school visits will now be presented.

There are several good stories of children taken from my field notes that provide excellent examples of principals who practice care in their daily work. The story of Brandon, a student at SES, is one such story.

Brandon is a second grader at SES who visits the office rather frequently. On one particular day, Mrs. Smith and Brandon had frequent meetings throughout the day. The first encounter is described as follows and begins as a teacher brings Brandon into the office:

The teacher said, "He's too much." The little boy came in, stomped his feet, sat on the floor, and pulled a chair in front of him. At first Mrs. Smith left him alone -- kind of ignored him. I think she was letting him cool off. While Brandon sat there, behind the chair, Mrs. Smith looked through the mail, discussed several different things with me. Brandon just sat there. I almost forgot he was there. Then, out of the blue, Mrs. Smith said, "What do they have for breakfast on Friday?" He answered her very nicely. Then she said, "Come here. I want to ask you something." Brandon came over and stood close to Mrs. Smith and she put her arms around him. "I want to know what happened a little while ago."
Mrs. Smith handled Brandon in a very caring way partly because she understood where he was coming from. She had maintained an ongoing “dialogue” with Brandon. Consider what Mrs. Smith shared with me about Brandon and his family:

This kid should be in Parkland. He is severely disturbed. I let him come in here and cool off. I’ll let him come sit on my lap and he’ll spill his guts. That’s how I know what I know. Mom’s boyfriend kicked them out and they spent two nights in a van. The kid carries around a lot of baggage.

This excerpt is a good example of the component of “dialogue.” Had Mrs. Smith not allowed Brandon to sit on her lap and “spill his guts” she would not have known what was happening in his life outside of school. She would have probably treated him differently. Mrs. Smith also spoke with the teacher about Brandon in an attempt to provide the teacher with some information so that she too could understand Brandon’s behavior.

After a discussion with Brandon, Mrs. Smith took his hand and walked him back to his classroom. She talked to his teacher about what was going on. She said, “He’s going through counseling and when they do that all this horrible stuff comes out that he has to deal with. It really gets worse before it gets better. It’s what we have to go through while they’re [kids] are in counseling.

Although Mrs. Smith had talked with Brandon and his teacher and had escorted him back to class, this was not the last encounter with Brandon on this particular day. As Mrs. Smith and I were sitting in her office we heard over the P.A. system: “We need help down here.” Mrs. Smith looked at me and said, “It’s Brandon.” We got up and went straight to the classroom. What happened next is a wonderful example of a principal who “models” caring for other students.
Mrs. Smith goes to the table where Brandon is sitting. A little boy says something (but I couldn't hear what he said) and Mrs. Smith says to the other children sitting at the table, "You tend to your own business. This is my friend." We bring Brandon back to her office and she says, "Brandon, why did you say you don't have friends?" He said, "cuz I don't." Mrs. Smith then said, "Yes you do. You have one [referring to herself]. Who is that?" Following this discussion Mrs. Smith let Brandon sit quietly in the office.

The story of Brandon is not over but for now we will consider Mrs. Smith's response to the call over the P.A. Of all the possible responses that a principal could have to being called back to a classroom not long after returning the child, this one surprised me. She demonstrated for Brandon and the other students an unconditional caring attitude. I believe that she truly felt that this was what Brandon "needed" and she responded to that need. I say this because, during my visits I saw her respond to discipline problems in different ways. Sometimes she would just say, "Send him home. I think Jimmy just needs to go home today." At other times, she would call a parent and ask him/her to come sit in the classroom with the child because she firmly believed that "Educating everyone takes everyone." The point to this discussion is that Mrs. Smith's response to each child depends on the circumstances that surround the incident. Sometimes children need to be punished and sometimes they need to be hugged. Mrs. Smith was caring in every instance but her caring took a variety of forms.

In Brandon's case, she brought him back to the office and let him sit there until she was ready to deal with him. This is how she handled the situation:

Finally, after a great deal of time passed, Mrs. Smith said to Brandon, "Come here. Let's get us a plan. Don't do your shoulders that way. Just be honest and tell me what happened." Brandon told her that Ted
pushed his chair and he got mad and pushed him back. Mrs. Smith said, “Have you ever thought of sitting by yourself? What are we going to do so that you won’t have to come back to me? What if Ted pushes you chair again? What are you going to do? Talk to yourself. Say to yourself, Brandon don’t get upset when Ted pushes your desk. I’m going to be calm. I’m going to let him get in trouble. You think you could do that. Try that.”

In this interaction Mrs. Smith tried to teach Brandon how to deal with his anger. She then brought him back to class again. Later, we went to check on him. We went into the classroom and Mrs. Smith walked over to Brandon and looked at his work. The lesson was about animals. She called me over to see. When I looked at his paper he was drawing a race car. I said, “He is really paying attention to the lesson.” Mrs. Smith had an entirely different interpretation and said, “Look how good that picture is. He’s a great artist; always has been. Somebody ought to tap into that.” Mrs. Smith said nothing to Brandon about his artwork or the fact that he was not on task. We went back to the office.

Once again I was surprised at her reaction. Although she did not praise him for his drawing of the race car, she “confirmed” Brandon. She chose to emphasize Brandon’s artistic talent rather than reprimand him for not paying attention. From a moral perspective, Brandon’s story raises many questions.

For one, what do the other children think of a child who is sent to the office kicking and pouting then returned to class and defended by the principal who says to the children, “He’s my friend.” Do the children understand that Brandon has problems and needs to be treated with kindness or do they feel that he did not receive just punishment for his crimes? I believe that the answer to this question depends on the overall atmosphere of the school.
If the norm is to treat children with kindness and compassion and all children are treated that way, then Brandon did not get away with anything. If, on the other hand, the school operates according to a strict discipline code in which punishment follows infraction, then Brandon received unfair and special treatment.

Some principals, arguing from a justice perspective, might argue that Brandon got positive reinforcement for negative behavior. From a caring perspective, however, the situation is totally different. Although we saw Brandon off and on that entire day, in the two weeks that I spent at SES, Brandon was not sent to the office for misbehavior again. I believe that he did his best to show Mrs. Smith that he was trying to be good. He knew that she cared about him and the feelings seemed mutual. This story was about a principal who exemplified Noddings' (1992) components of caring in an attempt to build a relationship with a child.

A story that provides a stark contrast to the story of Brandon took place at GES. It involved a fifth grade male student who hit a female classmate during recess. This is what happened:

A couple of little girls came into the office. Mr. Davis said, "What ch'all need?" The little girl said, "Matthew punched me for nothing." Mr. Davis looked at the injury and saw that they girl had a red mark. He said, "Go get Matthew and send him here." After the little girl left Mr. Davis went into his office to look up Matthew's discipline card. He didn't say anything to me but obviously Matthew's parents had signed giving Mr. Davis permission to paddle Matthew if necessary. Mr. Davis picked up his paddle and walked outside to the fifth grade yard. By this time, the recess bell had rung and all of the students were lining up to go inside. Mr. Davis found Matthew, made him bend over, and gave him three hard licks on the rear end. He said to Matthew, "Do you want two more? Do you? Do you?" All the other kids were lining up and they just watched. It all happened very quickly.
This episode describes the ethic of justice in action as Mr. Davis took disciplinary action against Matthew. Matthew broke a school rule by hitting another student and was punished for it. There was no discussion. Mr. Davis paddled him in front of his peers. This episode raises many questions as well. What does the paddling of a child in front of his peers mean in terms of "modeling?" Does it say that when someone breaks a rule he/she should be physically punished? Does it send the message to the students that hurting others in this school will not be tolerated? As an observer, I knew nothing about Matthew. I had not encountered him at all during my visit at this school. I wondered if Mr. Davis knew anything about Matthew's home life that would indicate that an open "dialogue" existed between Mr. Davis and Matthew?

Mr. Davis constructed the problem in a way that emphasized rules and punishment: Matthew hit a little girl and hitting others is not allowed (although the punishment for striking another, is ironically, also a physical blow). Mr. Davis then paddled him, in front of his peers, as the punishment. There was no discussion. Should Mr. Davis have given Matthew a chance to explain why he hit the little girl (even though there is no acceptable excuse for hitting others)? Did he forfeit an opportunity to talk with this boy about appropriate ways to deal with his anger as Mrs. Smith did with Brandon? This episode provides an example of a situation in which Mr. Davis operated from an ethic of justice. He was clearly focused on rights and rules and did not exhibit the components of care, as articulated by Noddings (1992), in the handling of this situation. However, although Mr. Davis did not exhibit or model
“caring” in his encounter with Matthew, he cared deeply about his school.

Perhaps there are different ways to view the care issue as it applies to principals. My experience as observer-as-participant at GES allowed me the opportunity to be there for two weeks and talk to people at that school. One impression that I got from talking to several teachers and a parent was that they were proud of the strict discipline policy at GES that was consistently enforced by Mr. Davis. Consider the following excerpts taken from interviews conducted at GES:

Guidance counselor:

Describe your principal. He is an easy-going person. He has certain things that he stands for and he believes that that's the way it needs to be done. Can you give me an example of that? As far as I guess the discipline policy, you know he's pretty hardfast on the discipline policy. The teachers know that and the kids know that. You know he does suspend kids, he does paddle kids, whereas a lot of principals don't do paddling anymore.

A parent:

Describe your school. There is no doubt in my mind that some of these children have very serious discipline and learning problems. This is something that I've never encountered before in another school system — children that come from these backgrounds. I feel that Mr. Davis does an excellent job disciplining these children. The children are afraid of him a little bit, but they also respect him. They know how far they can go. For my children personally, I would never ever give permission to anybody to spank my children, never. . . . So for my children, I would have to say that the discipline was probably stronger than they needed, but here at this school, the need is there. Does that make sense?

Describe your principal. He's definitely a good disciplinarian, strict, very involved, works probably double what everybody else does, goes the extra mile.
The interview asked respondents to describe the school and describe the principal. Both interviewees began to talk about the discipline at GES. It was clear that discipline is very important to Mr. Davis and consequently important to this parent and guidance counselor. When asked this open-ended question, they chose to talk about the discipline at this school. The parent said that she felt that the school needs good strong discipline. The following excerpt of an interview with a teacher will substantiate this view:

Fifth grade teacher:

I've subbed in other schools, and the difference would be that we can get a lot of things done here that we may not be able to get done in other schools, like our dance that we're doing for fourth grade. I think it would be a little more difficult to be able to do something like that because the kids are more rambunctious. I don't know, maybe it's Mr. Davis as an authority figure, because sometimes when he's not here, they [the students] know the difference, and you can tell the difference.

To suggest that students at this school are good only when Mr. Davis is on the campus makes one wonder if they are learning to be self-disciplined. Do the students at GES behave out of a fear that they will be sent to the office and have to face Mr. Davis, who stands about six foot three inches tall? I posed the following question to the fifth grader teacher quoted above: "Do you think that the kids behave because of an external control (if they don't they will be punished) or do they behave because it is the right thing to do and they want Mr. Davis to be proud of them?" She responded as follows:

I think it's a combination of both. And I think that the kids, whether they believe it or not, they have a lot of respect for him because we've done things in class -- recently we were talking about adjectives in class and I wrote "Mr. Davis" on the board and almost
everything I got back described him as positive. Some of them said he was strict, but when they were saying it they were also saying in the conversation that that's why our school is so good.

According to the teacher, the students show an appreciation for the fact that Mr. Davis is such a strong disciplinarian. They seem to understand that he is strict because he wants GES to be a good school. Does Mr. Davis demonstrate his "care" for the children by paddling them if that is what it takes to conduct an orderly school where children can learn and be safe? Mr. Davis seems to "care" passionately about his school and the children but he does not practice an ethic of care. He operates from an ethic of justice which is based on a conception of "morality of fairness" (Gilligan, 1982/1993).

