LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
MAR 0 5 1997 IL 1707905		
DEC 1 6		

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution
c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

IN PURSUIT OF AN ETHIC OF CARING:

UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CARING AND POWER

IN SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP

by

Kathleen S. Sernak

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

1993

ABSTRACT

**IN PURSUIT OF AN ETHIC OF CARING:
UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CARING AND POWER
IN SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP**

By

Kathleen S. Sernak

This study examines an urban high school in the midst of multiple reform efforts intended to develop the community and empower teachers and other staff members. Administrators and faculty members were charged with developing and implementing site-based management, and participating in partnerships with the local business community and with the local university. Additionally, the new principal, a female, sought, through her own and the reform efforts, to establish the school as a caring place. The study focuses on the understandings of and relationships between caring and power. Three considerations drive the study: 1) How is the notion of caring perceived by individuals and groups? 2) How is the notion of power perceived by individuals and groups? 3) Do caring and power intersect and, if so, how?

The data collected for this study included: interviews with teachers, administrators, and support staff; observations of

teachers in their classes; observations of faculty, department, university-school, and business committee-school meetings; observations of teacher in-services and student convocations; observation of meetings of the steering committee for site-based management; informal conversations in teachers' lounges and cafeteria; informal observations in the halls, counseling office, discipline office, and main office; documents, including steering committee minutes, pertinent to the development and implementation of site-based management, student newspaper and scrapbooks of the history of the school, administrative job descriptions, and the student handbook. The study's results include analysis of the formal interviews, fieldnotes on informal observations and meetings, and documents pertaining to site-based management.

Using feminist standpoint theory which emphasizes the importance of location and history, efforts toward development of school as a caring place occurred within a school plagued by a past history that negatively influenced its present operation and required that caring be embedded within a power structure of bureaucratic hierarchy. The results of the study indicated there is a complex intersection between the power relations of schooling and reform emphasizing caring. The degree to which one perceives the intersections as caring or power depends upon context, cultural understandings of caring and power, and the nature of reciprocal relationship between the care-giver and care-receiver.

Copyright by

KATHLEEN S. SERNAK

1993

DEDICATION

to:

Kim and Kent

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation culminates perhaps the most challenging and difficult period of my life. During the past five years I made decisions and embraced knowledges and understandings that have caused me to face myself as I have never done before, and to rejoice in, rather than to deny, who I am. I am a dreamer; I am an idealist. I will continue to struggle for social change that will allow for differing viewpoints, differing interpretations of life, and differing values. I will continue to view education as the primary source of social change. And I will continue to hope that education and schooling might someday become one.

I look forward to writing these final pages to acknowledge my appreciation to all those who have helped me reach this point in life and who have made this dissertation possible.

First to my children, Kim and Kent Johnson, who encouraged me to pursue my work at yet another level of intensity. They never doubted my abilities, and always had faith in me, even when I did not. Whenever I reached the brink of despair, they intuitively seemed to know, for I would receive a note, a phone call, or a gift from one or both of them. But most importantly, they taught me about caring--how to give and how to receive.

I am immensely proud of both Kim and Kent. Kim is a science teacher with the goal of becoming a teacher educator. She is sensitive and compassionate, and sees the potential in students others view as deviant. She values difference and learns from it. She taught me that I did not always know the best interests for others and that 'caring' can be oppressive.

Kent, a doctoral student in philosophy, has pushed my thinking throughout the coursework leading to the dissertation and throughout the dissertation process. He continually challenged me and provided me with different ways of considering a topic. I learned, and continue to learn, the art of arguing as an intellectual exercise. I treasure the summers we shared over the past four years and have delighted in seeing his emotional and intellectual growth.

I dedicate this dissertation to Kim and Kent with all my love, and with deep respect for them.

To my mother, Eleanor Sernak, who showed me the depths of caring. Although she could not understand why I would give up a good job and prestigious position for financial insecurity and the stress of a doctoral program, she supported and encouraged me. Her attendance at my defense was one of her proudest moments---and one of mine to have her there.

To Van and Ruth Johnson, my children's grandparents and virtually second parents to me, for their love and acceptance. They continually encouraged me and had faith in my academic potential.

To the members of my doctoral committee, each of whom brought unique talents which, together, added to the breadth of my thinking

about my work. Lynn Paine served as my academic advisor throughout. She believed in my work from the beginning and saw its potential. Her careful reading, detailed comments for my reflection, and our discussions significantly contributed to the quality of this work. David Labaree was instrumental in my taking a more critical look at caring, urging me to consider a need for the structure that bureaucracy provides. Through his attempts to imagine an ethic of caring as the basis of schooling, I began to see the need to conceptualize caring in relation to power, rather than as a binary opposite. Anna Neumann had the unique talent of being able to listen to my disorganized thoughts and make sense out of them for me. She also prodded me to think more deeply, but she did that with a gentleness and sensitivity that left me feeling good about the work I had done and excited about going further. Brian DeLany looked at my work from a policymaker's perspective and helped me see what further work I would have to do in order to be credible to and effective with educators who make policy. Finally, Mark Conley used his experiences in teaching and working within reform formats to help me understand the complexity of reform.

To Eliot Singer who appreciated my writing and my ideas early in my program. His support contributed to my believing I had important contributions to education.

To Carol Wolfe who has struggled along with me. I appreciate never having to explain to her how I was feeling because she knew and accepted and valued me and my ideas. She challenged me with

different perspectives about caring and power, and respected my playing with new ideas.

To the many others who contributed in thoughtful and helpful ways. Jeremy Price who helped me toward an understanding of critical, poststructural, and postmodern thinking, and Lamar Fertig who continually challenged my views of education. Tammy Lantz encouraged me to think about connections, contributing to my thoughts about the relationship between caring and power. All these discussions left me rejuvenated and eager to proceed with my work.

To those who participated in this study, the teachers, administrators, and staff members who work under difficult constraints yet continue to make a difference when others believe that is impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE: IN PURSUIT OF AN ETHIC OF CARING	1
Genesis of the Study	1
Development of an Idea	3
Background Study	6
My Study	7
Focus of the Study	10
Results	11
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	12
Introduction	12
My Choice of Methods	14
Data Collection Methods	16
Interviews	16
Observations and Hanging Around	19
Participant Observer	24
Changing the Question	28
Data Analysis	29
Personal Reflections	33
CHAPTER THREE: CARING OR POWER?	39
Introduction	39
Power	46
A Critique of Bureaucracy	53
An Ethic of Care	58
Women as Care-Givers	59
Tenets of an Ethic of Care	61
Connection	61
Particularity of Responsibilities	64
Commitment	66
Reciprocity - Giving and Receiving	67
Critique of an Ethic of Caring	72
Caring as Women's Work	73
Caring as Connection	83

Caring as Community 90
Caring as Reciprocal 96
Whose Caring? "The Myth of Sisterhood" 98
Summary: A Politics of Care 105

CHAPTER FOUR: THE STORY OF DIVISION HIGH 108

Impressions 109
Yesterday 110
Today 122

CHAPTER FIVE: THE PRINCIPAL: POWERFUL CARE-GIVER? . . . 128

Mattie Johnson - Background of a Principal 132
Mattie Johnson - Care Giver 137
Setting the Tone 138
Building Pride in DHS 138
Building Trust 140
Having High Expectations for Self, Staff, and Students 148
Accepting One's Humanity--Self and Others . . . 152
Ministering to Faculty and Students' Needs . . . 153
Building Community 159
Reflections on Mattie's Understandings of Caring 161
Mattie Johnson - Power 163
Taking Power - Working with External Forces . . 165
Maintaining Power - Balancing School and District Bureaucratic Expectations . . 178
Pursuing Power - Climbing the Hierarchical Ladder 189
Mattie Johnson - Powerful Care Giver 191
Reflections on Mattie's Understanding of Power 192

CHAPTER SIX: THE STAFF: WARY CARE TAKERS? 195

In Need of Caring 199
The Staff as One Body 199
For Lack of Trust 199
Fragmentation 199
Inadequate Communication 203
To Care for Students 207
High Expectations for Students 208
Student Attendance 209
Students' Personal Lives 211
Domestic Difficulties 212

Violence and Crime 214
Defending DHS 215
The Staff as Unique Groups 216
Senior Staff Members: Wary and Weary 218
Veterans of Desegregation 219
Veterans of the District and of Division High 225
Site-based Management Steering Committee Members: Dealing with Ambiguity . . . 232
Faculty Innovators: Needing Collaboration . . . 239
In a Nutshell: What Is Collaboration? 240
The Ninth Grade Team 244
Unraveling the Story 252
Reflection 263

CHAPTER SEVEN: CARING-POWER: A CONUNDRUM 268

Caring and Power: Shared Attributes 269
Webs of Relations - Individual Caring and Collective Caring 269
Caring-Power: Individual Effort 275
Caring-Power: A Collective Effort 277
Caring and Power: Reciprocal 283
Caring and Power: Contextual 292
Caring and Power: Socially Constructed 294
An Ethic of Caring--or--Power That Oppresses? 298

CHAPTER EIGHT: CARE/POWER: QUAGMIRE? 301

Research Issues 303
Individual and Collective Caring 303
Caring as a Female Ethic 305
Who Will Care and How Much 307
Caring as Multiply Interpreted 309
Leadership and Organization 311
Conclusion 314

BIBLIOGRAPHY 315

CHAPTER ONE

IN PURSUIT OF AN ETHIC OF CARING

> Peace does not mean an end to tension, the good tensions, or of struggle. . . . It means being centered.
>
> May Sarton
> The House by the Sea

In a sense, this study is about being centered. It is the story of a group of people who struggled and experienced tensions--both good and bad--as they tried to be more caring to one another. It is also a story about power--how it affected the people who tried to care. It is a story about school people who attempted to find the appropriate relationship between caring and power in order to attain . . . freedom? peace?

Genesis of the Study

This study actually began several years ago during my first research experience. I was assigned to interview several teachers at a high school in Newtown (the city where the current study occurred). The first person I met was Mattie Johnson, an assistant principal at our project site. When I met her, she was the last person I wanted to meet.

The first day to conduct interviews I awoke to my doorbell--not my alarm. The carpool had arrived and I was still in bed. My colleagues left while I hurriedly threw on my clothes and raced for my car. There was no way I would arrive in time. To make matters worse, I did not know how to get to the school and lost even more time as I stopped several places for directions.

I arrived at the school twenty minutes late, embarrassed, flustered, and apologetic. Hoping to meet my colleagues before having to face administrators and teachers, I rushed into the main office looking for a familiar face. Seeing my bewilderment, one of the secretaries asked if she could help me. I told her I was with the university research project; she directed me to the inner administrative offices.

As I opened the door, I glimpsed a fellow graduate student. Just as I felt a wave of relief sweep over me, an imposing, regal woman stepped between us. Life all but drained from me. Before I could begin to explain and apologize, this woman grinned and emitted a deep, hearty chuckle that even made me smile.

She looked at me with that wide grin and said, "You must be the one who overslept. I'm Mrs. Johnson, the Assistant Principal." Embarrassed, I tripped over my words. She simply put her hands on my shoulders, and said something like, "Honey, bein' late isn't the end of the world. Don't you worry about it. We're glad you're here and you're all right. Com'mon into my office and catch your breath." She took my coat, escorted me to her office and to a

comfortable chair, then left the room while I tried to regain my composure.

She returned shortly with coffee for me. After recounting an incident in her life comparable in embarrassment to mine, she ended with that laugh that I'm sure could be heard throughout the school. "Now," she said, "would you like to get on with the interview?"

Mattie Johnson's sensitivity and warmth, her caring, impressed me. Because of that incident I began to think about school leadership and what it would be like to work for a principal who was as caring as the assistant principal I had met. Was it possible for schools to be 'caring places'?

Development of an Idea

Throughout the next few years, my research focused on teaching and learning in urban schools. I was no stranger to city life having lived in an inner city during my childhood and adolescence and having taught in urban schools. However, I was not prepared for the 'neediness' I found. I am not referring to material needs--although many of the students lived in poverty--but to the desire to be acknowledged simply as being, as existing. That need was as evident among teachers as it was among students.

As I worked with the students and teachers, interviewing them and observing classes, I noted the eagerness with which they responded to my interest in them. Interviews scheduled for thirty minutes usually extended to an hour. Rare was the time when students and teachers had little to say. The norm was for me to

begin with a question, and with very little encouragement, the persons talked as though no one had ever asked about **their** thoughts and lives.

My reading, although not specifically planned as such, focused on educational reform and the debates over why kids were not learning and what they needed. As a feminist, I was particularly intrigued with the literature from feminist educators and thinkers that discussed the need to be more caring in schools. I thought about whether schools could be caring places. From what I had experienced as a teacher and as a researcher, I was not convinced. There were individual teachers who cared, but a whole school? Not that I had known. Besides, I was not sure what I meant by a 'caring place.'