Summary

This chapter explored the evidence for operative notions of caring occasions and the ethics of justice and care. In regard to caring occasions, all four of these principals responded to students in different ways. Mrs. Smith was always kind and spoke to everyone. She initiated most interactions. Mr. Davis joked with and interacted with a large number of children each day. However, while there was little substance to his interactions, they were meaningful in the sense that the children got the feeling that he enjoyed them. I think he did. In the case of GES, I think that Mr. Davis' practice of initiating interactions with children provided a necessary balance to his structure and strict discipline. Without his initiation of caring occasions with the children, the tone of
the school would have been entirely different. Mr. Samuel interacted with few students in a day and rarely initiated an interaction. He was hardly visible to the students. Mrs. Tabor interacted with students but the content of the interactions were questionable. At times it seemed that some of the remarks she made were almost insulting. As an observer, I never felt that she meant any harm but nevertheless wondered why she said certain things to the children.

The conclusion that I drew from these observations is that there was no real pattern to be discovered in regard to the male/female question and the notion of caring occasions. Each principal exhibited different behaviors in regard to the initiation of caring occasions. It appears that when principals initiate interactions with students a kind of atmosphere is created. Speaking to others and acknowledging the existence of other people becomes the norm. Conversely, the absence of these kinds of interactions creates a different kind of atmosphere. The simple notion of caring occasions seems to be an important concept for school leaders to consider. In the case of Mr. Davis, caring occasions provided a necessary balance to his structured, justice oriented nature.

In terms of gender and school leadership, Mrs. Smith and Mr. Davis provide excellent examples of the care ethic and the justice ethic in action. Mrs. Smith unquestionably operated from an ethic of care while Mr. Davis operated from an ethic of justice. They
both ran successful schools but they delivered their programs in different ways. Of the four principals, these two seemed the most passionate about their work yet this passion was revealed in different ways. For example, Mr. Davis was rule oriented and a follower of Lee Canter’s Assertive Discipline approach. He believed strongly in assertive discipline, a structured plan consisting of rules, consequences, and rewards. There was little discussion with Mr. Davis. If a student broke a rule then the consequences were applied. Mrs. Smith, on the other hand, did not like assertive discipline because she believes that it sometimes forces the adult into a power struggle with the child. She spent more time than Mr. Davis talking with students who were in “trouble.”

Mr. Davis also seemed to stress the importance of respecting the rights of others, which is characteristic of the kind of thinking that underlies the ethic of justice. While Mrs. Smith also considered respect of others important, it was not her only focus. She exhibited behaviors that indicated a concern for each relationship with others and a concern for the contextual details that surround each case (as in the case of Brandon). A child may break a school rule or do something wrong but Mrs. Smith tended to consider the whole child before taking action. The story of Brandon illustrated this quite well. She recognized the complexity of each problem.

In terms of the four components of care as outlined by Noddings (1992), Mr. Davis exhibited some of these behaviors but they were displayed within the larger context of a structured, formal and abstract atmosphere. For example, he did confirm
children. This confirmation typically took the form of some kind of reward that was a part of the Assertive Discipline package of materials, like a certificate or a coupon for a reward of some kind. This way of confirming is different from the way Mrs. Smith confirmed students. She typically used words such as, "I am proud of you." This finding suggests that there are multiple ways to "confirm" students.

Mrs. Smith operated from an ethic of care. This is evident in the way that she constructed the moral problem in the case of Brandon and Justin. In Justin's case (which can be found in chapter five) the problem wasn't that he got into a fight over a pencil and broke the school rule which prohibits fighting. The problem was that Justin wasn't doing well in school and he did not feel good about himself. He was angry and that anger came out in a fight over a pencil. The action that Mrs. Smith took was to find help for Justin so he would do better in school. Mrs. Smith handled many of the discipline problems that I observed in a similar manner. She considered the whole child and the context that engulfed the child.

In terms of the four components of caring, Mrs. Smith exhibited most of them in her discourse/practice. I will not repeat examples here but will assert that of the four principals, she was the most "caring" that I shadowed. Although caring, she could be tough when she needed to be and had a strong interest in instruction. In fact, I argue that her strong instructional leadership was one of many ways that she demonstrated "care" for the students who attended her school. Over the years, she created a school with a very positive moral atmosphere.
Mrs. Tabor also seemed to work from an ethic of care, although her ways of handling discipline differed from Mrs. Smith's methods. She seemed to have an understanding of the world from which her students came and considered this in the way she handled different children. Knowing that these children come from violent home situations, she instructed them to ask for forgiveness when they did something wrong. She attempted to model "getting along" for them. Her thinking was contextual rather than abstract, as was Mrs. Smith's thinking. One comment made by Mrs. Tabor that illustrates her contextual thinking follows: "Things change and they can change on a dime. Sometimes I think it's better to be inconsistent. Yea. Be inconsistent!" Although her thinking seemed to be in line with the ethic of care, her actions were not always consistent with this ethic.

My visit with Mr. Samuel did not provide enough information to make conclusions in regard to the ethic that he operated from. He seemed to work from an ethic of justice and seemed to be rule oriented. I did not observe any one-on-one between Mr. Samuel and a student so I am not sure how he interacts with children. Mr. Samuel was a self-described "drop principal" and this is possibly the best conclusion I can draw about him. He was ready to retire.

Did the two female principals in this study operate from an ethic of care more than the male principals? They both seemed more relational than the male principals and they both tended to construct the moral problem differently. For example, when the female principals disciplined students there was a great deal of discussion with the students. These principals brought many of the students' life experiences into the discussion. The male principals
typically did not discuss anything with the students. They handed out punishment. Within the practice of these two female principals, however, meaningful difference were found. Therefore, I am not suggesting that all female principals operate from an ethic of care more frequently than male principals. Although Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Tabor were alike in some respects they were very different in others. Mrs. Tabor “theorized” a lot along the lines of an ethic of care. Her actions sometimes were not always in line with her theory. There are two possible explanations for this observation. Perhaps the reality of Mrs. Tabor’s context made the application of her ideas difficult to put into practice or perhaps she simply lacked the passion exhibited by Mrs. Smith and Mr. Davis. Mrs. Smith, on the other hand, was more consistent — she seemed to “talk the talk and walk the walk.”

To my way of thinking, the two most effective principals in this study were Mr. Davis, who displayed predominantly male qualities of leadership and Mrs. Smith, who displayed predominantly female qualities of leadership. She was caring but tough when necessary. Of the two, it can be argued that Mrs. Smith practiced relational leadership. Her leadership style represented a synthesis of the feminine as well as the masculine qualities of leadership. Mr. Davis displayed male qualities of leadership most of the time. He displayed few of the components of caring in his work, although he cared deeply about his school. These two principals ran successful schools but managed them in different ways. They did what was needed to be done in order to reach their ultimate goal which was to provide strong instructional programs at their schools.
What do these findings suggest in regard to Noddings’ notion of “care” and Gilligan’s theory of the ethics of care and justice? Two main findings are suggested in this study. The ethic of care and the ethic of justice do not seem to be determined by gender. Also it seems that there are a variety of ways to “care.” Mr. Davis is an example of a principal who operates from an ethic of justice because he “cares” so passionately.
“Community” may be thought of as a set of experiences, rather than a particular place (Bender, 1979). The focus of this chapter is on the experience of community in the four elementary schools studied and the contributions of the principals to such communal experience. Two questions served to guide this inquiry into this area: Do principals promote a sense of community within schools? If so, how is this revealed?

In the present study, locating the experience of community was difficult for at least two reasons: First, administrator transactions with students, teachers, staff and parents are typically carried out “on the run.” Everyone, from the bus drivers to the teachers, is on a tight schedule. Second, the student populations in the schools observed are highly transient. For these reasons the sense of community within an elementary school is a “fluid” one.

One way to gain control over this matter of community experience was to adopt, as a lens, Sergiovanni’s (1994) notion of “community” as a cohesive group. His concept of community stresses both the importance of relationships as well as the transformative aspect of the group from loosely affiliated individuals to a tightly bound collective (“I’s” to the “we”) (p. 218).

Additionally, “community” (given Sergiovanni’s view of it), seems in stark contrast to “organization.” In this phase of the research I was interested in separating the perceptions of respondents who
spoke of their school as a "community," from ordinary notions of a structured or bureaucratic "organization."

The notion of community has one further requirement that has its grounding in the work of John Dewey. Dewey (1916) believed that the community must provide the means for individuals to achieve their full potential. Therefore, the experience of community is not an end in itself but rather a means by which individuals' can become their best. Applied to school settings, the community experience should enable students and teachers to reach their fullest potential. Thus, the experience of community goes beyond the formation of strong relationships and the sense of cohesiveness. This requirement of community has implications for the instructional program in elementary schools as well as the continuing education of teachers in the schools.

To frame my analysis, I used two of Sergiovanni’s (1994) ideas about community as well as Dewey’s notion that community must work toward the attainment of each and every members’ fullest potential. Sergiovanni (1994) has highlighted the importance of relationships in community and has argued that “community” is a collection of people so tightly bound together that it is transformed from a collection of “I’s” to a collective “we” (p. 213). Thus, one focus of my observations was on relationships. I paid attention to how people in the school interacted with each other and considered questions such as: “What kind of relationship did the principal have with the teachers and the children?” “Did the principal and the secretary know the children’s names?” I also became attuned to the language that the principals and teachers used during our interviews. Did they say “I” or “we” when they
were talking about their schools? Did they describe the faculty as a “family?” The language that people use reveals a good deal about their belief systems. Therefore, analysis of the language that people used as they talked about their schools and their work is highlighted.

Dewey’s requirement that “community” should provide a means for each member to flourish has implications for the kind of instructional programs found in schools. I took note of the kinds of instructional leadership that was exhibited by each principal to determine whether the attainment of each and every students’ fullest potential was considered an important goal of the school. The emphasis that a principal puts on instruction indicates in many ways the moral stance that he or she takes in regard to students. Greenfield (1995) describes the moral imperative as “a concern with the rightness or wrongness of one’s actions as an administrator; with what one ought to do as an ethical school administrator; and as one concerned with what is in the best interest of children and teachers (p. 69). I will argue that the sense of community in the schools in this study is linked to the moral imperative of the principal.

This chapter is organized around four case studies -- one for each school. Each case will include sets of observations that tell something about the general atmosphere of the school and the kinds of relationships in each school. I will then present interview narratives from teachers who were asked: “How does it feel to work in this school?” or “Describe the people in this school.” Finally, narratives obtained from interviews with each principal will be presented that provide insight into how each principal
conceptualized the notion of “community” versus “organization.” I will begin with Mrs. Smith.

SES -- Mrs. Smith
“School as Home”

As a visitor and observer-as-participant at SES, I got a generally good feeling about the school. Over a two week period, Mrs. Smith and I seemed to develop somewhat of a relationship. For example, one Friday I left early to pick up a cake for my daughter’s birthday party that was to be held the following day (Saturday). When I walked into Mrs. Smith’s office the following Monday morning, she was sitting at her desk doing some paperwork. As I put down my booksack she said, “I want to know how the birthday party went.” I was amazed that she had remembered the birthday party. Furthermore, I was touched that she cared enough to ask about it. Mrs. Smith makes an effort to build relationships with people.

I will begin this case with a set of observations that, I believe, speak to the issue of “community” in the elementary school. These observations suggest that Mrs. Smith knows the students and parents at her school.

Mrs. Smith and I were sitting in her office and we heard a child’s voice in the outer office. Mrs. Smith whispered to me, “See that little girl. She’s gifted and as flakey as ever. Just got out there and listen. I’ll tell you about her.”

A man walked into the reception area and Mrs. Smith said, “Go look at him too. I’ll have to tell you about him when I’m finished [some paperwork].”

A bus driver came in with a problem. Mrs. Smith asked her if she talked to the mother. The bus driver said that no she had talked to the stepmother. Mrs. Smith said, “That is not a stepmother. That is her biological child.” The bus driver said, “No. It isn’t.” Mr. Smith said, “I disagree with you. I know
that family very well." As it turned out the bus
driver was wrong.

The next set of observations reflect the depth of the
relationship between Mrs. Smith and two students. These are
eamples of relationships that go beyond merely knowing the
children's names. The first is about a little girl who returned to
SES to visit.

One afternoon Sarah and her social worker came into the
office. She used to be a student at SES but was put
into a foster home and had to leave SES. Mrs. Smith
was glad to see her. She took her hand and they walked
(hand in hand) to her old classroom to see her teacher,
Mrs. Long. Mrs. Long gave her a present and said, "You
left right before Christmas. This is for you." When
they walked back into the office, another teacher said,
"Hi, Sarah!" They were all happy to see her.

My impression of this visit was that these teachers and Mrs. Smith
really cared about Sarah. They all knew her story and were kind to
her.

The next observation describes Mrs. Smith's response to a
problem they were having with a little boy named Wayne.

Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Tanner, the guidance counselor,
were talking about different children and what was
going on in their lives. They began to talk about
Wayne. Diane said that he and his brother are either
fighting or crying. "They're miserable." Mrs. Smith
said, "I've had enough of this," and she tried to call
Wayne's mother but no one answered. The three of us
walked outside and before I knew it, we were walking
down the street to Wayne's house (which could be seen
from the school yard). We knocked on the side door, we
knocked on the front door. We knocked and we knocked
but got no answer. Mrs. Smith was sure that someone was
home. On the way back to school Mrs. Smith said that
they have repeatedly tried to get Wayne's mom to come
to school but they can't get her to come.

Both of these vignettes suggest that strong relationships exist at
SES. Stories about Mrs. Smith that were presented in previous
chapters suggest this also. Mrs. Smith seems to care very deeply
about her students and will fight for them if necessary. In one of our informal conversations Mrs. Smith said, “I don’t know how to lose gracefully. I never learned how to lose. These teachers know that. You might get me down for a while. And don’t mess with my kids. Like that woman treating that little girl that way.”

As I spent time at SES, I noticed that Mrs. Smith talked a lot about helping others which, to my way of thinking, is characteristic of community living. The following vignettes illustrate Mrs. Smith’s commitment to helping others.

One day, a student named Paul was giving his teacher a very hard time so Mrs. Smith called his mother and asked her to come to school. When she arrived, Mrs. Smith said, “Would you go sit in Paul’s class?” As we walked to the classroom, Mrs. Smith said to Paul’s mother, “Go sit and tell him, ‘If I have to, I will sit with you all day.’ Tell him he is going to get an education. We’ll help you.” Mrs. Smith talked to the parent the whole time they walked to Paul’s classroom.

A couple of special education students walked by as Mrs. Smith and I were standing out in the breezeway. I commented that all the kids in the school must know them and look out for them. Mrs. Smith said, “That’s what life is all about. Helping each other.”

Mrs. Smith talked a lot about helping others and seemed to emphasize this with her faculty and staff. “Asking for help” and “helping others” seemed to be accepted norms of behavior at SES. For example, the librarian explained to me that they had just moved the library to a new location that was right beside the computer lab. I asked her why they moved the library and she said, “So we can help each other.”

I will now present narratives taken from teacher interviews that will provide clues as to how the teachers feel about this school. The teachers were asked the following the questions: “What does it feel like to work at this school?” or “Describe the people
in this school." The first response comes from a first grade teacher who has nine years of teaching experience -- all at SES:

**What does it feel like to work at this school?**

This is home. I love to come back after the summer. Even the smell. It's an old musty smell but it's such a happy, familiar smell. I love working here. People are kind to ya. They're nurturing and that goes from the principal to the maids in the hall and everybody in between.

**Guidance Counselor - 19 years at SES:**

**What does it feel like to work at this school?**

It feels like home. I guess because I've been here for so long. We don't have much turnover as a faculty so we've gotten to know each other. We know each others' personalities well, so I think we mesh well together.

We have grown as a faculty and we look at ourselves basically as a family. Like I said before, we know each other. I think that helps a lot with the way that the school is run by us knowing each other we know our strengths and we know our weaknesses and we know who to call on when there's a need concerning the children or the school. WE know who to call on.

**Custodian, 6 yrs years at SES:**

**What does it feel like to work at this school?**

To me, it's a very clean atmosphere. I feel great here. I feel at home. I feel like a family here.

**Kindergarten teacher, first year teaching:**

**Describe the people in this school.**

Friendly. They're not like typical women. I worked with women all through college. I worked at an office of women and they're real back stabbing, vindictive, viscous, ugly for no reason. I haven't found one person here like that. I haven't found any person who will do something just to be ugly. I haven't heard one person do this -- yet. And everybody seems willing to help. They're just friendly. They're just nice.

**Fourth grade teacher, 14 years at SES:**

**What does it feel like to work at this school?**
I love my job here. I tell you. I live across town. We just moved another 5 - 10 minutes further away. Everybody says, "Why do you stay at this school? Why don't you go closer home?" Because you know I like this school. I like being here and that's why I drive the distance I do.

Librarian, third year at SES:

What does it feel like to work at this school?

I feel like I'm confident when I come here everyday and that I should be here. I feel like I will always be supported in my decisions. I feel like my administration and my teachers feel comfortable enough to talk to each other if they're not satisfied with what you're doing -- but they do it in a constructive way. It's never demeaning. They're real supportive.

Gifted teacher, travels to two other schools:

What does it feel like to work at this school?

I look forward to it. I look forward to it everyday. I've got . . . it's just a warm feeling and feeling good about it you know . . .

One theme that emerged from analysis of the language that these teachers and custodian used was the repetitive use of words such as "family" and "home" to describe SES. The gifted teacher talked of a warm feeling she gets when she is in this school. I found her comments interesting because she travels to three schools. She was in a position to compare schools and said, "This [SHE] is where my heart is," even though SES was not her "home school." The kind of language used by the teachers and staff members at SES strongly suggest that a cohesive kind of community experience exists at this school.

Another interesting comment, which has implications for the development of community in schools, was the suggestion that the school feels like home because there is not much faculty mobility. This notion supports the idea that "continuity of people" is important to building caring communities (Noddings, 1992).
Finally, one teacher said that “People are kind to 'ya. They’re nurturing and that goes from the principal to the maids in the hall and everybody in between.” This suggests that a certain kind of feeling permeates the entire school. Based on my experience as participant-as-observer at SES, I would argue that a sense of community does exist at this school. Kindness and caring seemed to be the norm.

Before considering whether or not Mrs. Smith promoted community in her school, we will explore the way that she conceptualizes the term “community.” In my interview with her, I asked her the following question: “Would you describe your school as a community or an organization?” She answered as follows:

I would like to think it’s a community that I’m building myself. It’s more of an organization within a community because there’s so many -- we don’t have the sports, so the kids are all in sports at CYAL or up in Baker in the Babe Ruth leagues. Years ago there were sports within the schools which makes you a community. You’re no longer an organization because the whole community gets behind you. Even though we have programs and invite the parents to come -- and we’re a voting precinct -- unless they have a child or a grandchild here, I don’t see a whole lot of the community.

Mrs. Smith defines “community” as the people living in the neighborhood that surrounds the school and her conception of “community” includes the goal of parental involvement. Mrs. Smith’s conception of “community” exists outside of the school. I later asked her if it was possible to build community within the school. She said, “You mean like a family? Yes. You can do that.” Mrs. Smith uses the word “family” to describe Sergiovanni’s (1994) concept of the experience of “community” that can exist within a school. Her initial reaction to the question of community indicated
that she understood "community" to be located within the context of a "school-community" kind of relationship.

I will now address the question: Does Mrs. Smith promote a sense of community at SES? Based on my experience at SES, I believe that Mrs. Smith does indeed promote a sense of community in her school. I assert that everything she does is well thought out. She made several comments to me about the importance of public relations (PR). It is on these comments that I base this conclusion.

Our most important job is PR with the public, with the teachers, with the children, because it's hard to push an instructional program if people don't respect you.

PR is important. Why do think I stop what I'm doing to talk to people? You've got to keep them happy. PR is everything. You can't get them mad and keep them mad.

PR is everything. Why do you think I stop what I'm doing to talk to people? You have to.

To Mrs. Smith's way of thinking, PR means having good relationships with all people that are connected to her school in any way. From a moral perspective, this sounds a bit hypocritical and raises questions about her sincerity because the term "public relations" sometimes has negative connotations. Does she stop to talk to people because she cares or because she ultimately wants them to support her instructional program? Based on my experiences at SES, Mrs. Smith uses the phrase "public relations," to mean "community." Mrs. Smith consciously promotes a sense of community in her school but refers to this as public relations. She stays on good terms with everyone. Further, I believe that she does this for two reasons: She genuinely cares about people, and to fulfill her goal of having a good instructional program. In one way, building
community is a means to a final end for Mrs. Smith. I never witnessed anything at this school, however, to make me question Mrs. Smith’s sincerity or passion for her work. One teacher described her as follows:

Every morning, she welcomes. “Good morning, how are you doing?” She’s not real nosy but she wants you to know that she cares about your family. If you bring up stuff about your family, she wants to talk about it but she won’t ... you know, ... ask, “How’s your family doing?” If you start talking about it, she’s all ears and ... But she’s just ... the whole office ... they’re all happy. When you walk in, it’s just a pleasant feeling.

I heard comments like this from many people at SES. As a visitor, I got the same pleasant feeling about the school while I was there. Mrs. Smith seems to be able to maintain high standards for her teachers as well as make them feel cared for. As one teacher put it, “If you give your 110%, you got it made with Mrs. Smith.”

The metaphor chosen for this particular school was “school as home” because of the strong relationships that seem to exist. Mrs. Smith promoted positive relationships in order to gain support for her instructional programs. This is indicative of her moral imperative as one concerned with what is in the best interest of students and teachers (Greenfield, 1995). She developed strong relationships in her school as a means to the greater end of promoting an effective instructional program for her students.

PES - - Mrs. Tabor
“School as Workplace”

If I had to describe Mrs. Tabor in one word I would have to say, “humorous.” My two weeks at PES were fun. I’m not sure how else to describe my feelings about this school. The metaphor that
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I chose to describe PES as "School as Workplace" where people come together to work and then go home. I got the impression that these teachers went through the motions of doing the best that they could in a difficult situation. Mrs. Tabor's response "The beat goes on . . ." seems to exemplify this attitude of hopelessness. I will begin, as I did in the preceding case, with observations that are relevant to the experience of community in this particular school.

The following set of observations represents a typical day at PES. There is no particular order to the way that the observations are presented because this reflects the atmosphere at PES.

When I was walking up to the building one morning the guidance counselor was greeting the kids as they got off a bus. The counselor said, "Nothing but goodness, love, and respect."

A parent walks in and signs-in her son. No one speaks to her.

A teacher comes into Mrs. Tabor's office and said, "Mrs. Tabor, I have a very unusual request. Can we leave at PE time?" Mrs. Tabor said, "Where you going? To the boat [gambling boat]?

A teacher walked past the secretary's desk and said, "I love that plant (on the secretary's desk). It makes me feel happy.

We were "hanging around the counter" and Mrs. Tabor announced to everyone, "I wish I could save my son from this woman." A teacher asked, "Who?" Mrs. Tabor answered, "Robert, my oldest son. What can I do?"