The more I read reports about educational reform and feminist writings about schooling, the more I experienced urban schooling as a researcher, and the more I thought about my past teaching in a large, inner-city junior high, the more I came to believe that the climate--the attitude--in schools needed to be changed. Students were not 'products' to be turned out; parents and students were not 'clients' of the 'corporation' of school. School comprised people who think and feel, who do not leave their personal selves outside the school doors.

I read reports detailing the needs of students from minority and/or lower socioeconomic cultures and how schools are failing them (Edelman, 1987; Fine, 1986, 1987; Anyon, 1983, 1981; Cusick, 1983; Ogbu, 1988; Olsen, 1988; Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin & Cusick, 1986;

Weiler, 1988); and reports about the changing demographics in the United States and the effect they are having on schooling (Hodgekinson, 1988). Each, implicitly or explicitly, indicated the necessity of treating our youngsters with more caring and understanding in order for them to achieve in school and to succeed in life.

I turned to literature on organization. Schools are bureaucratic and hierarchical. That type of organization does not support the kinds of things--community, cultural understanding, connectedness--teachers, researchers, social workers and others said students need in order to learn (Bryk, Lee, & Smith, 1990; Schorr, 1988). I looked for feminist writings about organization. Women, particularly, were beginning to seriously talk about the need to change organizational theory to support structure that emphasized caring, which, in turn, supported community, connection, and interdependence (Acker, 1991; Calas & Smircich, 1988; Hearn, Sheppard, Tancred-Sheriff & Burrell, 1989; Smircich, 1983, 1985; Kanter, 1977).

Along with the organization literature, I read works about leadership. Researchers, particularly women, wrote about the changes that female leaders attempted to make in order to be more nurturing and sensitive to those whom they supervised. They talked about the necessity of working with employees, sharing decision making and responsibilities; and envisioning themselves in the middle of an organization, not at the top (Blackmore, 1991a, 1991b; Helgeson, 1992; Regan, Smircich & Morgan, 1982). They called for

changes in thinking about leadership and organization that would value cooperation as much as competition, interdependence as much as independence.

But what actually was being done in schools to encourage such change? How would or could school people develop collaboration and cooperation, and community and interdependence in an organizational structure based on hierarchical power?

Background Study

To understand how educators thought about caring in schools, I searched for information that would lead to a better understanding of what caring is, and for research that described what teachers and administrators did to create and develop schools as caring places. Because I began to realize that I did not know how to discuss or explain caring, I turned to philosophers to learn how to understand the meaning of words and concepts (Putnam, 1975; Suter, 1989; Wittengenstein, 1989). Then, Gilligan's research (1982) and Noddings' (1984) philosophical understandings provided background for me to think about caring itself and an ethic of caring; Noddings' most recent work aided my thinking about caring in schools.

I found the research about caring in schools was minimal, dealing primarily with individual teachers and their students, or individual administrators' perceptions of leadership they considered caring, but not with an organizational structure that would support caring as a way of life throughout the school (Kriesberg, 1992;

Noblit, 1993; Regan, 1990). Books and articles about learning communities and cooperative learning exist in profusion, but the central force of all of them is the individual classroom (Cohen, 1986; Putnam & Burke, 1992; Johnson & Johnson, 1974, 1987; Slavin, 1984, 1987).

My question, originating two years earlier as I left Mattie Johnson's office, remained: Was it possible for schools to be caring places? I now added, How?

My Study

All of my research experience was in Newtown; I was fascinated with the city and with the school system--the grit in the midst of hardship. The city and its schools were in crises, economic and social. People seriously questioned whether Newtown would survive or would become a ghost town in the near future. Gangs, drugs, and violence abounded within the city (according to students; city officials and educators denied that); and the schools functioned within the environment, succeeding remarkably well at limiting actual violence and drug dealing in the buildings, per se.

An image of Newtown's schools could have been among those that prompted educational reforms to urge school people to create changes that would make room for caring. I chose Newtown as the site for my study on the ways a school staff made changes that had the potential to make schools caring places. I chose the particular site, Division High School, because Mattie Johnson was beginning her first year as principal there.

There were a number of factors that influenced by decision to collect data at Division. Mattie Johnson was the principal, new to the school and determined to have Division become known as a school where students knew they were cared for and about. The other administrators, male, were also either new to the school or to their positions. I wondered how they, as males, would respond to Mattie's goal of caring.

In addition to a new administrative staff, the faculty and staff agreed to become a site-based managed school. Changing to that type of organization provided challenges to the traditional bureaucratic top-down model of governance. I wanted to see how the faculty, administration, and other staff worked together to implement site-based management. What traditional assumptions would they challenge? Would the school people be able to break away from the this-is-the-way-we've-always-done-it mentality to a way of working together that might be ambiguous, especially at first? Would administrators and teachers, traditionally adversaries, learn to trust each other? If so, how? If not, why not?

Finally, Division hosted not only my research, but that of a university project embedded in a larger project, the latter a collaborative effort of school, business and university. Both of the projects had the potential to support change away from bureaucracy and hierarchy and toward a collaborative, cooperative organizational structure emphasizing caring and, therefore, school as a caring place.

I began my data collection focusing on change: how administrators and teachers perceived it, if they perceived it; who influenced change, how, and to what degree; did change involve a conscious effort of staff members to become more caring; what did staff members mean by caring and how did they perceive it.

As I interviewed teachers, support staff, and administrators, I realized they talked about power and power relationships often. Members of each of those groups referred to the oppressive nature of power, that is, those in more powerful positions to themselves wielding control over them (the principal and central administration controlling teachers, the principal controlling secondary building administration, and faculty in positions of authority controlling other teachers).

Teachers particularly discussed the principal in terms of power--authority, domination, and control. I was confused, for I saw her as a caring individual who had as her Number One goal to bring caring to Division High. I was startled at my own thoughts: **SHE** had as **HER** goal. . . . What did an ethic of caring as a basis for organizational change mean in terms of leadership? Could one lead without using power? Was power always control or domination? Could power be used positively, even if people thought it was control? What exactly was power? Could power be caring? Could caring be power? My head spun with the notion that caring and power might somehow be 'connected.' I had never thought about the possibility of caring and power as complementary concepts.

I went back to educational literature for guidance to help me with the concept of power and care connected. There was much about power and much about care; almost nothing about care and power. What there was focused again on one teacher and her/his classroom (Noblit, 1993; Kreisberg, 1992). Although there was literature that considered leadership and organization from the standpoint of a re-conceptualization of power--power as facilitative (Dunlop and Goldman, 1991), as "power with" others (Kreisberg, 1992), or the ethics of using power (Starratt, 1991)--there was virtually nothing about the connection of caring and power concerning school leadership and organization.

I felt compelled to find out if there was a positive relationship between caring and power and, if so, how would I need to understand 'power' in order to understand that relationship. The initial focus of my study, that of the process and perceptions of change that might lead to the development of an ethic of caring in schools, changed.

Focus of the Study

The focus of my study became the understandings of and relationships between caring and power. How did the principal and teachers perceive caring? How did they perceive power? Did the principal or teachers use power to accomplish an act that ultimately lead to caring? How did staff members perceive the use of power, that is, was power understood as caring or as oppressive? How did staff members perceive acts intended as caring? Is the use of power

necessary to achieve caring, and if so, is there a need to re-conceptualize power?

Results

There is a complex intersection between the power relations of schooling and reform emphasizing caring. The degree to which one perceives the intersections as caring or power depends upon context, cultural understandings of caring and power, and the nature of reciprocal relationship between the care-giver and receiver.

Caring as a collective of individuals seems to be considerably more difficult than caring between individuals. Concentration on one person's best interests is far less complex than determining the best interest for a group of individuals, making the latter more political, that is, a politics of caring.

Finally, caring and power as socially constructed concepts are perceived differently by people from various cultural backgrounds.

The following chapter details the methodology and data analysis to conduct the study.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

A person may conceal himself behind his image, he can disappear forever behind his image, he can be completely separated from his image: a person can never be his image.

Milan Kundera
Immortality

Introduction

This chapter is about me as much as it is about the methods used to collect data. Early in the writing process of this dissertation, I hit a block; I could not write about the thousands of thoughts that spun through my head and dominated my life. One of my committee members suggested that to get over the block I write about my connection to the topic and how I, perhaps, had chosen the topic because of its personal relevance to my life. My immediate reaction was that my connection to the topic was purely academic and not personal. I did begin to write, but only from the surface of the data.

Throughout the process, however, the notion of a personal connection between myself and that of caring and power festered within me. I found myself defending myself to myself: I am a caring person, power is not important to me, I would willingly work

collectively and cooperatively with others to achieve the best for all of us. Yet, the more defensive I became, the more I knew that at some point I would have to face the fears I have of personally being too controlling and dominating in the guise of caring for others. When I finally acknowledged those fears, I began to read and listen to the interviews differently.

The data became not only an intellectual challenge to understand the relationship of caring and power, but a personal one as well. The questions that drove me are: does caring, at times, require the use of authority or control because people, for a variety of reasons, do not always understand what is in their best interests; and who am I (or who is any person) to judge what is best for another? As I reflected on Mattie's and the teachers' thoughts about each other, the students, and the school, I really tried to understand where they merged caring and power, where they believed power was necessary in order for others to develop, or whether they used the pretense of care in order to benefit themselves, albeit not intentionally. I also tried to understand if they thought about the effect their intents and actions had on others--did others not only initially feel cared for or controlled, but did they, ultimately, benefit individually or as a group? And, most importantly, I saw them as individual people, most of whom probably wanted to be caring.

My Choice of Methods

The choice of methodology I used was the case study. My interest is people, who they are individually and how they interact with others. The case study allowed me to conduct an in-depth study of the lived experiences of teachers and administrators in one school; it provided me the opportunity to observe and interview the staff to understand their behaviors, perceptions, and experiences as they lived them and as they were affected by the history of the school (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

The case study enabled me to conduct my research in accordance with feminist thinking about scientific study, specifically, feminist standpoint theory. Standpoint theory, based on the politics of identity and location, made intellectual sense to me, but I wanted to find out how much people's identity and situation affected their thinking and actions and, thus, research. Concerns evidenced about the case study method--research is confined to one place and based on a small data base, it is too difficult to generalize because the data is situated--were actually my reasons for choosing that approach. Feminist thinkers, including myself, believe that knowledge is contextual, that it is situated. There are no unitary or finite truths (Luke & Gore, 1992; Noddings, 1992; Gilligan, 1982; Harding, 1987, 1991; Weiler, 1983?). The case study approach, therefore, afforded me the opportunity to study a particular group of people in a specific context. What I learned is specific to that group of people.

I was able to examine not only the ways the staff members approached change and viewed caring and power, but also the ways in which the history of the school affected them as they dealt with the process of change, and with caring and power. From the perspective of standpoint theory, one's identity is a result of one's history and experiences. Through multiple formal and informal conversations with staff members, I learned that they were not simply reacting to a current dilemma, but were reacting in response to the dilemma from their prior experiences within the school and/or district. That knowledge was critical to my interpretations of the current situations.

The case study approach gave me the advantage of really getting to know the people in the school. For me, they were not simply voices on cassette tapes or transcribed interviews in bulging folders, but people who had individual identities, people who existed beyond the walls of Division High.

Finally, the case study approach allowed me to practice my belief in the multiplicities of interpretation. My data source was one school among thousands that could have been chosen, and I am one researcher among many. Because of who I am--my personal history and experiences--my interpretation is only one of many possible. My commitment to the belief in multiple interpretations of data reinforces the notion of multiple strategies to solve the dilemmas presented. There are no single-strategy solutions for change, for ways of implementing an ethic of caring, or for re-conceptualizing power; there are no finite truths.

Data Collection Methods

The particular methods I used included formal and informal interviews of teachers, support staff, and administrators; classroom observation; participant observation; and "hanging around." I audio-taped all formal interviews and had them transcribed. I kept fieldnotes on all interviews and observations, both formal and informal.

Interviews

My interview schedule began with the administrators. The first interview dealt with their professional histories, their goals as persons new to their positions, and their aspirations. For the next few months, I interviewed Mattie and attended meetings that she held. My focus was virtually on the principal and, by hanging around, familiarizing myself with the building and routines, observing students as they interacted among themselves and informally with teachers, watching teachers interact among themselves, getting to know faculty members on an informal basis, and, generally, making myself available to any opportunity that might present itself to me. During that time, I also had several informal conversations with the deputy principal and one of the assistant principals when they monitored the student cafeteria. I learned background information about the students and about the kinds of support staff at Division.