We were sitting in her office one day and Mrs. Tabor said, "Have you ever had your color done? It's good to do a little introspection."

Mrs. Tabor told me, "Don't look at 'em [students] when the buses pull away cuz you will get the salute."

Mrs. Tabor and I stopped at the office counter and hung around for a few minutes. She took care of some business like teacher appreciation, nacho money, talked about her yard. Mrs. Tabor talks incessantly. She talked to everyone who came into the office.
Mrs. Tabor was standing by the counter. A teacher walked by. Mrs. Tabor said, "Smile."

We went into Mrs. Tabor's office. She was looking at the book order that had to be redone. Finally she said, "Maybe I'll re-do it. Martha's eyes are really not good and she won't let up. She keeps pushing.

Mrs. Tabor said, "Let's go see what is going on." We went for a walk down the hall. We walked down to the third grade classrooms. Both of these teachers were pregnant. Mrs. Tabor said, "I'm just checking on my pregnant ones. You have to check day to day to see how they look cuz you never know."

At 1:00 PES has a second recess. Mrs. Tabor and I walked outside. She pointed to a black child with lots of long braids and said, "Those [braids] are fake you know. First time I saw that some kids came to me and said, 'Boris pulled this out of Tameka's head.' I went to find her and I expected to find a bloody mess. She was sitting there doing her Math. It's an extension."

I could go on but I believe this sample communicates the "feel" of this school. What does it really say about the experience of community at PES? In many ways, as much as I enjoyed spending time with Mrs. Tabor, I began to question the depth of the relationships between the people at this school. Some encounters seemed shallow.

For example, a teacher came up to Mrs. Tabor in the hall one day concerned because Jarrod was "just filling in circles on his CAT test." I got the impression that the teacher was really upset about this. Mrs. Tabor said, "And the beat goes on . . . " I heard her say this several times while I was at PES. I laughed every time I heard her say it but wondered at the same time if she should be more serious.

The observations described above were caught "on the run." Although they do provide some insight into the humor that seemed to be Mrs. Tabor's style, they do not provide much information about
the quality of relationships in the school. Mrs. Tabor made two comments in passing that are revealing.

I'm so aggravated with my staff. They're so petty. My janitors too. I have two teachers who are petty. I'm ignoring them. I'm not going to get involved.

We were sitting in Mrs. Tabor's office and she said, "I hate teachers' lounges. I avoid them. A lot of bad talk goes on in 'em. We moved furniture out to discourage 'em [from coming in]."

These comments are meaningful. Mrs. Tabor feels strongly that what goes on in teachers' lounges is negative. Her belief is so strong that she removed some of the furniture from the room. What impact does such an action, on the part of the principal, have on relationships in an elementary school? What message did this gesture send to the teachers? I believe that this gesture promoted the formation of small groups of teachers (or cliques). It certainly did not promote the sense of "community" described by Sergiovanni (1994). It made me wonder about the social structure of this school. On the surface everyone seemed to get along fine. I typically saw the same teachers in her office, however, and there were many teachers that I never saw in the office area at all. The comments made by Mrs. Tabor indicate that she does not promote community in her school.

One teacher interview, which was partly deleted due to tape recorder malfunction, provides another perspective on Mrs. Tabor, and the community experience at PES.

Second grade teacher:

So you said that the faculty is not as close as it used to be? Over the past 22 years? What do you think has caused that?

Well, I think turnover too and uh . . . the faculty maybe . . . I don't know. I don't know what has caused
It. Well, maybe it's just me. I know a lot of my real close friends are retired or left. That might be it.

The last question is: How would you describe the principal. How would you describe Mrs. Tabor?

She's a talker. Well... she's my friend so how do you (she laughs)?

There are two interesting comments made in this excerpt. This teacher mentions that turnover may explain why the faculty is not as close as it used to be. Turnover among faculty, however, can be explained in more than one way. For example, it is possible to suggest that a lack of community led to high turnover.

Nevertheless, the comments made by this teacher support the idea of the relationship between caring and "continuity of people" (Noddings, 1992). The second point of interest is the comment made by the teacher when asked to describe the principal: "Well... she's my friend, so how do you...?" What are we to make of this comment? Perhaps this teacher had something negative to say about Mrs. Tabor but hesitated because of their friendship? This teacher continued as follows:

If you have a problem you can go talk to her about it and sometimes we don't agree on things. I don't because I just think that's human nature [to not always agree]. I get kind of aggravated with her.

But... she's relaxed a lot with the kids and with the teachers.

It is difficult to make sense out of the relationship between this teacher and Mrs. Tabor. In one way, this teacher exhibited a sense of loyalty to Mrs. Tabor as her friend. On the other hand, her comments about Mrs. Tabor were embedded with meaning. "I get kind of aggravated with her," suggests that when this teacher disagrees with Mrs. Tabor she feels aggravated with her. This
implies that Mrs. Tabor may not "agree to disagree" with the teachers and that the decisions made at this school are made exclusively by Mrs. Tabor. This situation has implications for our search for "community" at PES. Sergiovanni's (1974) concept of community stresses the transformation of a group from loosely affiliated individuals to a tightly bound collectivity ("I's" to the "we") (p. 218). In a community, when a decision is made by two people, even if they disagree, it is a decision for which both parties feel responsible. It is shared decisionmaking so that the individuals involved can say, "We have made this decision." This does not seem to be the case at PES.

Analysis of the interview with this teacher reveals another interesting finding. There is an absence of praise for Mrs. Tabor, compared with the praise of teachers at SES for Mrs. Smith. Often it is what is not said that is as revealing.

The following narratives will help the analysis. The information that I asked for was: "Describe the people in this school."

Custodian, 23 years of experience at PES

Describe the people in this school.

Well, everybody you know is nice. Newcomers, they kinda slow being friendly.

Who are newcomers?

Well just like a newcomer first coming in teaching. Just like you coming in. OK, you won't be friendly with everybody because you don't know nobody.

Third grade teacher, 8 years at PES, 22 years total

Describe the people in this school.

I think basically for the most part in every situation you're going to have your good and bad situations. For
the most part, the parents are supportive . . . My coworkers are very nice. I like them. We all seem to get along pretty good.

Although I only have a few transcriptions of interviews from this school, owing to technical problems with the tape recorder, there seems to be an absence of such words as "family" and "home." Most of the people in this school gave me the feeling that they thought things at this school were "for the most part, pretty good." No one at this school was overly enthusiastic about anything. My impression was that there is a lack of strong relationships between the people at this school. The school is a workplace where they gather to do their work and then leave for the day.

I will now present data that I gathered from my interviews with Mrs. Tabor. She is a lot of fun to be around, but she does have a serious side. She is intelligent and likes to discuss interesting topics. When I asked her whether she would describe her school as a "community" or an "organization" she had a lot to say (which was no surprise). She said that she would probably describe PES as a "community" rather than an "organization." I asked her to explain the difference between these two concepts. She had the following to say:

Organization kind of makes me think in terms of you know -- up here [points to head]. Things you do with your mind and structure -- more rigid structure and that sort of thing. Community is little more fluid. It has to do with the affective areas: The heart, the soul sort of thing. I don't like to say we're a family. I don't know. It's just a personal thing. And I'm not criticizing people who say, "This is the PES Family," because it's not. This is not our family. We have other families. I feel pretty strongly about that. I think you need to have a life. You've got to have a family, you've got to have some friends, you've got to have something away from this building.
Mrs. Tabor's answer was candid. From a moral perspective, is she not being honest by saying that PES cannot be a family because everyone has their own real families? Is this more honest than saying, "We're a family here." It is also indicative of how she feels about her teachers and students. She continues and clarifies her position:

> When we’re here, we are community. We work together to help these children. We have interests, we have fun. I guess organizations can have fun but I like for things to be a little more fluid. I like to be flexible.

> I think we are a community within a community. Another thing that I feel strongly about is we don’t have the right, I don’t think, to really criticize and to manipulate, if you will, the bigger community.

Mrs. Tabor talked about the larger community and raised some very important ethical issues. Scholars such as Sergiovanni (1994) propose that we change the metaphor for school to "community." Such a suggestion is complex. The norms and values of elementary schools are often at odds with the norms and values of the larger community from which the students come. An elementary school is frequently the point where idealism and realism meet. Contextual factors have important effects on the sense of community within a school. This is problematic to Sergiovanni's notion that we change the metaphor for schools and thus change the reality of schools. Mrs. Tabor speaks about these difficulties in the following passage.

> We don't have the right to tell people how to live their lives -- like parents. And sometimes we want to ... we might say, "This violates my morals." Well it may, but we don't have the right to tell somebody that. And if you're going to deal with family issues, and illegitimate births, welfare, violence, drugs -- you have to be very subtle. And if I've learned anything it's that I don't know what it's like to be poor and...
impoverished and living in a cycle of poverty and hopelessness. I know I don’t know how to deal with that so how can I really tell somebody if I’ve never been in that position.

From a moral perspective, how does this condition impact the moral discourse/practice of a white principal in a predominantly black school? Can Mrs. Tabor cultivate Frankena’s (1980) “moral point of view” if she knows nothing of the childrens’ private struggles? Although I do not think that it is possible for her to cultivate a “moral point of view” as described by Frankena, I believe that by her awareness of this reality, she has done the next best thing. She has used awareness to structure her discourse/practice.

Mrs. Tabor continued to discuss the problems associated with being a community within a community.

I think people love their kids and want their kids to be happy and secure. And they want them to learn so you can’t go back in there and say, “You’ve got to change this and this and this in your life.” And do it in an aggressive and offensive way. So I think we are a community within a community maybe a little bit different. We speak standard English, or we try to here, knowing that they don’t in the larger community. And maybe if you go down in the middle of a violent neighborhood and you get too prissy with your talk you can get beat up. So I know these kids when they go back out there, they’re going to have to slide back into whatever the street talk is. Do I have the right to change that without taking the child out of there – which I can’t do. You have to be careful. You have to be real careful.

Mrs. Tabor made some interesting points that support her conception of PES as a small community within a larger community. I do not believe that she has presented an argument against creating “community” in elementary schools. She has, however, highlighted some of the difficulties that must be considered in doing so.

Does Mrs. Tabor promote a sense of community in PES by developing positive relationships with principals and teachers?
This answer is difficult to answer. Perhaps she tries to instill a community spirit in students by teaching them to ask for forgiveness and to forgive. In regard to teachers, the same is not true. Her attitude about the teachers' lounge suggests that she does not actively promote community in her school. Rather, it seems that she attempts to prevent pettiness by discouraging teachers from congregating in the lounge. Instead of promoting community she discourages pettiness by removing furniture from the lounge. Her comments about her "petty" teachers supports the suggestion that there is no spirit of community at PES.

GES -- Mr. Davis
"School as Learning Organization"

My experience at GES was interesting. Mr. Davis may be characterized as a hard worker. As one teacher put it, "Nobody works harder than Mr. Davis." A parent interviewed described him as follows, "He's definitely a good disciplinarian, strict, very involved, works probably double what everybody else does, goes the extra mile." I believe this is an accurate description of Mr. Davis. At the end of the day, after following Mr. Davis around, I was physically tired. I was tired because we never stopped moving -- walking around the campus and taking care of business.

The atmosphere at GES can be described as serious and structured. The metaphor that I have chosen to describe this school is "School as Learning Organization." Mr. Davis structured and organized this school so that children can learn. For example, I noticed that the doors had been removed from the students' bathrooms. There was a wooden screen installed on the inside of the doorway. You could not really see into the bathrooms but you
could hear what was going on in them very well. Mr. Davis said that he removed the bathroom doors because the kids were hanging on the pipes that run along the bathroom ceiling. Without doors, you could see kids swinging from the pipes. Mr. Davis runs a tight ship -- there is no doubt about it.

The following set of observations were all coded "general atmosphere" and will provide some idea of what this school was like.

The phone rang. The secretary answered the phone and then said, "Mr. Davis . . ." It's too late, he was gone. She then said to a teacher standing close by, "Go catch him."

It was recess. The secretary looked out of her window into the breezeway. There were a lot of kids sitting in the breezeway against posts. The secretary said, "Do we have half the school punished?" Mr. Oster said, "We have more kids punished than playing."

A little girl came into the office. She had fallen off of the monkey bars? The secretary said, "What is your name?" The girl said, "Connie." "Connie who?" Mr. Davis then chimed in, "Connie Washington."

As I walked into the covered breezeway a teacher walked by me but didn’t look at me.

I heard a teacher say, "If you don’t close your mouth, you’re going to get a pink slip."

Mr. Davis and I talked about math. GES gives a math button for learning math facts. They use computers and manipulatives. Mr. Davis said that every class is above the national average.

The morning bell rang. Mr. Davis walked the halls. "Jeremy, you rode the bus this morning? Why were you eating breakfast so late?" As we walked away from this boy Mr. Davis said, "Biggest liar in the school."

Mr. Davis seemed to know all of the children’s names.

In terms of relationships, most of them seemed friendly but businesslike. I walked to the teachers’ lounge in the morning before school on two separate occasions and found it empty both
times. The teachers did seem to congregate, however -- they clustered in the auditorium where teachers' mailboxes, the copy machine, and the Coke machine were located. I was never able to get a strong impression, positive or negative, about the relationships between the teachers at this school. I, as observer-as-participant, saw very few teachers while I was at GES. In other schools I got to know some teachers better than others. The teachers that I became familiar with were those that came in to the office most frequently. At GES there was not a select group of teachers that came into the office any more than others. I saw very few teachers in the office.

The following narratives were gathered from teachers who were asked: “Describe the people in this school” or “How does it feel to work in this school?” The responses to these question are somewhat mixed; some of them were positive and some negative.

Guidance Counselor, 4 years at GES

Describe the people in this school.

I’ve been here a while so I know all of the teachers pretty well. Our faculty meshes well together; they work well together . . . They’re just a real good faculty to work with -- real caring people.

Librarian, 27 years at GES

How does it feel to work at this school?

I think it’s a very pleasant environment. I have been in other places where there’s not the positive environment that we have. I think ours is very positive. Our faculty, for the most part I believe, feels relaxed and confident and I think we all work well together.

Substitute teacher (and parent)

How does it feel to work at this school?
Having already been a professional person and worked as a substitute, I realize I couldn’t do this indefinitely, because you don’t belong. You don’t belong to the faculty, as a substitute. You don’t have your own class, you don’t have your own resources, you don’t have your own children; you go from class to class. It’s hard to be a substitute.

**Fourth grade teacher, 15 years teaching experience, 5 at GES**

*How does it feel to work at this school?*

Well, I guess some days it’s good, some days not so good. Pretty good. It’s a very relaxed atmosphere. I enjoy working with the children, parts of the faculty are pretty close-knit. Some is just geographics, I guess the way the school’s set up. The people that you work with - - - normally you’re closer to on a day-to-day basis, . . .

*Do people meet in the lounge?*

No. People meet in the rooms, it kind of depends. Or they come out here to get a Coke, which used to be the lounge, right there where the Coke machine is.

**Third grade teacher, 16 years at GES**

*How does it feel to work at this school?*

You shouldn’t have asked me this. I you’re not on the principal’s bad side, then it’s fine.

*How do you get on - - - do you feel like you are on the principal’s bad side?*

Oh sure. Because I voice my opinion I feel. He doesn’t really forgive and forget. If you get on his bad side, you’re on it. That’s just the bottom line . . . You know, he’s a male principal and it’s kind of like it’s his way or no way.

*Do you feel like you’re alone in that, or are there other people who would agree?*

Well, there are other people who feel the same way but they wouldn’t voice their opinion because they don’t want to get on his bad side. So I just take whatever happens, and you know, I think that’s why I get, you know like the other third grade teachers have 8 girls and 8 boys, I get 16 boys and not any girls. Plus he knows I have a heart problem - - - he knows I take medication, but yet he still gives me cases like this.
The guidance counselor and the librarian agreed that the faculty worked well together. The guidance counselor’s comment, “Our faculty meshes well together; they work well together,” suggests that she feels separate from the faculty. She could have said, “Our faculty meshes well together; we work well together.” This comment suggests that the guidance counselor does not feel tightly connected to the teachers. The individuals at this school do not seem to be bound together into a collective “we.”

The responses from the third grade teacher, the fourth grade teacher, and the substitute teacher reveal mixed feelings about GES. The substitute said that she just did not belong. This doesn’t seem to be an unusual feeling for a substitute to have because they do not have a classroom, they do not have a class of children, and they do move from place to place; however, this substitute teacher was at school many days during the two weeks that I was there. It seems that a substitute teacher who subs often in the same school could feel, at least, like part of the faculty. The comments made by the substitute suggest that she does not really have a warm feeling about this school.

The third grade teacher presented a negative image of GES and Mr. Davis. Likewise, Mr. Davis made several negative comments about her to other people while I was there. Apparently, these two people do not get along. Does this relationship between Mr. Davis and a teacher say anything about the overall atmosphere of GES? From a moral perspective, the fact that Mr. Davis criticizes this teacher openly is meaningful. This kind of moral discourse/practice sets a tone in the school where it is acceptable to talk negatively
about people when they are not present. If the principal, or the leader, of the school behaves in this way then it seems that the teachers would feel free to behave this way also. Behavior such as this clearly interferes with the building of strong relationships between people in schools.

Mr. Davis mentioned to me that he believed that “the school has got to be the center of the community.” He believes strongly that the school should serve the community. When he spoke of community, he seemed to be referring to the external or outside community of GES. I asked him the following question: “Let me ask you something about this community thing. Do you think that there’s an outside community and the school should be the hub of that community . . . Is there a sense of community within the school, do you think, or is it more like an organization?” He answered as follows:

It’s both. You have to have organization. That’s number one. But you’ve got to have the school community. The first year of integration we canceled the . . . Halloween Carnival. It takes two or three months to plan that thing and get it off the ground and the white parents who were left here said, “Hey, we’re not going to be involved. That’s it. Let them do it.” The black parents said, “You’re making my kid come from this school to this school” . . . to a white school which was a joke. There was just total distrust. I said, “Hey. We’ll just shut it down -- we won’t have it.”

When asked about “community,” Mr. Davis seemed to view it as a relationship between the school and the parents. His conception of “community” places it in the “school-community” dichotomy. To Mr. Davis’ way of thinking, to achieve community is to get the parents involved -- to get them to come to school for different functions. He explained at great length what they did at GES to get the parents to come to school for different events. Mr. Davis
said that to achieve community you have to work at it. It does not just “happen.” They worked very hard at it and have managed to get parents involved. For example, they set up a “parental involvement committee” to work on improving the school—community relations.

Mr. Davis’ conception of “community” as parental involvement or a school community relationship is important. It is, however, a conception in which “community” is located outside of the school as relational -- not within the school. This is how Mr. Davis conceives of the notion of community. I do not believe that he considers the notion of an “experience of community” within the school. Does Mr. Davis actively promote a sense of community within his school? Based on my observations and on the interview narratives collected, I argue that he does not promote a sense of community within his school. He is more focused on instruction and discipline. He has formed his school into a learning organization because he cares about his students. There seems to be a link between the moral imperative of the principal and the kind of community promoted within a school.

VES -- Mr. Samuel
“School as Workplace”

During my two week stay at VES, the impression I got was that the teachers did their jobs as best they could, and that everyone generally enjoyed being at VES. I never got the feeling, however, that this particular school was “moving forward.” I came to this view from comments made by Mr. Samuel like, “See this office [referring to his own office]. Next year it will have curtains and all . . . I don’t care” or “We have not gone to ‘Math Their Way.’ If they want to, they can later.” These remarks made me conclude
that Mr. Samuel is not interested in starting or trying anything new. As long as "things are quiet" he seems happy. The school was like a "workplace" in which people gathered to do their jobs and go home.

I spent most of the two weeks at VES sitting with Mr. Samuel in his office. We did not walk around the school much. He typically left for lunch and stayed away for 30 minutes to an hour. I noticed that the teachers' lounge was often full of teachers. I heard laughter coming from the lounge on more than one occasion. Of all the schools that I visited, the teachers' lounge at this school had the most life. I believe that this observation is meaningful in terms of the kinds of relationships between the teachers at this school. I think these teachers enjoyed being at this school and they all loved Mr. Samuel. In fact, one striking characteristic about this school was the affection that the teachers expressed for Mr. Samuel. When they talked about him, there was an outpouring of love for this man.

The following set of observations will provide an idea of the general atmosphere of this school.

Mrs. Howard, the PE teacher, was waiting for the copy machine. She said to the teacher using it, "Hurry up Capricorn!" Then she looked at me and said, "We're both Capricorn. What are you?"

We started talking about the "Mr. Earl" that they have in the lounge. Mr. Earl is a life size cardboard man that came with the fund raiser materials to remind the children about the fund raiser. Now that the fund raiser is over, Mr. Earl is in the teachers' lounge. Covering his face is a picture of Elvis puckering. The rest of Mr. Earl is dressed like an Easter bunny. Mr. Samuel said, "You gotta have some fun."

The guidance counselor stopped at Mr. Samuel's door and said, "If you act happy around here the teachers think you're not working."
We got up and walked into the teachers lounge. We talked with the teachers. Mr. Samuel laughs a lot.

A man poked his head into the office and said, "Good morning, principal Samuel." The secretary said, "Whose parent is that?" Mr. Samuel said, "I don't know."

Mr. Samuel seems to enjoy being with the teachers. On the few occasions that we went into the lounge at recess, Mr. Samuel came alive. He laughed with the teachers more than any of the other principals that I shadowed.

The following set of interview narratives were derived from teacher interviews. The teachers were asked: "What does it feel like to work at this school?" or "Describe the people in this school."

Guidance Counselor, 14 years at VES

What does it feel like to work at this school?

It feels great. We get tremendous support from Mr. Samuel. It's just ... you can work your program. Mr. Samuel is the kind of principal that allows you to excel and do what you do and knows that there's more than just one way to skin a cat and I like it. All these years I've liked it.

Librarian, 16 years at VES

What does it feel like to work at this school?

It's comfortable. Mr. Samuel is a strong enough principal but at the same time he never makes you feel like he's breathing down your neck or you know upset with you or anything like that. If he has something to say to you, he says it and it's all over with.

Secretary, 18 years at VES

Describe the people in this school.

That's one reason I like to work here. Our teachers are just very ... they have a good rapport with each other. They are glad to be here. We are always glad to tell parents that this is a good school because we feel like it's a good school ... it is a good school.
For that reason there is very little bickering that I even know about. And if there are disagreements (and which there are) we take care of it and get it going right in no time.

Custodian, 7 years at VES

Describe the people in this school.

Well I say they’re very nice people. You know. Good morning – – every morning. Never had no problem with nobody at this school. I think it’s a very good staff to work with. Everybody’s understanding . . . try to help each other . . . like I said at first . . . like a family. You know. The people . . . they real nice.

PE teacher, 7 years at VES

What does it feel like to work at this school?

Well, we laugh a lot. The atmosphere is a lot of fun. We joke a lot but we do our jobs and it’s pleasant. I anticipate coming to work everyday and I anticipate leaving (laughs). It’s great. You know by the time you look around it’s time to go. You’ve done what you have to do. It’s OK. I love it.