At the beginning of the second semester, I began interviewing teachers and staff members. The first teachers interviewed were the

chair of the steering committee for site-based management, who had a formal position of leadership and two teachers who taught at Division from its opening day. I asked each of them to give me a list of the teachers and staff members who were in formal leadership positions and those who were informal leaders in the school. I based that decision on the thought that many of these leaders, because of their positions, play some role in organizational structures that may or may not affect organizational change. From those three and from names Mattie gave me, I chose the people that were mentioned most often. After that, I interviewed teachers who I kept meeting through other activities or who were recommended to me by teachers I interviewed. In all, I interviewed fifteen males and eighteen females, of which eight were African American, one Pacific Islander, one Korean and twenty-four white.

The interviews were semi-unstructured. My intent was to ask the teachers and staff members about Division's organizational structures, past and present, how they functioned and impacted the teachers and administrators; about changes in structure they perceived affected the ways in which teachers and administrators interacted, within and between the groups; about site-based management, shared decision-making, and consensus and the changes, if any, they perceived regarding organizational structure and culture; about the administrative team, past and present, and its influence, personally and/or through goals that either maintained or changed the structure and culture of Division; about the role(s) they saw themselves playing in organizational change; and how they

described their experience concerning the initiation, negotiation, and implementation of changes within the school. For most of the interviews, I would start with a question or two, and then I basically listened and asked questions that built on their conversation.

I formally interviewed the chairperson of the steering committee, three steering committee members, two ninth grade team members, the deputy principal, the two assistant principals, and two counselors three times; the remainder of the teachers and staff were interviewed once. I interviewed Mattie seven times.

I made a conscious decision to separate myself from Mattie during those four months of the second semester, talking with her only if I met her in the halls or in the main office. The intent was to build trust among the teachers and myself; I did not want them to think that I would meet with Mattie to talk about their interviews. Consequently, for these four months, I spent most of my time formally interviewing teachers, talking with teachers at various times throughout the day in one or the other of the teachers' lounges, and visiting with teachers in the teachers' lunchroom during each of the three lunch periods.

The last month of school was unusual. Prior to that last month, I taught overseas for three weeks. When I returned to Division, I was nervous, wondering how I would re-establish myself in order to wind up my data collection. There was no need to worry, for as I entered the building, I was greeted not only by students from the ninth grade English class I had taught for two months as

part of my university role, but by faculty members asking where I had been, saying they had missed me and thought I might not be back, and saying they were glad to see me. I was included in invitations to end-of-the-year lunches and people just assumed I would be at the final day's breakfast for teachers.

The biggest surprise, however, was the change that occurred in the relationship I had with the teachers regarding my data collection. Teachers began coming up to me in the halls to 'volunteer' information they thought would be useful, to make appointments with me for interviews, or to give me names of teachers I should talk with about a specific topic. I felt as though by going away and then coming back, the teachers knew I really was serious about them and the changes they were attempting. I believe a bond of trust was established, much as Hammersley and Atkinson (1989) discuss. The more an ethnographer is in the setting, the more trust increases, and the less concerned are the participants with controlling the information available to the researcher. I felt the teachers, at that point, wanted me to have information that previously they had not wanted to share with me, but now trusted that my interest in them was genuine.

Observations and Hanging Around

Observations included a variety of activities. I observed teachers' classes; some I asked to observe, for others, I was invited. That gave me the opportunity to view students, procedures, and lessons that teachers discussed with me. The literature

regarding what is said and done in schools indicates that often perceptions differ in terms of what is verbalized and what is actually accomplished, of what is said and what realistically can be accomplished, of what is said and how that is interpreted for action (March, 1980; Weatherley & Lipsky, 1977; and Thompson, 1980).

The student convocations were particularly interesting to me. After the first marking period, students who maintained their place on the honor roll from the prior year were invited to attend a celebration in their honor. The event took place in the cafeteria; students were excused from a morning class to attend. As they entered, they were offered juice and cookies, and were given a certificate of achievement and some Division memorabilia.

For the first time since I had been at Division, I saw several white students, most of whom sat together in groups, but as part of groups with black students. The students chatted among themselves and were quite orderly, that is to say, they filed into the cafeteria, stood patiently in line for their juice, cookies, and gifts, then sat at the tables talking quietly while waiting for the event to start.

The program consisted of three speakers: Mattie, an assistant principal, and the mayor of Newtown, who was a former Division graduate. All complemented the students on their achievements and encouraged them to continue studying so they could go on to college. The mayor, who was the main speaker, used much of his time to emphasize behavior, that is deportment. He talked about men's responsibility to be gentlemen and women's to be ladies. His thrust

was sexual responsibility, with a heavy emphasis on the girls' responsibility to dress properly and not to entice the boys. I found it very interesting to watch the reactions of the students, who seemed to accept what he said without resistance as indicated by their nods to him and by the looks they exchanged with their classmates. When the mayor concluded his talk, the students applauded him, and then were dismissed. Most left for their classes, but a few hung back to talk a moment with the mayor.

The other convocation I attended celebrated Black Brotherhood Week. Because the auditorium was too small to hold the whole student body, teachers signed up to take their classes. The process was first come, first served, which meant not all students were able to attend all convocations and, conceivably, some students might never attend, depending on the teacher they had that hour. The deputy principal assigned each teacher a specific place in the auditorium to sit with his/her class. Students entered noisily, yelling to friends, milling about, and being rounded up by teachers to sit in assigned rows.

The convocation began with the singing of the Black National Anthem; few students seemed to know it. The din resulting did not appear to be singing. Across the aisle from me, a student's voice rose above the rest, blatting out the words of the anthem. Before I could determine what the noise was, three teachers converged on the student to stop him and to reprimand him (simultaneously). The program then commenced.

A faculty member had asked for permission to work with students to create the program. Students read original or published poetry celebrating black Americans; a community choir, the majority of whom were Division students, sang spirituals; and a local jazz group with which the band director played, performed for the students.

As interesting as the performances, were the "asides" that occurred. The choir was directed by a woman who was also a secretary at Division. Before the choir sang, she talked to the students about learning how to read and about staying in high school. I felt as if I were at a revival as students interjected "A-men" and other positive responses throughout. The more response the choir director-secretary received, the more animated her talk became. As she introduced each choir selection, she attempted to relate it to the values that students should have. At various points throughout the program, the deputy principal reminded the students to quiet down, and praised them for being together in the auditorium with no "incidents." The band director and a member of a local jazz group also talked to the students about the importance of staying in school. No white students or teachers participated in the actual program.

Both of these convocations gave me insights about caring and power; both influenced my thinking about my study, nudging me to begin thinking about what caring might mean to another culture, and whether that would be the same as my idea of caring (see Chapter Three and Seven). I bristled when the mayor admonished the young women to be responsible for not teasing the young men, and saying

explicitly that it was up to the girls to set the standards for sexual responsibility. I was uncomfortable listening to person after person 'preach' to students about the benefits of graduating from high school, intimating that high school graduation would bring them 'success.' Those convocations forced me to recognize that I had to work to understand caring and power from others' perspectives, and to not impose my own feelings on their experiences and words. Many times, following through with those recognitions was difficult or, sometimes, nearly impossible for me.

I observed meetings--faculty meetings, steering committee meetings, half-day meetings (department meetings, academy meetings), meetings with the business committee, and meetings with the university partnership team--on a regular basis. I was a silent observer at all but the university partnership meetings. I was asked not to audio-tape the steering committee meetings; however, I was allowed to take notes and was given minutes of the meetings (a member of the committee, with the approval of the chair, gave me all the minutes of the steering committee from its first meeting).

As a member of the university team, I had several roles. I worked one-on-one with a teacher who asked for help to improve his teaching. As part of that role, we decided I would teach a ninth grade English unit so we could talk about my thinking concerning planning and implementation; so we could use my teaching as a basis to discuss pedagogy; and so that the teacher could more closely observe the students as they participated in the learning experience. I also facilitated team planning sessions for teachers

working on academies and the ninth grade team. I was uncomfortable concerning my note taking during the meetings of the university team and teachers involved with the university project. I was a participant of the project, yet the notes I would take related to data on the relationships of caring and power. I talked with my immediate supervisor, who felt there should be no problem with my taking notes for my personal data.

Hanging around took place in a variety of settings. I sat in the main office, watching teachers, parents, students, and visitors come and go; I watched the interactions between the secretaries, between the secretaries and student workers, between the secretaries and teachers, parents, or visitors; I sat in the waiting room of the discipline office, watching and listening to the students talking with each other, with the secretary, and with the assistant principal; I walked around the hallways between classes and watched students, security guards, and teachers; I stood in the counselling office waiting room listening to the secretaries dealing with the constant stream of students; and I went to the auditorium on a university extension campus to watch the students decorate for their prom and to talk with their senior sponsors. All these activities contributed pieces, or made clear pieces I already had, about the inter-relationships between groups and individuals.

Participant Observer

As one of several university representatives collaborating with Division teachers on various projects, I felt that the position

as p

and

teac

I fe

them

barr

whom

situa

infor

speak

the u

her b

effec

had pa

many o

wanted

T

univer

relatio

admirat

study.

the oth

collecti

expectat

as participant observer affected my data collection both positively and negatively.

Positively, I developed a camaraderie with the individual teachers and teacher groups with whom I worked. In those instances, I felt that they saw me as a colleague who was willing to work with them. Because of my work, they began to trust me, breaking down the barriers of researcher and participants. They became informants to whom I could go for background information and 'updates' on current situations. Some would seek me out in order to apprise me of information that the person thought would be helpful.

On the negative side, there were some teachers who chose to speak with me as little as possible because of my association with the university. In fact, one teacher refused to let me interview her because she wanted no contact with the university and I, was in effect, a part of that institution. That teacher and several others had participated in a summer project sponsored by the university; many of them left with a negative attitude about the university and wanted no part of the partnership (see Chapter Six).

The most disappointing happening of my participation in the university partnership was the toll it took on Mattie's and my relationship. We began the year reclaiming the respect and admiration we had for each other as a result of a previous research study. We had several conversations, each of us 'catching up' on the other, and then our moving into the negotiation for my data collecting. Mattie was eager to talk with me about her expectations, concerns, and excitement for Division.

I put off telling her about my involvement with the university partnership because I could tell from a few general comments that she had serious questions about the university's position at Division. About six weeks after school started and before the first meeting with the university representatives, I told Mattie of my dual role--researcher and university collaborator--at Division High. Her face became very stern. She asked me just exactly what my role would be and if my role with the university was integral to my data collecting. I told her my study was not contingent on the university's role at Division and that, in fact, I expected the roles to be quite different. She agreed to let me proceed with my study.

For the next month, Mattie seemed open and even talked with me about concerns involving the university. However, the more time the university representatives spent at Division and the more they involved themselves in Division's concerns, the more Mattie's and my conversations seemed to assume a formal and, at times, stilted quality. They were never as free and open as they had been prior to Mattie's knowing I was part of the university team. I often wonder if I would have been her sounding board if I had not been a part of the university. When I first approached her about doing the study at Division, she had asked me if we could discuss my observations of her so she could use the information and our discussions to think about ways of doing things differently.

Prior to beginning this study, experienced researchers questioned me about my dual role at Division, cautioning me that it

could present problems and/or put me in a compromising position. I was convinced that the two roles could be separate; I found they could not. The experience was not all negative and I do not believe the dual role hurt my data collecting overall. However, I would not choose to have such a dual role again, for I agonized over situations that would not have presented a dilemma for me had I not been involved with the university. For example, there were times supervisors from the university, knowing I was collecting data, wanted information that was confidential. In those instances, I was put in an uncomfortable position of having to refuse compliance with those who had power over me.

Finally, neither negative nor positive, was the reality of being unable to keep my two roles separate. I found myself thinking about caring and power as it related to everything I did at Division. Whether I was working with a group of teachers on the ninth grade team, or whether I was in a discussion about teaching methods, I thought about caring and power relationships and how the individuals and groups were addressing change. I also found that I digressed in some of my interviews to talk about the partnership and how it could help that teacher, or, in some cases, attempted to defend partnership actions.

At other times, I was very critical of the partnership, noting its attempt at control through the rhetoric of caring. At those times, I found it difficult to respond positively when a participant in my study asked me outright for my opinion.

Changing the Question

The initial intent of this study was to examine the perceptions and experiences of Division's staff as they participated in organizational changes that were focused on developing collaboration and cooperation among and between administrators and staff. Since the goals were consistent with those embodied in an ethic of caring, I wanted to learn if staff members understood a need for caring, how they would define that need, and how they envisioned meeting it.

As I interviewed teachers and administrators, however, my question changed its focus to the relationship of caring and power. Virtually all the participants in my study talked about the need for a caring environment, but the understandings and perceptions varied widely concerning the understanding of what caring meant to them, individually, as groups, and as a whole staff. What one person defined as caring, another saw as control, a power over that was oppressive.

Additionally, I began to question my own thoughts about caring and power. Prior to my data collection, I had the notion that caring and power were two separate concepts. Caring was good and power was bad. Listening and observing at Division caused me to re-think the relationship and to examine the participants' intents, actions, and perceptions of the intents and actions to determine whether power might be re-conceptualized as something more than that which is oppressive, but something that has a positive effect as well. I, then, also wondered how power might be used to effect acts of caring. In essence, my question turned to the inter-relationship

of caring and power, divesting myself of the notion that power and caring are dichotomous. My focus, then, moved from a study of perceptions and notions of change to that of perceptions and understandings of caring and power.

Data Analysis

Data analysis consisted of my listening to the taped interviews and reading the transcripts. I initially began analysis by only reading the transcripts and would have been satisfied to do only that except there was a gap in one of Mattie's transcripts. Since I could not make sense of the written piece, I went back to the tape. To my amazement, hearing the words added so much to my understanding of the context of the discussion and circumstances of the interview. The emphases of words, the nuances in voice texture, the speed of talking, and the silences all contributed to a dimension I did not have through the written text alone. From that experience, I decided to listen to all the interviews as I followed along with the written transcripts.

From the interviews, I looked for common strands that identified the ways in which staff members, explicitly or implicitly, discussed the concepts of caring and power as they experienced them. I analyzed Mattie's interviews separately from the interviews with the teachers, for I found that she was pivotal in the staff's attitudes about change, caring, and power.

I examined Mattie's interviews for her perceptions of herself. I wanted to know her intents, purposes and actions to carry out her

goal of caring and how that goal related to her other goals of improving student achievement, building community relations, and developing and implementing site-based management. I looked for indications of control and authority and whether Mattie used them in oppressive ways, for the teachers continually described Mattie as controlling and authoritative, preventing them from reaching goals they desired.

I re-read her interviews to note whether there were indications of Mattie's viewing power as a "capacity to implement," (Baker Miller, 1976, p. 116). Did she use power not for herself or over others, but to allow teachers opportunities to develop themselves? Did she use the power of her position and the power she generated from her charismatic disposition to advance the growth of individual faculty and staff members and of the staff as a whole?

Through the interviews I looked for her intentions and actions of leadership, as well as her description of her image of a leader. How did her perception of leadership fit the organizational structure, site-based management and shared decision making toward which Division was moving? Did she use her power to move toward the achievement of Division's goals?

As I analyzed the teachers' and support staff members' interviews in a similar way. My focus was on their perceptions of caring and power in terms of caring for the faculty and support staff, that is caring for themselves. I examined their interviews to learn if and how they exerted power among themselves in oppressive ways, such as indicating support for a colleague's

project but actually working against its acceptance; and if they used personal and/or political power that manifested itself as caring.

I examined faculty and staff interviews for insights about leadership and organizational structure. Did the faculty have common understanding and agreements on the kind of leadership and organization they could support? Did those insights and perceptions evidence characteristics of caring?

As part of the analysis, I focused on the relationships between what the participants, including Mattie, said or implied and what they actually did in terms of caring. I used my fieldnotes; notes on observations of Mattie, teachers, and support staff participating in various meetings at Division; notes on Mattie's and various teachers' meetings with outsiders; and notes on observations of informal interactions among staff members and my informal interactions with staff. I found common themes, listed them and compared them to the list of common themes I identified from the participants' interviews. From those lists I examined relationships between caring and power.

My intention was to note the multiplicity of perceptions and experiences and the ways in which they contributed to the staff's understandings of caring and the relationships between caring and power. I looked for evidence of organizational structure that limited or enabled change in organizational culture, and what changes were initiated or negotiated to enable those changes the faculty desired. Through this part of the analysis, I sought to

learn if caring and power were understood in similar ways, or if they were individualistically perceived, defined, and experienced and, thereby, perhaps in conflict with the efforts made by a pluralistic group toward particular changes. That is, did a group recognize a need for change, identify a specific need--perhaps, the need to develop an ethic of care--work to achieve the change, then, ultimately perceive and experience the change(s) in individualistic ways?

Using my fieldnotes and notes that I kept of various meetings, I examined my role of participant observer as it may have affected the research. I interacted directly with teachers. How they responded to my presence as a researcher may be as informative as how they reacted in their groups (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). Although I have no way of knowing for sure how my presence affected them, I read the interviews with an eye toward participants' monitoring the information they gave me, telling me what they thought I wanted to hear, putting themselves and Division in the best light possible, and/or struggling over the hard issues with me.

The point of my research is to emphasize the many possibilities for interpretation of the lived experiences of those whom I study. As Maxine Greene so eloquently states, "To recognize the role of perspective and vantage point, to recognize at the same time that there are always multiple perspectives and vantage points, is to recognize that no accounting, disciplinary or otherwise, can ever be finished or complete. There is always more. There is always possibility" (Greene, 1988, p. 128). And it is with this intent,

that there is always more and always other interpretations, that it is not the point of research to reach a "complete grasp of abstract principles" (Greene, 1988, p. 120), that I conducted this project.

Personal Reflections

Many aspects of this study have given me cause for concern, some because of my novice status as a researcher, and some from basic theoretical concerns regarding the interpretation of data. Let me begin with myself as a novice researcher.

As I look back on my data collection, I realize that I overlooked aspects which I now believe are important, even critical, to this study. My intent was to balance my interviews in terms of gender and ethnicity. Not only did my interviews not reflect the ratio of African American teachers and white teachers, but to my dismay, I did not discover my neglect until writing this chapter. That causes me great concern because awareness of and sensitivity toward all peoples is a personal as well as professional aim for me. By realizing that I did not seek out African American teachers and staff members to interview, I feel that I have contributed greatly to the feeling of invisibility that one of the teachers discusses in Chapter Six.

Thinking about that neglect causes me to ask why I was unaware of my not interviewing African American teachers and staff members. The names people gave me for formal and informal leaders contained primarily white teachers. Additionally, very few black teachers frequented the teachers' lounges or lunch room. I should have

questioned those disparities, particularly as the faculty was split almost evenly between African American teachers and white teachers.

I can attribute my oversight to inexperience as a researcher. However, I think there is also an underlying question regarding research in schools with high populations of non-European persons. Can white, middle class researchers divest themselves of their egocentrism to really see from the perspective of other cultures? Even when they--I--try, is it possible for them--for me--not to fall into the traditional patterns of 'seeing,' that is, of gravitating, unknowingly, to people and situations with which we are most comfortable, of seeing things in paradigms that 'fit' our patterns of thought? My neglect has given me personal insight, as well as an understanding for the critical need to have more educational researchers of non-European backgrounds active and contributing to the analyses and interpretations of the needs for American education.

As a novice researcher, one of the more difficult aspects of data collecting was hanging around the school. I felt uncomfortable sitting or standing in the office, rather like a 'fifth wheel.' When teachers would comment that it must be nice to have so little work to do, I would blanch and, at the same time, remind myself to smile and not be defensive. I worried that the teachers would not take my research seriously. Hopefully, with more experience, hanging around will become less painful and anxiety-producing.

My interview schedule influenced me in a way that I had not intended nor anticipated. I mentioned earlier that it was

essentially divided between interviews with Mattie during the first part of the school year and teachers during the latter half. The more I associated with the teachers, the more I began thinking like them. I began to question Mattie's intents and actions, seeing the teachers as victims of administrative power. Occasionally I would 'catch' myself and attempt to put the teacher interviews into perspective, weighing what they said against what Mattie said, and against what I observed. However, when my data collection was completed and I began the analysis procedure, I discovered how immersed I had become in the teachers' culture. I listened to audio recordings of Mattie's and the teachers' interviews, read the transcripts, and read my fieldnotes, and was startled to realize how biased my thoughts had become against Mattie. Going back to the data brought me back into the reality of really thinking about the impact of perception and interpretation of other's intents and actions, and how those perceptions and interpretations can influence others.

My theoretical perspective is that of feminist standpoint theory, the politics of locale and personal identity. Collecting my data I was aware of the impact the history of the school had on the staff members' attitudes toward and ways in which they worked toward change. As I listened to the interviews and read and re-read the transcripts, I realized that the personal histories of the staff enhanced my understandings of why they thought and functioned as they did. Unfortunately, few of my interviews contained much personal background. I became so immersed in the immediate topics of

caring and power and how the school's history influenced administrators' and teachers' perceptions that I did not pursue the personal identities of the staff. As I think about the follow-up studies to this research project, I want to be aware of seeking out the individuals' personal backgrounds.

My history and position also influenced the ways in which I read and interpreted the data. As a woman and as an educator, I wrestled with the need to care and the need for care. I struggled to understand how I used power in my life and how that power related to my sense of caring.

I thought about myself as a parent, as a teacher, and as an administrator. There were times when I believed I needed to use power in order to effect a result that ultimately was caring. There were also times when I took control or used my authority to effect what I thought was in the best interests of someone or a group, and I was wrong. There were also times that I believed I was caring and the recipient(s) saw my efforts as solely authoritarian and power over.

Those experiences caused me to think about the ways in which I was unable to separate the notions of caring and power, that I did not see power as only oppressive. Power could be used to liberate. Power could be used to accomplish good things. But, how did I know when caring and power would work together for the good? How could I know when what I intended as caring would be interpreted as not caring, but as power over? As I read the data, I thought about the intents as well as the outcomes of actions that people took, for

often the intent was caring, but because of inherent bureaucratic constraints, the outcomes may have been less than the caring hoped for.

From personal and professional histories I recognized that I need caring. As I interpreted the data, I had to be aware that I did not impose my needs on those whom I interviewed.

From a methodological and theoretical perspective, I have serious concerns about readers' interpretations of my report. I want to make very clear that my report reflects the people only in as much as I could understand who they are. Although I try to express their thoughts and actions through their voices, you must understand that you are still reading them through me, for I chose the interviewees, I chose the quotations to use, and, most importantly, I saw and heard them from the depth of my own life and experiences. Try as hard as I might, it seems impossible for me to get "outside of my own skin" (Krieger, 1991, p. 53). And like Krieger,

> . . . the more I try to grasp someone else's experience, the more I am impressed with how hard it is, how much beyond me that other experience really is. This makes me reluctant to present my views as someone else's. I think it is important to try to grasp experiences that are not one's own. However, such attempts ought not to be masqueraded as other than what they are: they are attempts, they grasp only small pieces of experience, and they are always impositions of an authorial perspective. (p. 53)

Hence, the story of the persons at Division High School is an interpretation of their lived experience as understood through my lived experiences (Schutz, 1970, as cited in Neumann, 1992). That

understanding reinforces the notion of there being no finite, unitary truth; research is situated, not only in locale, but in individuals.

The chapters that follow focus on people who are attempting to effect changes that will make their school more caring. Although they do not routinely describe the changes as caring, they use phrases such as, "the need to build trust," "the need to understand each other," "the need to work with each other."

Caring does not come easily. Each person brings a history which is a result of past individual and collective, personal and professional experiences. Perceptions and understandings of caring and power emanate from those backgrounds.

Before I begin the story of Division High's staff, however, I examine the concepts of caring and power, especially as they relate to organizational structure and leadership.

CHAPTER THREE

CARING OR POWER?

Women seek a reconstruction of relationships for which we have neither words nor models: a reconstruction which can give each person the fullness of their being. . . . We seek a new concept of relationships between persons, groups, life systems, a relationship which is not competitive or hierarchical but mutually enhancing.

Rosemary Radford Ruether
New Woman, New Earth 1975

Introduction

Psychologists, theologians, and philosophers have long acknowledged the necessity of caring relationships as essential to human existence. John Macmurray (1950), a protestant theologian, wrote that only through relationships can persons realize freedom and genuine personhood, and that choosing to involve oneself actively with others is "indissolubly linked" (Beck, 1992, p. 456) with personal freedom. Jean Baker Miller (1976), noted psychologist, in her seminal work regarding the emergence of women from the private to the public sphere of society said, "It now seems clear we have arrived at a point from which we must return to a basis of faith in affiliation--and not only faith, but recognition that it is a requirement for the existence of human beings" (p. 88). Martin Buber (1965), philosopher and theologian, admonished

that in order for there to be community, there had to be caring actions; without them, "the organic community disintegrates from within . . ." (p. 197). In a lengthy study of American individualism, Robert Bellah, sociologist, and his colleagues (1985) found that people throughout our country believe in the "sacredness" (p. 142) of the individual, that is, anything that violates our right to think, judge, or make decisions for ourselves, or to live life as we see fit, is not only morally wrong, but is sacrilegious. Despite this strong tendency for individualism and independence, Americans are ambivalent, for they recognize that only in relation to society can individuals fulfill themselves. It is against this backdrop of the necessity of relationship to human life and, therefore, to personal freedom, that I position a discussion of caring and power as they relate to school organization and leadership.