Third grade teacher, 11 years experience, 4 years at VES

Describe the people in this school.

Everybody is very friendly. They joke and kid around. I’m sure you’ve seen that in the lounge. Everybody is friendly . . . they’re real easy to get to know. When I first came here I came in an extra second grade teacher. He called the three second grade teachers he already had. They came up here and met me in the summer . . . went through all the materials so they’re very friendly. But you’re free to do what you want to do in your classroom. Nobody . . . there’ no constraints like you have to teach this way because this is the way we’ve always taught. So they’re good about that. They’re very supportive of one another. It’s fairly pleasant. I mean there are some problems here or there. I think you get that anytime you deal with lots of people in a stressful situation like a school (laughs) . . . For the most part, I think everybody respects everybody else and we work pretty well together. When the time comes, we all pull together in the same direction – – most of the time so that helps.
The general impression that one gets from these narratives is that working for Mr. Samuel is comfortable. Also, it seems that the teachers at this school get along well. What is it about this school that makes it such a comfortable place to be? Does Mr. Samuel have anything to do with this feeling? Does he promote a sense of community in this school? The following narratives, gathered from interviews with teachers, provide some insight into these questions.

Third grade teacher, 11 years experience, 4 at VES

He treats everybody like they’re his own children and you know he’s very talkative and very friendly. Everybody knows what’s going on in everyone’s lives. That’s something that makes it a whole lot easier to work here. Cuz he knows what’s happening. Very supportive when something happens like you saw me with the note from the parent. I know that if she calls him on Monday that he’s read my response to her and he’s going to stand up behind me and if necessary he’ll tell her to come in and meet with us and we’ll discuss it and he’ll stand behind me no matter what happens. So that’s always nice to have.

This teacher described Mr. Samuel as being an extremely supportive principal and one that is interested in his teachers’ personal lives.

PE teacher, 7 years at VES

He’s wonderful. I love him . . . we all love him. In fact, everybody tries to get to this school because of him. You know when you come to work, you don’t have any pressure on you . . . You tend to do a good job. And there’s no pressure.

This teacher described VES as a place where you can do your work without pressure. That seems to be what she admires most about Mr. Samuel. He allows the teachers do their jobs without interference. This characteristic can be looked at positively as well as
negatively. Does this mean that Mr. Samuel is easily satisfied? Or does it imply that he has no expectations for his teachers to fulfill?

In order to get some feel for Mr. Samuel’s conceptualization of “community,” the following narrative taken from my interview with him will offer some clues. I asked him the following question, “Would you describe your school as a community or an organization? And what is the difference between the two?”

It’s a community. It’s a community. An organization . . . well, a community, as I see it, is everybody gets to say their thing and get some input. See we start working on the calendar . . . well two of us basically put the structure there but I’m waiting for my PTO president to come over so we can finalize some things. She may want to change some of those dates and I’m open to that but we have to tentatively put some things down and so . . . PTO has input, teachers have input. For one thing, I don’t know everything. I think somebody else is bound to have a better idea or just as good an idea about how to do something as I do and, why do it the hard way? So if I can find somebody who knows a better way . . . hey, come tell me. I’m all for it. If they can set up a duty roster that’s better, well come tell me. Don’t come in griping about it. Just come and say, “Why don’t we try this? I’m ready, I’m ready to try that. So, I guess it’s more like a community. Organizations are down, you know. Authority down. It’s kind of . . . they have a lot of say about what they . . . do.

What would you say the difference between a community and an organization is?

Well, I guess the community is . . . the way I’m putting it is that everybody has input into decision making. And not an organization that’s top down. And a lot of those are changing . . . organizations are changing where they’re getting input from employees and all that but uh . . . it means a lot to the employee to be called in and say what do you think about this? You’ve been doing it this way for a long time . . . could we do it a better way? And I think we operate pretty much like that.

Mr. Samuel thinks of community in his school as a process of “shared decision making.” He feels that in organizations authority
runs "top-down" and in communities it goes from the "bottom-up." He emphasizes the fact that in communities all people have input into important decisions. Nowhere in his definition of community is there mention of relationships between people, but he seems to have a wonderful relationship with his teachers. I am not sure, however, about his relationship with the children. I did not gather enough data to make any conclusions.

Does Mr. Samuel promote a sense of community at VES? I believe that he encourages shared decision making because he believes this is the hallmark of "community." He also values the relationships that he has with his teachers. Mr. Samuel is a kind man who wants everyone to be happy. It appears that one way he kept his teachers happy is by not putting any pressure on them. I am not sure what to think of this. As I said previously, it does not seem that this school is moving forward. It is just maintaining itself. Based on my observations and interview data, I believe that Mr. Samuel is more interested in keeping his teachers happy than anything else. In Mrs. Smith's case, she builds community in order to gain support for her instructional program. Mr. Samuel does not exhibit any indication that he is concerned with instruction or the achievement of the students at his school. He keeps everyone at his school happy but possibly at the expense of high academic expectations. This seems to be a reflection of his moral stance of apathy.

Summary

Did the principals in this study promote a sense of community within their schools? None of these principals consciously promoted the kind of "community" suggested by Sergiovanni (1994)
within their schools. For example, I don't think that any one of them made a decision like the following: "This year I will work on creating a sense of community in my school that will focus on positive relationships and a coming together to achieve a common goal." However, Mrs. Smith practiced "public relations" in an effort to gain support for her instructional program.

When asked about their views of community, each of the principals had a different concept of "community". Therefore, their behavior tended to promote their particular notion of community. For example, Mr. Davis viewed community as strong parental involvement -- this is what he worked toward. He did not consider the possibility of a community spirit within his school at all.

Mr. Smith promoted a sense of community by doing what she called PR. She made teachers "feel good" so that that would give her 110%. Mrs. Smith indicated that the purpose of PR was to get people to respect her and support her instructional program. Of all the four schools, SES had the strongest sense of community in terms of strong relationships between people. She promoted a sense of community with her teachers and students. More importantly, she created a sense of community to enable every person in her school to reach his or her fullest potential.

Mrs. Tabor viewed community as a fluid kind of thing. She believed in flexibility. In terms of the kind of community that this study investigated, one in which strong relationships are the foundation, Mrs. Tabor did not promote this kind of community. Perhaps this is an unfair appraisal, but the comments about the teachers' lounge seemed to indicate that she did not attempt to
build relationships between her teachers. She preferred to ignore the teachers and their pettiness.

Finally, Mr. Samuel viewed community as having to do with the ways decisions are made in schools. In a community, he felt that decisions are made from the “bottom up.” He allowed the teachers input into decisionmaking and, in his view, promoted his conception of community in his school. In terms of relationships, the teachers at this school seemed to be a close group. I heard much laughter from the teachers’ lounge during recess. Mr. Samuel doesn’t seem to put a lot of pressure on his teachers. Perhaps this explains the relaxed atmosphere of the school. It also raises questions about the effectiveness of the school.

In summary, these principals did not consciously promote community within their schools. Mrs. Smith is the only principal who consciously and purposefully promoted “public relations” at her school. Her concept of “public relations” is close in meaning to the kind of “community building” that this study investigated. She promoted positive relationships among her teachers and staff members and created an atmosphere in which helping others was the norm. All of this was done to gain support for her instructional program. She wanted her teachers to be the best and she wanted each student to reach his or her fullest potential. The case of Mrs. Smith indicates that it is possible to build community in schools. It also supports Dewey’s (1916) notion that communities are actually means to a greater end — self actualization.
CHAPTER EIGHT - CONCLUSIONS

This study was driven by a concern, promoted in current literature, that our society is in the midst of a moral crisis. The school, as a microcosm of the larger society, is shouldering the burden of a whole new set of problems. For example, some children come to school so preoccupied with family problems that they are unable to concentrate on their school work. They arrive at school needing to feel safe and cared-for. Problems like these are situated within the moral realm and the impact of these problems on the elementary school is substantial.

As schools begin to accept additional responsibilities, a new kind of leadership is required. Mitchell and Tucker (1992) have suggested that, "Perhaps it is time to recognize that leadership is less a matter of action than a way of thinking and feeling . . ." (p. 30). This notion of leadership as a way of "being" seems to begin to capture the essence of what it means to be a "moral leader." Beck (1992) has argued that we must "reclaim educational administration as a caring profession." This perspective offers as a common focus, a commitment to care for all children -- a view that differs from the traditional aim of education that centers on "ends" such as achievement test scores. One question that was explored in this study dealt with discovering how educational administrators "care" for children. Foster (1986) argues that educational administration should be considered a moral science in which principals are aware that every decision they make carries moral as well as technical implications. All of these suggestions point in the direction of the moral realm of schools and schooling.
It is within this realm that this study was undertaken. In this final chapter, the theories of Jackson et al., (1993), Gilligan (1982/1993), Noddings (1992), and Sergiovanni (1994) will be discussed in light of the findings of this study.

The moral atmosphere of the elementary school was investigated through the examination of the discourse/practice of four principals. I set out to test the applicability of the "Taxonomy of Moral Influence" that was created by Jackson et al., (1993) by imposing a modified set of categories on the behavior of four elementary school principals. The result was the discovery that such an imposition was an oversimplification of the moral atmosphere of schools. This is because the relationship between the behaviors of the principal and the moral atmosphere of the elementary school is far too complex to be captured by a taxonomy. The moral atmosphere was found to be a complex process that is continually being created and recreated -- incapable of being reduced to a checklist of behaviors. The case of Mrs. Smith illustrated this notion of "moral atmosphere as process" quite well. Over many years at SES she gained the trust of parents and built a very positive reputation with the school community. It was a lengthy process -- and continues to be.

In some areas, the taxonomy provided a useful guide to observations that generated some interesting ideas to reflect upon. One question that was asked was: "In what ways do principals seek to explicitly as well as implicitly influence students morally?" In this study, it became clear that principals have little direct contact with students which raises yet another question: How can principals be moral leaders (or explicitly seek to influence
students morally) when they have little or no direct contact with students? The principals in this study did not come to school each day with the intent to teach the students a moral lesson. The public address system or a student assembly are two ways that a principal can have the attention of the entire student body. In this study I found that most of the announcements made or the words spoken to the students were strictly routine in nature. I never heard the principal speak about moral matters. In two schools, however, I did observe the practice of allowing fifth grade students to read a “Thought for the Day” or a “Topic of the Week.” At VES I heard the following: “The greatest knowledge is the knowledge of God,” and at GES “Choices are made everyday. It is important that we make good choices.” The principals did not read these messages over the PA -- the students did. I was not sure if the principals were afraid to deliver such “moral” messages or if they felt that it was a learning experience and therefore beneficial for the students to make the announcements. In any event, the principals in this study did not use the PA system as a way to deliver moral messages to students.

A second interesting finding suggests that if a moral message was communicated by a principal to a student at all, it was done in the context of a discipline problem. In fact, most one-on-one encounters between principal and student were conducted with those students who were sent to the office to be disciplined. It was at this juncture that the principal decided how he or she would handle the problem. The female principals “interjected moral commentary” into their discussions with the children whereas the male principals typically did not engage in a discussion with the
“offenders” at all. For example, Mrs. Tabor was heard instructing a student to “Go and ask your teacher for forgiveness.” It remains unclear if this comment by Mrs. Tabor made her a “moral leader?” As was said previously, the moral atmosphere of a school is a complex phenomenon not easily captured. The creation of a positive moral atmosphere is a process that requires the kind of leadership that Mitchell and Tucker (1992) have written about -- “a way of thinking and feeling” rather than mere action. In the case of Mrs. Tabor, there were inconsistencies in her discourse/practice which leaves the question of whether or not she is a moral leader in the balance. The purpose of using the example of Mrs. Tabor is not to make judgments about her but to illustrate the complexity of determining the moral influence of an elementary school principal. The moral influence of the principal seems to be revealed in a way of “being” rather than in the “doing” of certain things. Therefore, this study has concluded that principals rarely do anything explicitly to influence students within the moral realm. The moral influence of a principal seems to be implicit and found within his or her whole “being.”