The organization of our social institutions, bureaucratic and hierarchical, contributes, in large part, to the emphasis on independence and individualism. Bureaucracy is based on power--authority and control--of the few over the many. Although not intended by the classic Weberian model, modern bureaucratic organization breeds competition, individualism, and independence, all of which are needed to "get to the top," and all of which contribute to the maintenance of a stratified social system.

In recent years, feminist thinkers have spoken out against such organization, calling instead for an alternative built around caring, which would have at its core, relationships (Noddings, 1992,

1984; Beck, 1992; Smircich, 1985; Calas & Smircich, 1989). Behind that call is an understanding of the need to build community, to recognize the importance of relationship to the individual as well as to community, and to work together if we are to survive as a viable society. The call is, in essence, to care.

School reformers, seeing too many children fail and/or served inappropriately or not at all within the schools' traditional bureaucratic hierarchy, also have taken up the cry to re-organize and re-structure schools to reflect an atmosphere of caring and concern (Blackmore, 1991; Regan, 1990; Starratt, 1991). Nel Noddings (1984, 1991, 1992), whose work has been fundamental to educators' thinking about the relation between caring and schooling, has issued a challenge to the education community to develop schools in which an ethic of care presides. But, it is one thing to talk about re-organizing schools around an ethic of care and another to do so.

Such a challenge is not simply to change the ways school are structured to function, but to change the politics of society. Re-structuring schools to function under an ethic of care is fundamentally positing a major shift in the way we think about and, consequently, enact, power and relationships in the larger society. It is positing the shift of caring, a heretofore private quality, to the public realm which has been dominated by unequal power relationships.

The implementation of an ethic of caring in schools is a political issue concerning power, for such an ethic would be

situated within the current power structure, affecting and affected by it. An ethic of caring would focus on building relations, fostering interdependence, and creating community within schools. That focus is significantly different than the current one which emphasizes independence, autonomy, and competition, maintaining the bureaucratic hierarchy of domination of the few over the many. In order to work within the tenets of an ethic of caring, a reconceptualization of power is necessary, for power emphasizing one's own development at the expense of others would no longer be acceptable. Politically, an ethic of caring would require a major shift in values and moral reasoning, a shift to a commitment to working for the good of others as well as one's self.

In order to understand what school organization based on an ethic of care entails, it is necessary to first explore the current structure of schooling which is modeled on bureaucratic hierarchy. I begin by focusing on the Weberian model of bureaucracy which referents the 'organizational model of choice' for its administrative efficiency and its attempt to equalize power. I, then, present a discussion of an ethic of care as a foundation for school organization, followed by a critique of an ethic of care focusing on the politics of caring.

Weber's Rational-Legal Model of Bureaucracy

Efficiency

Weber understood that problems of power and authority are at the heart of bureaucratic organization. His theory of bureaucracy

focuses both on the structure of the organization, setting forth the ideal model for the efficiency of the institution or state, and the power of the organization, which consists of control and domination fostered by the bureaucratic structure. Current organizations and mainstream organizational theory, however, tend to underplay the aspect of power as domination, restricting the concept of authority to an emphasis on the functional contributions to efficient management practices, that is, the uses of hierarchy, leadership, and technical competence (Fischer, 1984, p. 174). In this section, I will discuss the ideal model of bureaucracy in terms of technical efficiency for organizations.

Bureaucracy advanced as a method of organization in response to a culture that was becoming more complex and specialized. Weber theorized that authority is the basis of organization, for it directs the organization toward its goals by imposing order on chaos (Fischer & Sirianni, 1984, p. 7). His main concern was the replacement of the authority that leadership gained from tradition and charismatic qualities with leadership arising from a rational-legal basis. In the latter, authority is derived from procedurally-determined rules and regulations which coordinate various administrative units to efficiently achieve organizational aims. Built into the organization is a hierarchy with levels of graded authority. These serve to establish a system of checks and balances, with supervision by higher offices of lower ones, and by providing the opportunity of appealing a decision by a lower office to a higher authority.

For the worker, this system means that her job is defined by a formal job description outlining the criteria necessary for her to fulfill the job (although, most likely, the criteria are interpreted by the supervisor) rather than by direct orders or whims of the supervisor; she is evaluated by those criteria, rather than subjectively assessed; and she is aware of the rewards and punishments for adequate or poor performance. Organizationally, the outcome is that such formal structure and status distinctions, resulting from a rigid hierarchy, make possible a narrower differentiation of jobs. Hierarchical authority also makes the power relations less visible, that is, power is embedded in the rules and structure of the organization rather than directly attributable to "personal, arbitrary power" (Edwards, 1984, p. 131).

Weber conceptualized the ideal bureaucratic model of organization as one that would ensure the rational and logical functioning of the system by eliminating the personal, that is, the emotional. By everyone's adhering to a set of standardized, abstract regulations, all persons are treated fairly and justly. Case-by-case decisions are eliminated in favor of universal standards which apply to all, and against which all are measured and judged. Authority becomes imbedded in a set of rules and the rules become, in turn, "the bearers of authority" (Anderson, 1966).

Although Weber concentrated his attention on the positive and intended consequences of the use of rules, there are both functional and dysfunctional consequences. Rules provide direction for organizational behavior, including role performance and

clarification among roles. They allow decentralization of authority, making possible control of behavior from a distance. (See Foucault, Discipline and Punish, for an in depth discussion of control from a distance.) Rules depersonalize authority relationships, serving as a buffer between supervisors and subordinates. They justify punishments by giving advance notice of sanctions for noncompliance, while simultaneously providing protection for subordinates from unjust punishments. Rules provide the basis for negotiation between supervisors and subordinates. Finally, rules serve as a buffer between employees and external demands (Abbott & Caracheo, 1988).

Dysfunctional consequences of the use of rules also exist. Rules can lead to goal displacement and role distortion, causing compliance with the rules rather than a judicious enforcement of them. They may reinforce apathy and foster legalistic thinking, through the discouragement of creative efforts and encouragement of minimal performance justified by legalistic interpretation of the rules. They also lead to avoidance behavior; rules are substituted for personal judgment. Additionally,

> . . . adherence to rules also leads to rigidity on the part of the employees. To avoid punishment, organizational members adhere closely to the rules; in those cases where it is necessary to choose between exercising judgment and adhering to rules, the rules tend to win. The increased rigidity that results from strict adherence to rules tends to increase the amount of conflict between members and clients, and the increased conflict leads in turn to an increase in the felt need for defense on the part of employees. The increased need for defense tends to lead to a proliferation of rules, which leads once again to increased rigidity, and the cycle is repeated (Abbott & Caracheo, 1988. (p. 248)

Bureaucratic organization that nears perfection operates like a machine, discounting and discrediting human emotions and human agency. Each person fits into the organizational machinery like cogs in a wheel. Each person and each office is dependent on the others, operating within the systems' guidelines and administrative regulations so that the organization as a whole functions at a technically superior level--with precision, speed, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, and no ambiguity. The more completely developed bureaucracy is that which is "dehumanized" or as Weber further describes, "the more complete[] [bureaucracy] succeeds in eliminating from official business love, hatred and all purely personal, irrational and emotional elements which escape calculation" (Weber, 1958, p. 216). When all the conditions of the ideal model are met, the height of efficiency is achieved.

Power

Although the rational-legal model of bureaucracy, with its focus on authority, hierarchy, and technical efficiency has been--and continues to be--viewed primarily as a model of administrative efficiency, Weber (1958) saw it equally valuable as a tool to balance power in a mass democracy by leveling economic and social differences. He explained, "[T]he more complicated and specialized modern culture becomes, the more its external supporting apparatus demands the personally detached and strictly 'objective' expert . . ." (p. 216). Ideally, a rational-legal system of bureaucracy removes power from the dominant classes and distributes

it to those most capable in the needed areas of expertise. Organizations manage and control through rules and regulations enforced by experts who have particular knowledge and qualifications specified for their levels on the hierarchy, and who are needed to direct and operate the system. No longer is authority the privilege of persons with power derived from ascribed social and economic status. Everyone has an equal opportunity to reach the top of the hierarchy through meritocratic means, by aspiring to meet universal standards and by accruing the necessary expertise to fulfill the position of authority. Authority and its ensuing power, according to Weber, occur through legitimate means, and are employed through agreed-upon rules or laws "concerning the coercive means, physical, sacerdotal, or otherwise, which may be placed at the disposal of officials" (p. 196). Authority is not arbitrary, but "rests on the willingness of free individuals to enter into a contract or to conform to orders based upon a prior agreement" (Abbot & Caracheo, 1988, p. 244).

According to Weber, power includes "every conceivable quality of a person and every combination of circumstances that may put someone in a situation where he can demand compliance with his will" (Weber quoted in Abbott & Caracheo, 1988, p. 241). Bureaucracy gives legitimacy to power emanating from the organization inasmuch as power is derived from authority. Authority, Weber indicates, is earned by adhering to the rules and regulations of the organization and by acquiring expertise and knowledge to exercise reason in order to enact the laws integral to the organization. Legitimation of

authority and, therefore, power, occurs as individuals willingly enter into a contract or conform to laws based on prior agreement. Individuals agree to domination based on law and reason. Bureaucracy, in essence, is conceived of three types of legitimated authority: rule by law, that is, legal domination; acceptance, by those governed, of the norms upon which the laws are based, that is, legitimation; and, elimination of irrational elements, such as emotion, from the actions of officials, that is, rationality (Abbott & Caracheo, 1988). Authority, therefore, gives rise to power; power is not causal to authority. For Weber, the legitimation of power through authority obtained by rational and legal means was of utmost importance. Authority was gained through rational means; therefore, power, in the ideal model, would be used rationally.

Despite his conceptualization of power as an equalizing agent, and of authority as the cause of power, Weber recognized the problematic aspects that bureaucracy presented in terms of power. He implied that bureaucracy is like a double-edged sword. It is not only an instrument for equalizing power, but "is a power instrument of the first order--for the one who controls the bureaucratic apparatus" (Weber, 1958, p. 228).

Bureaucracy, in fact, is a type of domination, and domination is a form of power (Abbott & Caracheo, 1988). 'Power over,' including domination, subordination, coercion, subjugation, or manipulation (Kreisberg, 1992), is a driving force in bureaucratic structures. The use of power in this manner enforces and maintains social stratification, not only in the organization, but in the

whole of society. Marx addressed the issue of bureaucracy in his consideration of the state and its levels of hierarchy.

Although Marx is not considered an organizational theorist, he has provided acute insights about bureaucratic control in his discussions of the hierarchy of the state. He saw bureaucratic organization as an invidious tool of the bourgeoisie to dominate and control the proletariat. His insights are valuable in a current analysis of bureaucracy as it applies to organizations and organizational theory.

In "The Spirit of Bureaucracy," he discusses hierarchy and secrecy as formal characteristics of bureaucracy. He contends that each successive level of a bureaucracy deceives one another; that bureaucrats, concerned more with their own careers, mask their own goals in those of the organization; and that the bureaucratic meaning of things is often much different than the real meaning. These results arise from secrecy, that is, only those at the top of the hierarchy have the information necessary to operate and maintain the state. Therefore, those with the information are those who have power over others and power to determine the goals of the organization/state (Marx, 1967). Expertise not only brings efficiency, but also power over subordinate levels of workers. Unlike politicians who are voted into a position for a term of service, the experts, secreting their information from others, may be there indefinitely. The more information one has, the more power over others s/he has. Workers are separated from their products, know only pieces about the organization, and therefore have only

minimal information into the understanding and maintenance of the organizational system. Each level of the hierarchy is dependent on the one above for survival in the bureaucratic system. For efficiency purposes, this system of people fitting into the organization like cogs in a wheel works well. This system, however, promotes a 'power over' reality. That is, power is restricted to the few at the top over the masses at the bottom of the hierarchy.

> Bureaucracy is a circle no one can leave. Its hierarchy is a **hierarchy of information**. The top entrusts the lower circle with an insight into details, while the lower circles entrust the top with an insight into what is universal, and thus they mutually deceive each other. (p. 185)

In Weber's rational-legal model of bureaucracy, the institution's efficiency is enhanced by implied consensus across the hierarchy regarding the institution's goals. The goals are rationally determined and agreed upon. Marx, however, strongly suggests that bureaucrats, ensconced in advancing their own careers, make the aims of the organization their own in order to move up the hierarchy. Power over the workers results as the bureaucrats use their power to advance their careers which they achieve by meeting the institution's goals. In essence, Marx sees bureaucracy as an imaginary state obsessed with its own power and formalism. Through the power of bureaucracy, the powerful "possess[] the state's essence, the spiritual essence of society, as private property" (p. 186). Those at the top of the hierarchy see the world as an object to be administered. The system perpetuates social stratification, maintaining the power at the top.

Others have also noted the 'power over' or dominating effect of bureaucracy as it relates to stratification within organizations. In order to understand the domination of the mass of workers by the few, the organization must be seen as a system, one in which "power is institutionalized and the various elements of control fit together" (Edwards, 1984, p. 137). The system carries out the directives, the monitoring and evaluation, and the rewards and punishments. People are responsible only insofar as they fulfill their roles within the system. Power, therefore, is embedded in the social relations of the organization.

Through this system, bureaucracy ostensibly eliminates arbitrary and capricious rules by bosses. Because of the legal nature of the system--detailed written rules and regulations and procedures for following them--supervisors are subjected to scrutiny as they evaluate workers' performance. Workers also have the right to file grievances, giving them a "sense" of power, if they believe their rights have been violated. All are entangled in the system.

Workers are motivated to support the system through rewards and incentives for cooperating with the organization and punishment for recalcitrance. Positive incentives, however,

> . . . function as an elaborate system of bribes, and like all successful bribes, they are attractive. But they are also corrupting. They push workers to pursue their self-interests in a narrow way as individuals, and they stifle the impulse to struggle collectively for those same self-interests. (Edwards, 1984, p. 138)

The power emanating from the top of the hierarchy manipulates the workers into believing their best interests lay within the

organization. The workers are isolated from each other, each seeing only one piece of the job and having little knowledge of how all the pieces fit together. The workers are dependent on their fitting into the organization and see the system as their benevolent benefactor. When there is discontent, it is expressed individually or in small groups through grievances; there is not opposition from the larger collective, as the workers have been effectively stratified through bureaucratic control. Even the union poses little threat to the system, as it does not question the organization of work, but directs its energies to non-job benefits, such as salary, fringe benefits, and working conditions (Fischer, 1984). Power is actively embedded in the social structure of the organization.

School systems, too, maintain power of the few over the many who are subordinate. A quick glance at schools reveals a hierarchy, from the board of education members at the top to the students at the bottom, with similar outcomes to other bureaucratic institutions. Teachers are the middle-level managers who enforce the rules and regulations that provide service to the students (clients), but, more importantly, control and regulate the students' behavior so that it services the bureaucracy in the largest sense, society. Policy emanates from the top--the district level--to the school and classroom level. Administrators and teachers, with the belief they are serving the clients, enforce the rules and regulations and maintain the norms that limit the range of options among the students. School organization prevents teachers and administrators, despite attempts within individual classrooms and

schools, from pursuing interdependence, connection, and care among themselves that could enable them to search for their own freedom. In turn, the barriers placed before teachers and administrators limit their ability to inspire students to learn to learn in order to become capable of transforming society into one that is less oppressive and more equitable.

Educational reformers believe there are better ways of organizing society's institutions, ways that are non-hierarchical and are not rule-bound, but are based on caring relationships. The following section is a critique of bureaucracy by those who indicate why they believe there is a need to change institutional organization and, ultimately, the larger society.

A Critique of Bureaucracy

Organizations are not animated machines, but are composed of human beings with feelings and emotions. The attempts to achieve a 'perfect' bureaucracy, one that is totally rational and logical, often result in dysfunctional consequences. Bureaucracy is as much a process as an organizational structure, shaping the texture of society into multiple pyramidal hierarchies with room for only few people at the top, and valuing competition, independence, autonomy, and logical reasoning over cooperation/collaboration, interdependence/relations, connection, and the logic of feelings (Calas & Smircich, 1989; Ferguson, 1986). In general, bureaucracy is bounded by rules and norms which ostensibly are to maintain or increase efficiency, but which in essence serve to maintain the

bureaucracy by restricting the range of options for all but those at the top of the pyramid (Kanter, 1977). The result is the maintenance of inequality within the organization, as well as in society.

> As both a structure and a process, bureaucracy must be located within its social context; in our society, that is a context in which social relations between classes, races, and sexes are fundamentally unequal. Bureaucracy, as the 'scientific organization of inequality,' serves as a filter for these other forms of domination, projecting them into an institutional arena that both rationalizes and maintains them. (Ferguson, 1984, pp. 7-8)

Additionally, bureaucratic practices of limiting information and communication to only information necessary for the workers' specific role in the institutions produces isolation, depersonalization, and alienation. The results are de-skilling, fragmented lives and the loss of connection with other human beings. The workers see only that which they produce and the final product; they have little or no understanding of how their work integrates with others,' nor are they knowledgeable about each step in the process necessary to reach the goal.

One-way language--the language of technics which emanates from only the top and provides no opportunity for worker response--replaces human action. How closely the workers' behavior fits their places in the bureaucracy becomes the measure of worth (Arendt, 1958). There is no room for discourse, debate, or judgment. The language of technics does not facilitate communication which could lead to enactment of change in the organization, but controls the

behavior of those within and limits their upward mobility (Ferguson, 1984).

A perception of organizational structure is that it has been built on what are now considered male-determined, -accepted, and -legitimated characteristics: the rational, logical, and analytic. The result is organizational structure built on abstract and rule-bound constructs; hierarchy; and dualism (Acker, 1990; Hearn, Sheppard, Tancred-Sheriff, & Burrell, 1989; Schaef, 1985; Noddings, 1984; Gilligan, 1982). Organizational systems become analytical and defining, driven by the desire to be technically well-functioning wholes. To accomplish the latter, there is a need to analyze, understand, and explain by breaking down the system into its component parts and defining each of the parts in turn (Schaef, 1985). Jobs become organizational aspects to be defined apart from the whole and independent from the people who fill them.

Joan Acker (1990), exploring the way in which jobs and hierarchies are genderized, discusses the way in which organizational logic abstracts them. According to this logic, jobs and hierarchies are abstract categories; they have no occupants, no human bodies, no gender. She explains that in organizational logic, jobs are viewed as "a description of a set of tasks, competencies, and responsibilities represented as a position on an organizational chart. A job is separate from people" (p. 148). Jobs are evaluated from the perspective of their characteristics, not from that of the people who may differ in their skills, commitment and industriousness. People are chosen to fit the job. "The job exists

as a thing apart" (p. 148); the job is an abstraction. As such, it can be filled only by "disembodied workers" who exist only for their work. As such, their lives, in the eyes of those high in the bureaucracy, have no legitimate obligations beyond those required for their jobs.

Hierarchies also are not conceptualized as having workers, but are built on abstract differentiations. Organization is based on the fact that workers accept hierarchy as a given, as an acceptable principle. The way in which jobs within the hierarchy are ranked must make sense to the managers, and must be perceived as fair by the workers if the system is to work. "Levels of skill, complexity, and responsibility, all used in constructing hierarchy, are conceptualized as existing independently of any concrete worker" (p. 149). Again, the worker is seen as disembodied, this time from the hierarchy. Jobs and hierarchies are viewed in terms of the universal worker--embodying all workers, but, in actuality, embodying none.

Power related to bureaucratic organization is based on the few with "power over" the many who are subordinate. Managers are the middle-persons with much less power than those in overall control. They, however, are empowered to enforce the rules and regulations designed to keep the subordinates in place; service to clients is secondary to the maintenance of the bureaucracy which controls and regulates the behavior of the clients in order to maintain the power of the few (Ferguson, 1984; Kanter, 1977).

Michel Foucault (1979) discusses the insidious nature of "power over," as it is implemented through a hierarchical and continuous surveillance system. Through a network of power relations, control is exercised throughout the bureaucratic hierarchy by supervisors (managers) given the charge to supervise. As each supervisor watches subordinates for rule infraction, the supervisors, themselves, are under continuous surveillance; "supervisors perpetually supervised" (p. 177).

Kathy Ferguson (1984) further notes that as one moves higher in the organization, the more important "impression management skills" (p. 105) become. Relationships become less rule-governed, and there is a greater expectation of intense loyalty to and involvement with the organization. Because persons at higher levels are more involved in decision-making that is not covered by rules and, therefore, requires more personal judgment, demonstration of loyalty to the organization is sought. Thus a successful image, one that positively reflects the organization and its goals, must be achieved in order to move upward. The more one mirrors those in the upper echelon, both outwardly and in social and economic class, the better chance one has of advancing.

> The skills of impression management allow subordinates to shape their images in such a way as to approximate their supervisors. Given the impersonality of the bureaucratic setting, outward manifestations of trustworthiness take the place of direct personal knowledge and managers fall back on social similarity as a basis for trust. The more similarity there is in outwardly identifiable characteristics, such as race, sex, dress, language, and style, the more likely is an aspirant to be seen as the "right kind of person" and given access to positions of discretion and power. Thus the patterns of racial, sexual, and class

> stratification of the larger society are reproduced in the organization. . . . Lower-class individuals, blacks and Hispanics, and women all encounter immense difficulties in breaking into the administrative ranks because they are identifiably different, they clearly do not "fit in," and their efforts to fit in are stymied by their lack of familiarity with bureaucratic discourse. (p. 106)

For women and minorities, bureaucratic organization not only stratifies along socio-economic levels, but according to race and gender as well.

Extrapolating this critique of bureaucracy in general to that of schooling, I believe it would be accurate to say that the bureaucracy of schooling is a political tool to maintain and further the interests of the dominant class; that it has not been conceptualized as a "tool for the pursuit of personal, group, or class interests" (Fischer & Sirianni, 1984, p. 11); and that it is a tool of 'power over,' limiting and/or negating the value of connection, interdependence, particularity, context, and, ultimately, caring within community. For those reasons, a strand of educational reformers and feminist thinkers propose an ethic of care as the basis for school re-organization and re-structuring.

An Ethic of Care

Feminist scholars have given impetus to the development and implementations of an ethic of care as a way of thinking about school reform in more than a 'tinkering' fashion. That is, to think about an ethic of care is to think about more than simply re-arranging the same pieces of school organization differently and

saying that a reform has been wrought. It is to think differently about the structure of society and about the distribution of power. Attempting to function within an ethic of care is to think about particulars as well as universals, about responsibilities as well as rights, about connectedness as well as individualism, about the concrete as well as the abstract, and about the contextual as well as the general (Gilligan, 1982, 1983; Noddings, 1984, 1992; Grimshaw, 1986; Fox-Genovese, 1991). An ethic of care would alter significantly the power structure of schooling which, in turn, would affect that of society in general. The following examination of caring, specifically an ethic of care, provides a basis for understanding the political importance of caring as an alternative method of school organization.[1]

Women as Care-Givers

Feminists from a variety of disciplines write about caring and an ethic of care as alternatives to bureaucracy in our social institutions. They base much of their thinking on the history and tradition of females as care-givers, and because of their own experiences as women, they believe they know what caring is (Fisher & Tronto, 1990). They also draw on psychological data which

---

[1]Much has been written about an ethic of care; therefore, I will discuss it and its tenets only briefly in order to lay a foundation for the critique that follows. For a full background, please see Gilligan (1982), In a Different Voice; Noddings (1984), Caring: A Feminist Approach to Ethics and Moral Education; Noddings (1992), The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education; or Brabeck (1989), Who Cares? Theory, Research, and Educational Implications of the Ethic of Care.

supports the notion that women see themselves in relation to others, that is, in positions to serve others, or having primary responsibility to others. (Baker Miller, 1976; Gilligan, 1982, 1983). Psychologists attribute the latter, not to natural instinct, but to socialization (Chodorow, 1978; Baker Miller, 1976). Women have been socialized to take care of others and have constructed their identities in that light. They bring that identity from the sphere of private life--home and family--to public life--the workplace.

> Women have traditionally built a sense of self-worth on activities that they can manage to define as taking care of and giving to others. . . . This situation is complex because even out of this traditional setting a valuable tendency arises. Women, more easily than men, can believe that any activity is more satisfying when it takes place in the context of relationships to other human beings--and even more so when it leads to the enhancement of others. Women know this experience in a way men do not. (Baker Miller, p. 53)

Although many feminist writers demure to call it a 'female' ethic of care, the implication is that it is easier for women to care than men (Baker Miller, 1976; Noddings, 1984, 1992; Gilligan, 1982; Tronto, 1987; Tiger & Fox, 1984; Bettelheim, 1984).

Discussing an ethic of care, feminist thinkers often pose it as complementary to and in tension with an ethic of justice, which focuses on rules and principles, independency, autonomy, the abstract and the universal. Feminists associate justice with males who, in turn, use that ethic to judge all, including an ethic of care. What is an ethic of care?

Tenets of an Ethic of Care

Feminist writers describe an ethic of care as a kind of moral reasoning. The reasoning takes on the qualities of connection, particularity of responsibility (the contextual), commitment, and reciprocity.

Connection

An ethic of care is a way of moral reasoning that is contingent on human relationships "sustained by a morality that protects relationship--a morality whose essence lies in not abdicating responsibility, in not breaching primary loyalties, in not giving way to acrimony, in not deserting one another" Gilligan, 1983, p. 33). It implies connection, a web or circle (Noddings, 1984), of relationships at its core. Responsibility to others in relation to self results in interdependence rather than independence. Women, particularly, feel responsibility to others as they encounter dilemmas and find it difficult to meet their own needs at the expense of others.