The early work of Gilligan (1982/1993) set up a dichotomy between the ethic of care and the ethic of justice. The ethic of care, associated with the feminine, is characterized by an emphasis on responsibility and connection. The ethic of justice, on the other hand, is linked to the masculine and has as its major emphases rules and separation. This distinction between an ethic of care and an ethic of justice fostered an assumption that these two ethics were in opposition to each other and, in fact, represented an either/or dichotomy. Later Gilligan used the musical metaphor
of a fugue to describe the relationship between these two ethics as "related but independent melodies, with fixed rules of harmony that constitute a harmonious whole" (Hekman, 1995, p.1).

A second question investigated in this study was: "Does the gender of the principal have any relationship to the extent to which the principal practices an ethic of care or an ethic of justice?" In general, the two female principals in this study seemed to embrace a caring point of view and were more relational than the male principals. Mrs. Smith was consistently caring and nurturing while Mrs. Tabor often sent mixed messages. She could be caring and nurturing at times and at other times she appeared insensitive. While the two female principals were somewhat more relational than their male counterparts, they were different in many respects. These differences make it impossible to draw the conclusion that all female principals are more caring than male principals. The male principals both seemed to be focused on rules and rights of others just as Gilligan (1982/1993) has suggested.

Of the four principals shadowed in this study, Mrs. Smith and Mr. Davis provided an interesting contrast between the ethic of care and the ethic of justice. Mr. Davis was concerned with the protection of the rights of others. The rights of the students were protected by a set of school rules. Any student who broke a school rule was punished according to the rules with little discussion or consideration of the context. One reason that he paddled students was to set an example for the other students. Mr. Davis did not seem to think contextually. For example, he had little patience for students who were on medication for attention deficit disorder. He referred to these children as the "Pill Kids." He did not seem
to take ADD or ADHD seriously. To Mr. Davis ADD/ADHD is a problem that is easily solved with strong discipline. Mrs. Smith, on the other hand, was more concerned about the context within which each child lived. She wanted to know what was happening in each child's life and took action to find out. For example, she let Brandon sit on her lap and "spill his guts" so she would know what was going on at home. She then disciplined him accordingly. Although Mrs. Smith consistently displayed a caring attitude at her school, she was not weak. She could be tough, if that is what the situation demanded. I saw her handle a meeting with an attorney in which she had the upper hand the entire time. The attorney did not have a chance. She took role of "child advocate" and defended a particular child completely.

Mrs. Smith and Mr. Davis provided textbook examples of the "ethic of care" and the "ethic of justice" in practice, but they were similar in at least two respects: Both cared very deeply about the students at their schools, and both of these principals displayed passion for their work. They exhibited their care and concern for the children in different ways. One way that "care" was revealed was through their commitment to providing a quality instructional program for the students. Mr. Davis and Mrs. Smith worked very hard at getting programs such as "Reading Recovery" for their students so that the poorest readers could get assistance. They also kept up with the latest technology and actively raised money to buy computers and equipment. Mr. Davis did not operate from an "ethic of care," as defined by Gilligan (1982/1993) or Noddings (1992), but he cared deeply for his school and his students. This situation suggests two interesting points in regard
to the theories of Gilligan (1982/1993) and Noddings (1992). For one, it seems that the ethic of care and the ethic of justice can be practiced simultaneously. Secondly, there seems to be multiple ways to show "care."

These two ethics do not set up an either/or situation. The case of Mrs. Smith and Mr. Davis supports Regan and Brooks (1995: notion of the double helix metaphor to describe educational leadership. They have argued that "... life can be lived on both sides of the fault line, necessitating movement across it depending on the circumstances, which in turn is an expression of the idea that both either/or and both/and behaviors are required for competent administering" (Regan and Brooks, 1995, p. 20). I would agree with Regan and Brooks that "good" administering is dependent upon the ability to move between the ethic of care and the ethic of justice freely as well as the ability to practice both the ethic of care and the ethic of justice at the same time. Mr. Davis operated from an ethic of justice because he "cared" deeply.

A second interesting finding suggests that there are multiple ways of "caring" and that it is not a gender specific phenomena. For example, Mr. Davis believed that strict discipline is necessary to create an environment where students can learn. When necessary he paddled students. I found a sense of pride about the discipline at this school when I interviewed a parent and several teachers. Students, parents, and teachers seemed to understand that he was a tough disciplinarian because he "cared." Mrs. Smith "cared" in different ways. She made "home visits," sat children on her lap, and spent a great deal of time talking with children. These two principal "cared" in different ways -- but they both cared
passionately. The notion that there are multiple ways of caring needs to be investigated further. The context is an important influence on the ways that principals are called to "care." To "care" means to attend to students' needs and these needs vary from context to context. A variety of needs requires a variety of responses. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that the response to these needs would be reflected in a variety of ways of "caring." Thus, there are multiple ways that one can "care."

A third area of this exploration delved into the questions of "community." These questions were undoubtedly the most difficult to answer. The question investigated was: "Do principals promote a sense of community within their schools? If so, how is this revealed?" In this study, I was searching for the kind of "community" described by Sergiovanni (1994) and Dewey (1916). I observed the kinds of relationships between the people at these four schools and examined the language that they used in our interviews. I was also interested in the emphasis placed on instructional issues by the principal. Dewey (1916) has asserted that active participation in a community should provide the means for individuals to achieve their fullest potential. Following Dewey, a school that provides students the opportunity to participate in community life should also give students the means to achieve their fullest potential. Learning and achievement by all students should be a high priority in a community.

The data obtained that is pertinent to the question of community was organized into four case studies. In one school, SES, I found, what I consider "school as home." The relationships in this school between the teachers were positive. The teachers
interviewed used words such as “family” or “home” to describe this school repeatedly. The relationship between Mrs. Smith and all persons at this school were also positive. Mrs. Smith consciously made an effort to stay on good terms with everyone. She called this public relations (PR), and considered it essential if she was to gain respect and eventually support for her instructional program. Mrs. Smith’s commitment to instruction and to student learning is, to Dewey’s way of thinking, also indicative of community. All of the teachers and staff and this school worked together to help the students learn -- to reach their fullest potential. The experience of community at SES was a means to a greater end. As was discussed in Chapter Six, Mrs. Smith operated from an “ethic of care” and I believe that this ethic has much to do with the development of community in schools. In fact, it has been argued that the context of caring is community (Beck, 1992).

Did Mrs. Smith promote this sense of community in her school? Her comments about PR indicate that she did indeed try to create an atmosphere in which positive relationships existed between people. More important than these strong relationships was her commitment to delivering a strong instructional program in which all children can learn. Mrs. Smith created community in her school to reach a greater goal and she operated from an “ethic of care” to attain this goal.

The other three schools did not seem to have the same kind of community as SES. At VES, the teachers seemed to love Mr. Samuel because he did not put any pressure on them. Although laughter was heard at this school frequently, the missing ingredient seemed to be passion for student growth and learning. This was also true of
PES. Strong relationships between people and cohesiveness seem to be necessary but not sufficient to the attainment of true "community." The formation of community in schools should provide the means to the achievement of the self actualization of all persons in the community. Without this thrust, community in schools becomes merely a comfortable place to work. The question remains: Did Mr. Samuel promote community within his school? Mr. Samuel wanted all the teachers to be happy and I think he worked hard at that. However, this conception of community falls short of being the true kind of community discussed previously. The Deweyan sense of community seems to be linked to the moral imperative of the principal.

Did Mrs. Tabor promote community within her school? She did express concern about the quality of relationships between her teachers and said that her teachers were petty. She even went as far as to remove furniture from the teachers' lounge to discourage them from congregating. This action, in itself, suggests that she did not promote community within her school. I would argue that while she was not happy about the poor relationships between her faculty members, she did little to improve them. As I said before, Mrs. Tabor's actions were often inconsistent so it was difficult to arrive at any strong conclusions about her.

In terms of the community question, GES was very different from the other three schools. It most closely resembled an "organization." This could be explained by the fact that Mr. Davis operated from an "ethic of justice" and was extremely structured the way he ran his school. Mr. Davis ran a tight operation. For example, he bought two new ladles to serve punch at the DARE
graduation and had the librarian bar-code them. This example shows the degree to which this principal is structured. My conclusion about this school, in terms of the community question, was that while it had as its major thrust student learning, it did not have the positive relationships and cohesiveness characteristic of "community." This seemed to work at this school. However, when I interviewed an outside social worker who was working at this school on contract, she made the comment that this school was just beginning to see the problems that other schools were already facing. Maybe strong relationships and cohesiveness are not needed by the children attending this school in the same way that they were needed by students attending SES, for example. This suggests that the context of school has implications for notions of community. This finding throws Sergiovanni's call to change the metaphor of school from organization to community into question. It does not seem possible to impose one notion of "community" onto schools and then expect them to become this one kind of "community." Regarding the question of whether or not principals promote community in schools, it seems that each principal promoted "community" as he or she understood the concept. There appears to be no single and easily understood meaning of the word "community." This notion, much like the notion of "care" has multiple meanings.

In conclusion, I found that the notions of the moral atmosphere of schools, the ethic of care versus the ethic of justice, and community are far more complex than Jackson et al. (1993), Gilligan (1982/1993), Noddings (1992), and Sergiovanni (1994) seem to suggest. These notions are all parts of an ongoing process that is highly sensitive to contextual details. There is
no formula for creating a moral atmosphere or building community in a school. However, I will argue that the principal sets the moral tone of the school. In a school where a quality instructional program is delivered -- the principal is typically the catalyst behind it. In the cases of Mrs. Smith and Mr. Davis, they did what needed to be done in order to get support for their programs. They practiced two different ethics because they cared about their students. The promotion of a strong instructional program in a school is a very "moral" thing to do.
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APPENDIX A
MODIFIED TAXONOMY OF MORAL INFLUENCE

JACKSON'S TAXONOMY
(TEACHING)

SET ONE: MORAL INSTRUCTION
1. Moral Instruction Within the Classroom
   Lessons that were moral in tone but part of the regular class.
   The teachers' purpose was not to teach a moral lesson. Example: A history lesson dealing with the moral character of an important figure such as Martin Luther King.

2. Rituals and Ceremonies of a Moral Nature
   Rituals and ceremonies considered morally influential because of the attitude they sought to engender. Example: Guest speaker against drug abuse. An opening ceremony that includes the "Lord's Prayer."

3. Visual Displays with a Moral Content in Classrooms
   Signs, pictures, posters, in the classroom, urging viewers to behave in morally approved ways. Example: "Take pride in what you do."

MODIFIED TAXONOMY
(ADMINISTRATION)

SET ONE: MORAL INSTRUCTION
1. Moral Instruction from Principal
   Statements made to entire student body or classes containing a moral message. Example: Principal taking Gideon representative from class to class to distribute free bibles.

2. Rituals and Ceremonies of a Moral Nature
   The principal is involved in the planning and production of rituals and ceremonies considered to be morally influential because of the attitude they seek to engender. Example: Principal decorates the auditorium for DARE graduation.

3. Visual Displays with a Moral Content found in the School Office
   Signs, pictures, posters, in the office urging viewers to behave in morally approved ways. Example: Artifacts or displays found in principal's office such as a bible.
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4. Spontaneous Interjection of Moral Commentary into Ongoing Activity

The introduction of moral subject matter that has almost nothing to do with the lesson at hand. Usually triggered by a breach of conduct so serious that it could not be ignored. Also includes praise for good behavior. Example: Reaction by the teacher to a student’s act of cruelty to a fellow student.