May Sarton (1978), beautifully illustrates the importance and tug of a web of relations on women's moral reasoning. In her book, A Reckoning, she follows a sixty-year old woman, Laura Spelman, from her first learning about her inoperable cancer to her death. Laura, finding out she has a limited time to live, is determined to die her own way, that is, to live only doing the consequential things in her life, and to do them as she chooses. Her initial reaction is not to tell her family until her physical health requires her to do so.

She finds out, however, that all her decisions involving dying involve a web of relationships--her children and her sisters, each seen as distinct individuals to be dealt with differently; her mother, and her maiden aunt--that she cannot ignore, including the web that exists to connect one to nature and the environment.[2]

> Yes, Laura thought, it's like a web. Whatever the secret, the real connections, we are inextricably woven into a huge web together, and detaching the threads, one by one, is hideously painful. As long as one still feels the tug, one is not ready to die. . . . But, she reminded herself, the future is not my concern now. I have to shut it out. Only the present moment can have any real substance--so she looked again at the azalea and noted what unusually large single blossoms it had, and she felt that this looking, this still intense joy in a flower, was her way of praising God. Outside the human web, there was another far more complex and yet not binding structure that included Grindle (her dog) and the azalea and she herself, and in that she could rest. (p. 183)

As Laura becomes progressively more ill and must be taken to the hospital, she finds that making connections with the strangers who 'care' for her is immensely important.

> Of course the questions had to do only with illness. By the time he was through this young man would know all about her years in the sanatorium, about her hysterectomy, and about her damaged lungs--and that is all he would know. Laura was amazed to discover that she was struggling to make a connection on another level. In a hospital one is reduced to being a body, one's history is the body's history, and perhaps that is why something deep inside a person reaches out, a little like a spider trying desperately to find a corner on which to begin to hang a web, the web of personal relations. . . (p. 204)

---

[2]See Noodings (1984, 1992) for a discussion of human relationships to animals, the environment, and man-made products.

She attempts to converse with the young doctor. In the course of the conversation she tells him that she is dying. When his cajoling does not move Laura from the seriousness of her intended discussion with him, he rises from the chair telling her he must see several more patients. Laura's thoughts are, "Of course to do their work they couldn't afford to come in contact with a patient's soul. There was always that out" (p. 205).

Throughout the novel, Laura attempts to die as an individual not bound by others' wants and desires. She however is unable to accomplish that, recognizing the needs of those within her web of relationships and her responsibilities to them. As Laura's cancer increasingly debilitates her, she says time and again that she must acknowledge her growing dependency on others. I disagree with Sarton's use of the term "dependency," for I think there was interdependence, as Laura's children and sisters continued to look to her for a strength they needed in order to come to terms with her dying. Laura was interdependent within a network of social relationship.

The young intern, however, is an example of independence and autonomy. He did not want to be drawn into a 'real' relationship with Laura, even for a moment. His concern was to accomplish his job of taking three more medical histories before his round of duty ended, not to help a dying woman understand death.

Woman's connections to others, her circles of care, her web of relationships, never leave her, even when she most thinks she wants them to. Within an ethic of care, connection is the center of moral

reasoning. Her individuality is often subsumed in connection. Regarding that, Gilligan (1982) notes that a woman achieves the highest level of moral reasoning when she is able to reflectively consider a situation and understand that there are times when she must care for herself first.

Particularity of Responsibilities

The ability to reflectively consider each situation, that is, to study the particularity of context for each moral decision, is paramount in an ethic of care. Unlike an ethic of justice, universal rules and principles do not apply to an ethic of care. An ethic of care is based in the specific context and in the concrete, not in the universal and abstract. It revolves around responsibilities and relationships rather than rights and rules. Criteria for judgment need to be developed for each dilemma or condition because of the impossibility of labeling any specific act as universally or absolutely responsive to caring (Gilligan, 1984).

The morality of rules and principles can be dangerous, for with each principle there is an exception (abortion is wrong unless the mother's life is in danger). Additionally, principles lend themselves to self-righteousness. Morality in an ethic of caring, therefore, is contextual, emerging as more details are known about a situation. An ethic of care, therefore, based on individual human experiences is subject less and less to general rules and principles the more details are known about a situation (Noddings, 1984).

Virtually everyone wants to be cared for, but not in the same manner. "[E]veryone wants to be received, to elicit a response that is congruent with an underlying need or desire" (Noddings, 1992, p. 17). An ethic of care suggests that although people may be in similar situations they may choose different ways of handling their particular circumstances.

Let us return to Sarton's Laura to illustrate caring in context and not according to rules. Although Laura wanted to direct her dying to suit herself, she acknowledged that she needed to inform relatives sooner than she had intended because she realized they were a part of her dying. However, she wanted to inform them as she felt ready to deal with them on a deeply emotional level.

Her eldest sister, Jo, a highly successful academic, arrived unannounced. After many attempts to open the door to understand Jo, Laura finally asked,

> "Why did you come, Jo?"
>
> "After all, you are ill."
>
> "'Families are different,' you said, earlier. And yet--forgive me for being blunt--you must have intimate friends who are far closer to you now than I. We haven't talked like this for years." Jo took a swallow of coffee and put the cup down. (p. 176)

"Caring" for Laura and Jo are quite different. Jo lived by rules and principles. One of the principles was that "one should visit family when ill, and the ill member ought to wish to be visited" (p. 181). Jo could not respond to Laura's inquiry with any reason other than Laura was family and there are certain expectations for all family members. If Jo had functioned within an

ethic of care, she would have called to find out if she were welcome at that time. If Laura had declined her visit, Jo, from the standpoint of an ethic of care, would not have come, despite the universal expectations of family members in times of illness. She also would have tried to understand Laura's perspective on her own process of dying.

Perhaps a bit more difficult was Laura's 'caring' situation with her doctor, whom she trusted and admired. The doctor had promised Laura that she would live to see the spring. Knowing how agonizing the hospital stay had been for her, the doctor arranged for her son to carry her to the chaise in the garden after her return home. Laura, too weak and sick, no longer wanted to leave her bed. The doctor, however, neglected to see that, for he wanted to keep his promise to her; keeping promises is an important principle. Only after Laura had a severe coughing attack that weakened her even further could the doctor see that he had not shown care.

From the perspective of an ethic of care, there is no set of principles, no recipe, for care. Caring is grounded in the daily experiences and moral problems of real people; it is a way of being in relation (Noddings, 1984; Gilligan, 1982; Tronto, 1987).

Commitment

Commitment is most important in an ethic of caring. The commitment spoken of is not that one will be forever present in body to the other, but that there is a joint 'knowing' or awareness of

caring between people. Caring involves "a commitment that is stronger than the desire to run" (Beck, 1992). Caring requires devotion, loyalty (Noddings, 1984).

The caring relationship may change over time, but the bond remains. The form of caring or the circumstances may alter, but the fact that one cares, that one is devoted, does not.

The longer one is committed to caring, accepting that it demands responsibility, the more potential there is that one will have to sacrifice. Sacrifice, however, enhances the experience of the one making it. Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (1984) suggest that women commit themselves to caring, and are willing to sacrifice in order to care for others, but their sacrifice is devalued by a patriarchal society that values individual actions that lead to accomplishment more than nurturing (Beck, 1992).

Reciprocity - Giving and Receiving

In order for a caring relationship to be complete, both care-giving and care-receiving are necessary. Noddings (1984) discusses the characteristics associated with each of those positions. The care-giver is distinguished by engrossment (attention) and motivational displacement (apprehension of the care-receiver's needs and desires from her perspective) for the care-receiver. Noddings indicates that as long as the caring occurs--from moments to long durations of time--the care-giver really sees, hears, and feels what the other wants to convey. That is followed by motivational displacement. The care-giver

understands what the care-receiver conveys and responds in a way that enhances the other's goals or objectives.

To realize the relationship as caring, the receiver must acknowledge receipt of the care offered. This is done in two ways. The receiver acknowledges and responds to the care-giver's particular form of attention, and she shares herself in relation to that which was offered, enabling the care-giver to continue contributing support to her efforts. Acceptance of caring is natural if it is consistent--congruent--with the care-receiver's needs.

It is also natural for the care-giver to accept the care-receiver's gift of responsiveness. It is, however, inconsistent with caring to demand responsiveness from the other. "The one-caring is motivated in the direction of the cared-for and she must, therefore, respect her freedom. She meets her as subject--not as an object to be manipulated. . . ." (p. 72). The care-giver's response allows the receiver to grow in freedom in the wide support of caring, that is, the care-giver strives to respond in ways compatible to the care-receiver's needs and understandings of care. For the caring relation to be complete, the importance of the acknowledgment of caring by both the care-giver and care-receiver is the reality of being in relation. That is, the care-receiver may not acknowledge the care received through words or actions, but because she and the care-giver are in relation, they know, understand, feel the reciprocity of the caring, whether through a smile or trust that the care has been accepted.

What happens if the care offered is not consistent with the care-receiver's needs or wants? Is it possible to still have a fulfilled caring relationship? Noddings explains that if the relationship must be maintained because of formal or long-term expectations (parent/child, teacher/student, doctor/patient) the cared-for must respond to the care-giving. In those kinds of relationships, the cared-for acknowledges the "wisdom and motivational displacement of the one-supposed-caring" (p. 75) for she does "things to us and for us for our own good" (p. 75). The response is one of respect and obedience.

If, however, the motives of care are actually such that the care-giver wants/needs to be cared-for, that is, the care-giver demands response from the care-receiver to satisfy her own needs, then the latter is in an intolerable position.

> It is easy to see that, in dependent relations, the greater responsibility belongs to the one-caring. As soon as the cared-for must consider the needs and motives of the one-caring, he becomes one-caring himself or he falls into a life of inauthenticity or he becomes an ethical hero--one who behaves as though cared-for without the sustenance of caring. (p. 76)

There are two ways of dealing with such a situation. She may act as cared-for out of self-interest, expecting "others to be engrossed in [her], shar[ing] spontaneously to promote [her] own ego, and grow[ing] in [her] nonethical dimensions without even considering the relation" (p. 77). That response may eventually lead to the care-giver's realization of the irrelevance of caring and withdrawing.

On the other hand, she may respond to the needs of the care-giver by consciously giving up her place as care-receiver and from concern for the care-giver behave as cared-for. This response, if done without reflectiveness, may tarnish the ideal of an ethic of care by promoting a false relationship. If, however, the cared-for "maintains an intellectual doubt concerning the relation" (p. 76) and, therefore, interprets the care-giver's each move of caring in its best light and every response in the way it should be meant, then the cared-for may assume that "the lack of feeling is (or may be) a lack in the cared-for or a result of accident or a product of too much effort--or anything that preserves the one-caring as one-caring (p. 77).

To illustrate the reciprocity of care let us again turn to Laura and the people who intended to be care-givers to her. As Laura grew weaker, she experienced a need to have someone sit with her. Mary, the woman hired to help her, was experienced in taking care of dying persons. She understood Laura's need and offered to stay in the room with her. Mary's caring was to bring her mending and to sit unobtrusively, not talking, but responding to Laura according to Laura's needs. Laura rejoiced in that care. Caring was reciprocal in the way Laura took Mary's hand or smiled at her when she sat quietly doing her work.

Laura's children, however, continually wanted to be with Laura and to talk with her, to do. Their 'offers' of care were really efforts to be cared-for; they needed her dependence on them in order to feel they were doing something to help her through her illness.

Laura's first response was annoyance and anger that they were NOT caring for her. She, after reflecting on her position and theirs, became in Noddings' term, the ethical heroine. She accepted--and took responsibility--for the care offered and responded to her children as the one-cared-for. She allowed her youngest son to sit with her and initiated conversation when she knew he was uncomfortable in the silence. She, beyond the need or desire for such things, genuinely responded to her daughter's need to play the guitar and sing for her. All the while, Laura was conscious of the relationship and how she was responding. The critical point is that she sought to maintain the relationships, seeing the intended care-givers in the best light possible.

The above is the fundamental basis on which feminist thinkers and educational reformers wish to change organizational theory in order for schools and other institutions in society to become caring places. I based my discussion of an ethic of care on my understanding of prominent feminist thinkers' works. Note that the emphasis was on the individual's caring for another individual. Schooling, however, involves a collection of individuals that needs to be cared for as a whole, as well as for its unique members. I ask you to keep that in mind as you read the following section which examines issues problematic to an ethic of caring and, therefore, to its acceptance and implementation as the foundation for organizational theory.