4. Spontaneous Interjection of Moral Commentary into Ongoing Activity

The introduction of moral subject matter that has almost nothing to do with the purpose of the interaction between principal and other. Usually triggered by breach of conduct so serious that the student has been sent to the principal.

SET TWO: MORAL PRACTICE

1. Classroom rules and regulations.

Represents the most specific moral code that all students in the classroom are expected to obey.

Although these rules appear to be straightforward, Jackson et al. (1993) found that they become complex in their enactment.

SET TWO: MORAL PRACTICE

1. School rules and regulations.

Represents the most specific moral code that all students in the school are expected to obey. These “School Rules” are typically found in the student handbook of each school.

Although these rules appear to be straightforward, Jackson et al. (1993) found that they become complex in their enactment.
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SET TWO: MORAL PRACTICE (CONT.)

2. Expressive Morality Within the Classroom

Expressive morality includes but is not limited to the range of facial expressions and gestures of teachers and the moral messages they convey.

SET TWO: MORAL PRACTICE (CONT.)

2. Expressive Morality Around the School

Expressive morality includes but is not limited to the range of facial expressions and gestures of principals and the moral messages they contain.
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INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. Give me a brief history of the school and the neighborhood surrounding the school; what has redesign done for this school; and where do the kids come from that go here?
2. Describe how you got into education.
3. Was your family supportive of your decision to go into education?
4. How did you become a principal?
5. Describe your work as a principal.
6. What do you like the most about your job? the least?
7. Would you describe your school as a community or an organization?
8. What beliefs guide the decisions that you make?
9. How would you define moral or morality? Do basic issues of morality have a place in the schools? Do ethics have a place in schools?
10. Do you think schools have a moral impact on kids?
11. Do you think that it makes a difference that you are a male (or female) principal? In your opinion, does gender have a significant impact on your work as perceived by others?

TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. How long have you taught? Where have you taught?
2. Describe your school.
3. What does it feel like to work at this school?
4. Describe the people in your school.
5. How would you describe your principal?
APPENDIX C

CODING SCHEMES
Sullivan Elementary School -- Mrs. Smith
Coding Scheme

A. SETTING/CONTEXT

The most general information about the school and the principal.

1. General atmosphere.
2. The story of Mrs. Little and Mrs. Conway.
3. Stories of children. (Past students)
4. Physical description of the school.
5. Stories of children in school presently.
6. Personal information about principal (conversations of a personal nature).

B. PRINCIPAL'S WORLDVIEW

The principal's worldview - how the principal sees herself in relation to the school. What do they hope to accomplish? How do they define what they do? What is important to them? Do they have a particular orientation that affects how they define participation (religious, political, social class, feminist, right to life, etc.)?

1. Principal's religious influence (Baptist).
2. View of her work.
3. View of teachers with problems.
4. Copy machine.
5. Maintenance Department at Central Office.
6. View of leadership role.

C. PERSPECTIVES SHARED BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS

Ways of thinking that all or some subjects shared that are not as general overall definitions of the situation but indicate orientations toward particular aspects of the setting. Shared rules, norms, and general points of view. (i.e. We're a family here.)

D. PRINCIPAL'S WAYS OF THINKING ABOUT PEOPLE AND OBJECTS.

The ways that the principal understands teachers, parents, students, maintenance people, etc.

Definitions of teachers, bus drivers. (i.e. Kdg. teachers views of children as either: immature or ready for school.)

1. Way of thinking about central office (maintenance).
2. Way of thinking about assertive discipline.
3. Way of thinking about Ph.D.'s.
5. Way of thinking about special education students.
7. Way of thinking about school size.
8. Way of thinking about public relations.
9. Way of thinking about pride.
10. Way of thinking about men versus women.
11. Way of thinking about another principal.
12. Way of thinking about a school psychologist.

E. ACTIVITY CODES

Regularly occurring kids of behavior. (i.e. Joking with kids, greeting buses).
1. Discipline (Willie, Patrick, Justin, Malcolm, Brandon, Matthew, Todd)
2. Greeting visitors.
3. Interaction with an injured child.
4. Interaction with a teacher (personal).
5. Helping children.
6. Greeting parents, talking with parents.
7. Comment about the secretary.
9. Comments about particular teachers.
10. Principal's meeting.
11. Discussion with a bus driver.
12. Post-Conferences (teachers).
13. Dismissal (loading buses).
15. Greeting students in the morning.
16. School Advisory Board Meeting.
17. Discussion with custodian.
18. Phone call.
19. Speaks with secretary.
20. Meeting with Mr. Wilson.
21. Library Power Meeting at the Sherwood Center.
22. Speaks to a nurse.
23. Discussion with teachers (school related).
27. Personal discussion with researcher.
29. Morning Assembly.

F. EVENT CODES

Particular happenings that occur infrequently or only once. (i.e. the firing of a teacher, teacher strike, etc.)
1. Read Sexual Harrassment guidelines over the PA.
2. Testifies at a tenure hearing against a bus driver.
3. Takes secretary's place for a day.
4. Story of a robbery at school. (Mrs. Sorrell chased the purse snatchers.)

G. STRATEGY CODES

Strategies refer to the tactics, methods, ways, techniques, maneuvers, ploys, and other conscious ways principals accomplish a variety of things. (i.e. Techniques to control children.)

1. Strategy to get rid of a teacher.
2. Strategy to control children (field trips).

H. RELATIONSHIP AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Units of data that directs the researcher to cliques, friendships, romances, coalitions, enemies, and mentors. (i.e. teacher friendships)

1. Conflict with school nurse.
2. Friendship with textbook rep.
3. Teachers' lounge.

I. METHODS

Material pertinent to research procedures, problems, joys, dilemmas, etc.

1. Comments made by researcher.
Princeton Elementary School -- Mrs. Tabor

A. SETTING/CONTEXT
1. Description of students' lives.
2. General atmosphere.
3. General information about principal.
4. Description of physical setting.

B. PRINCIPAL'S WORLDVIEW
1. View of her work.
2. View of desegregation order.

C. PERSPECTIVES SHARED BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS

D. PRINCIPAL'S WAYS OF THINKING ABOUT PEOPLE AND OBJECTS
1. View of child out of district whose mother wants him to say at PES.
2. Sex and drugs.
3. Curriculum.
5. Principal's understanding of teachers.
7. Special education children.
8. Central office.
10. Technology in schools.
11. Discipline.
12. Old people.
14. Young teachers and student teachers.

E. ACTIVITY CODES
1. Hands out PE awards.
2. Interaction with secretary's husband.
3. Interactions with teachers (school related).
4. Interaction with a sick child.
5. Comments made to children.
6. Interactions with children.
7. Comments about children.
8. Hanging around counter.
9. Discipline.
10. Interaction with parents.
11. Checking on classrooms. "Let's take a walk."
12. Lunch time.
13. Spontaneous lecture to a music class.
15. Paperwork.
17. Duty.
18. PTA lady.
19. Phone calls (personal).
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21. Phone calls (business).
22. Making announcements over PA.
23. Meeting at central office.

F. EVENT CODES
1. Secretary's Appreciation Day
2. Smoky smell in cafeteria.

G. STRATEGY CODES
1. Where do you live?

H. RELATIONSHIP AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE CODES
1. Janitors.
2. Teacher's lounge.
3. Who are you?

I. METHODS
1. Observer comments.
A. SETTING CONTEXT

1. Giving out medicine.
2. General procedures.
3. Description of the school.
4. Physical description of the school.
5. Teachers’ comments about principal.
6. Atmosphere
7. Personal information about principal
8. Personal information about a teacher

B. DEFINITION OF THE SITUATION

C. PERSPECTIVES SHARED BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, STUDENTS

D. PRINCIPAL’S WAYS OF THINKING ABOUT PEOPLE AND OBJECTS

1. School Redesign
2. Inclusion (Special Education)
3. Other principals
4. Foreign Language teachers
5. Memos to teachers
6. 504 Modifications
7. Testing
8. The BD teacher
9. Way of thinking about disciplining little girls and little children
10. Teachers
11. About principals (good, mediocre, drop)
12. Stealing
13. Recess
14. The general public
15. Central Office
16. Participation in this study
17. Maintenance department (Central office)
18. I Care

E. ACTIVITY CODES

1. Morning Announcements
2. Interaction with children.
3. Dismissal
4. “Let’s take a walk.”
5. Interactions with secretary.
7. Delegating jobs.
8. Phone call.
9. Paperwork/deskwork
10. Discipline
11. Answers phone for secretary.
12. Interaction with teacher (informal).
13. Interaction with teacher (school business)
14. Interactions with custodians
15. Interaction with a parent
18. Hanging around counter.
19. Looking at lesson plans.
20. Taking care of sick or injured child.
21. Taking care of candy delivery
22. Discussion with a salesman.

F. EVENT CODES
1. Death of a parent
2. Huge St. Bernard dog on campus

G. STRATEGY CODES

H. RELATIONSHIP AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE CODES

I. METHODS
1. Informal conversations with Mr. Samuels.
Grant Elementary School -- Mr. Davis
Coding Scheme

A. SETTING/CONTEXT
1. General description of the school.
2. General atmosphere
   a. Lunch time in office.
   b. Principal knows everyone’s names.
   c. Friendliness.
   d. Schoolwide rewards.
   e. Morning before school.
   f. Dismissal.
3. General information about a teacher (from principal).
4. General information about principal (from observer).
5. Stories of children.
6. Comments about students.
7. Comments about teachers.
8. Teachers’ comments about Mr. Davis.
9. General procedures.
10. Observer comments.

B. PRINCIPAL’S WORLDVIEW
1. View of the job.
2. View of his work.

C. PRINCIPAL’S WAYS OF THINKING ABOUT PEOPLE AND OBJECTS
1. View of a teacher.
2. View of porter in cafeteria.
4. View of DARE.
5. View of Teacher Appreciation Luncheon.
6. View of Holmes Program.
7. View of “Teacher of the Year.”
8. View of Retention meetings.
9. View of Special Education budget.
10. View of orients.
12. View of morality and schools.
14. View of “Student of the Week.”
15. View of redesign.
17. View of another school.

D. ACTIVITY CODES
1. Paperwork/office work.
2. Preparing for DARE graduation.
3. Answering phone for secretary.
4. Setting up the ice cream machine.
5. Discipline/paddling.
7. Fixing things.
8. Making copies on the risograph.
9. Giving out "Student of the Week" awards.
10. Taking pictures.
11. Miscellaneous activity around the school campus.
12. Looking for a teacher.
14. Public relations.
15. Greetings things that the school and/or teachers need.
16. Retention meeting.
17. Discipline.
18. Interaction with visitors.
19. Interaction with bus drivers.
20. Interaction with maintenance crew.
21. Hanging around counter.
22. Morning announcements.
23. Interactions with teachers (school business).
24. Interactions with teachers (personal).
25. Interactions with parents.
27. Interaction with special education children.
28. Interactions with secretary.
29. Comments about parents.
30. Interactions with children.
31. Interactions with janitor.

E. EVENT CODES
1. Case of possible child abuse.
2. Planning a retirement party for a teacher.
3. Louisiana Music and Dance Program.
4. DARE program.

F. STRATEGY CODES
1. Presence and/or enforcement of school rules.
2. Watching kids.
3. Stating consequences.
4. Verbal correction.
5. Paddling.
7. Writing spelling words.
8. Watching kids in the cafeteria.

H. RELATIONSHIP AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE CODES
1. Conflict between special education teacher and her aide.

I. METHODS
1. Informal conversations between researcher and school people.
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