Critique of an Ethic of Caring

This critique focuses on an ethic of care in light of educational reform. My particular concern is educational reform involving a change in school organization and leadership. I will examine particular aspects of an ethic of care from a feminist perspective and apply those analyses to organizational and leadership reform. My argument is that an ethic of care is thought about primarily from a personal standpoint, that is, what 'a' person needs to know and do in order to be a caring person. I believe, however, that as an educational reform measure, an ethic of care requires a vision of 'collective' effort, involving support and resources that individual persons either could not provide, or could do so only on a limited basis.

Such a vision would require thinking about the relation of caring to power, as the reality is an ethic of caring would be created within the context of a bureaucracy, a hierarchy of power. Within that context, we need to think about how caring will be defined, whose caring it will be, whether it will be simply another way to maintain the dominant interests, or whether it will replace one form of oppression with another. We also need to consider whether caring is separate from power and, if not, what is the relationship and what effect will that have on school organization as bureaucracy. An 'ethic' of care pondered from those perspectives quickly becomes a 'politics' of care.

The issues discussed and questions I pose in this chapter are intended to stimulate the reader to think about the implementation

of an ethic of care as a collective effort, one involving power and politics. I ask the reader, then to think about these questions and your own as you read Chapters Four and Five telling the story of Division High's valiant, yet painful, attempts to become a caring community.

In this chapter, my focus is on the following aspects of an ethic of care: caring as women's work, connection, community, and reciprocal. I also discuss caring as having different understandings depending on one's cultural background. Throughout all of these topics, I attempt to show the need to move beyond caring from an individual perspective to that of a collective concern.

Caring as Women's Work

An ethic of care is very often viewed as a "female ethic" (Grimshaw, 1986, p. 196) for traditionally and historically women have been the care-givers in our society (Fox-Genovese, 1991; Arendt, 1958). Feminist thinkers, subsequently, suggest that women's lives provide the space to question values that see human lives as dispensable in the service of abstract ideas or causes; see caring for others or devoting one's life to serving others as relatively unimportant; and see the responsibilities of maintaining human life and nurturing connections as sharply distinct from and inferior to the affairs of the public world (Grimshaw, 1986). Understanding an ethic of care from that perception presents several problematic issues.

There is a tension between caring and other values in society, specifically, individualism, autonomy, rationalism, and competition. Caring is devalued, despite the fact that "human existence requires care from others and such caring is an important part of life" (Fisher & Tronto, 1990, p. 35). It is associated with women's work, which has been relegated to the private sphere of society (Finch & Groves, 1983; Tronto, 1987; Graham, 1983; Elshtain (1981; Jagger, 1983; Hartsock, 1984; Brown, 1982). As such, it has virtually no place in the description of the 'good life' which provides the focus for Western philosophy--autonomous, rational, and public (Fisher & Tronto, 1990). In discussions of caring, the focus tends to be on the carer rather than on the act of caring. Major among the reasons for this are

> . . . the tremendous fund of everyday experience that women especially have concerning caring. This experience encourages us to think that we already "know" what caring is. The second [reason] is the absence of a strong secular tradition in which to conceptualize caring. The liberal tradition in Western philosophy centers on a world view in which the rational, autonomous man accomplishes his life plan in the public realm. This tradition assumes a theory of self in which people are isolated, in which the self is prior to its activities and to its connections with others. From such a perspective, people need to be activated in order to be purposeful and goal-directed; hence, the question of motivation to act becomes a central philosophical issue. It also assumes that the caring needed to sustain these activities somehow will get done, if not by oneself, then by slaves, women, or lower-class, or lower-caste people. (Fisher and Tronto, 1990, p. 36)

[For the remainder of this discussion, I ask the reader to include "lower-class," "lower-caste," that is, minority peoples, in their thinking as I discuss caring in relation to females. I believe that

feminist literature struggling to determine and find an equitable place for females in our society traditionally developed, maintained, and dominated by white males, can--and should--be used to work toward the alleviation and elimination of oppression for all who are oppressed. Consequently, though the literature I draw on may deal specifically with women, I think of these issues as encompassing a much broader range of peoples.]

Caring conceptualized in that manner maintains modern societies' world vision of a sexual division of labor: men are autonomous and rational and motivated to accomplish purposeful, formal, and paid activates in the public domain; women are dependent and caring, ministering to the needs of family and building and maintaining relationships, unpaid. In other words, there is a public and private division in society evidenced by "men-who-do" and "women-who-care" (Graham, 1983, p. 23). That sets up a dichotomy, determining what counts as "caring" by who does it as much as by what is done. In turn, such a dichotomy contributes to primary defining characteristics of women's and men's self-identity and work: women are 'caring,' and men are 'not-caring'; women are to focus on others and men are to focus on themselves (Graham, 1983; Baker Miller, 1976).

Unfortunately, the latter contributes to a polarization by feminists of idealized feminine private virtues and a corrupt male public world. Such a view

> . . . supposes that women can remain quite unchanged and it does not ask whether women's powerlessness and dependence might not have led to distortions in the idea of female virtue which both

> worked against women's interests and misrepresented any particular capacities or insights that they might have; it also supposes that men are 'naturally' corrupt. (Grimshaw, 1986, p. 200)

Considering the implementation of an ethic of care with that dichotomy and perception makes me question how nurturing can take place in relationships that are not intimate or private. That is, if caring is separate from the public world, how does one think about nurturing in terms of broad educational policy? Can women remain "unchanged" as they function in the public world? Should they?

There is also the danger with such a polarization of simply substituting one oppressive form of dominance with another. If males are seen as 'naturally' corrupt, and females as 'virtuous,' will an ethic of caring attempt to reverse the current oppressors and oppressed?[3]

---

[3]Sheri Tepper's (1983) Gate to Women's Country is a grand illustration of a hypothetical situation where women ran the country. In this science fiction novel, the women and men live in separate but contiguous villages joined by the gate to the women's country. Women support and govern both. The men spend their lives preparing for their war games, while the women educate themselves and do all that is necessary to maintain and support the villages. The women dole out supplies, including food, clothing, and household needs, to the males. When the men are ill, they provide medicine and medical attention. However, when the men return from a war, the women give them only water, refusing to attend to their wounds for war is against the women's principles. The women will not allow men books, believing that the males' propensity for physical combat prevents them from being caring and thoughtful towards others and the group. Although the women did not engage in physical abuse among themselves, they did, however, use emotional measures to control the women in the country. Thus, I do question whether women, given major power, would resist oppressing others.

Some feminist thinkers interpret women's propensity for caring--not as a genetic trait, but as a socially constructed characteristic (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984; Chodorow, 1978)--as a positive dimension in their lives, despite its devaluation by the patriarchal structure of society. Others, however, view the relationship between women and caring as oppressive because of its complexity. Emphasis is put on the psychological aspects of caring--connection, relationship, interdependence, commitment, and community. Yet, little consideration is given to the fact that caring is often time-consuming, difficult and unpleasant, and a collective effort (Ungerson, 1983; Fisher & Tronto, 1990). In the patriarchal family, caring is reduced to an obligatory transaction of goods and services, leaving women defined in terms of female sacrifice and supreme selflessness (Graham, 1983). In the marketplace, women are expected to care for their families, yet are devalued when they do. Consider the following.

It is difficult for caring to be a collective effort when the marketplace does not value caring. It discourages role reversal, that is, making home and family top priority, but encourages females to give priorities to home responsibilities. (Ungerson, 1983). Doing so is a way of returning women back to the home and, therefore, reclaiming the public domain solely for males.

Recently, the Congress passed the Family and Medical Leave Act, legislation designed to allow people, male and female, unpaid leave for the birth of a child, "after an adoption, to care for a seriously ill family member, or if their own health condition makes

them unable to perform their jobs" ("Family leave," 1993). In this time of financial instability, unemployment, and multitudinous lay-offs, including white collar workers, those who take advantage of this bill are often seen as not serious about their work. Marcia Kropf, director of a non-profit organization to promote changes in the workplace for women, commented, "This is one reason why men rarely reduce their working hours or take leave to help their families. . . . Family leave has often meant maternity leave and is seen as a women's thing" (quoted in "Family leave," 1993).

Heidi Hartmann, director of the Institute for Women's Policy Research, however, counters that in a family emergency when there is no choice, women, particularly, will be able to take leave without fear of losing their jobs. But, there is mounting evidence that employers are choosing not to hire women or are finding reasons to sever employment when they take extended leave (Stahl, 1993). Mary Reed, legislative representative at the National Federation of Independent Businesses, concretely points out the market devaluation of caring with her comments about the potential long-range impact of the Family and Medical Leave Act: "Small employers are going to be less likely to employ women of child-bearing years and more likely to cut the number of low-skilled jobs" (quoted in "Family leave," 1993).

Caring as a collective effort is problematic. Our societal norms reflect an attitude of women 'care' and men 'do.' Arendt (1958) pointed out that in the prepolitical society of Greece, the home was the place to which men returned to revitalize themselves

after the challenges of the public life. Such an attitude exists in the United States today. Women are expected to forge and maintain the connections within the family. Through those strong connections of caring, however, dependency results, not because women receive care, but because they give care (Graham, 1983). If women can be convinced it is their responsibility to be the primary--or sole--care-givers, the public domain will remain male dominated and controlled, thereby, keeping women from making significant progress in public life. The result is women's continued dependency on men.

Consider the following comment by noted psychologist, Bruno Bettelhiem (1984) on the place of men in the family in modern society.

> The fulfillment of manhood is achieved by making a contribution to society as a whole, an impulse which is quickened when a responsible man becomes a father. Without a child, there seems little reason why a man should wish to perpetuate society, to plan beyond the reaches of his life; why he should plant trees, the fruits of which will not ripen while he can still enjoy them. But the relationship between father and child never was and cannot now be built principally around child-caring experiences. It is built around a man's function in society: moral, economic, political. (p. 308)

One can say that Bettelheim is conservative, but, then, what are our nation's schools? Implementing an ethic of care in schools will require thought about meeting the challenges of those parents and staff who do not want the private world of caring (female) infringing on the public work of doing (male).

An ethic of caring, however, presumes an integration of men into women's caring work, thus, making caring as valuable as other

activities. It requires that the "worthiness" (Fisher & Tronto, 1990, p. 36) of caring be recognized. That presumption assumes that those who have traditionally relegated caring to life's private domain desire to recognize it as essential to the public domain. If schools are to be reformed through an ethic of caring, such a reforming "is dependent on a transforming, and on a challenging of the sharp distinction between a public and a private ethic" (Grimshaw, 1986, p. 203). The question is, is there a tension of new needs that is great enough to motivate people for change, however painful? If not, change is unlikely, for "a transvaluation of values can only be accomplished when there is a tension of new needs and a new set of needy people who feel all old values as painful although they are not conscious of what is wrong" (Daly, 1973, as quoted in Grimshaw, 1986, p. 155). Do men, as well as women, feel a need for interdependence and connection which causes tension with the need for independence and autonomy?

Change, however, does not necessarily come with recognition. It may lead to ignoring the "oppressive and oppression-linked" (p. 36) aspects of caring and, therefore, reinforces what is already perceived as women's work. An ethic of caring may only serve to reinforce the current structure. For instance, will more females be 'awarded' positions as principals so they may administer an ethic of caring determined by male superiors? And will the position of 'principal' become devalued in the long term?

The latter is particularly poignant at this time. There is asymmetry between responsibility and power, not only between

positions in the institutional hierarchies, but between males and females in the same or similar positions, and between care-givers and care-receivers. In the case of principals, where responsibility is great, but power limited, will females, more than males, be expected to compensate for the deficiencies in the caring process? Will female principals be given the "toughest" schools--those with the least resources and those needing the most care--and expected to accomplish as much or more because they are encouraged--perhaps, mandated--to create a caring atmosphere that is monitored through bureaucratic practices?

School resources continue to become particularly scarce. Having/not having material resources may dictate what we choose to care/not care about. Limitations in time, knowledge, skills, and resources impinge on what we will care about, forcing us to make choices. As a foundation for school reform, an ethic of caring does not seem to address the concrete dilemmas from an organizational perspective. Questions, such as the following, are but a few that may plague those within the midst of change: Who will make those choices? What will the relationship of responsibility to power and authority be? What role will the care-receiver have in the choice of what she needs and wants? How will the care-giver and care-receiver be allowed to function together? apart? What if the care-givers' and care-receivers' conceptions of needs are contradictory? Consider the Family Leave Act. Many care-receivers cannot afford to take an unpaid leave and would prefer to have on-site daycare. Would principals be able to provide that? Or would

their power be limited to abiding by the higher echelon determination of what caring is, which may simply perpetuate the system? Caring is labor-intensive, time-consuming, and often contradictory. Who will have the power to determine its value?

Furthermore, those who advocate an ethic of caring in schools fail to acknowledge that the requirements of an ethic of justice, that is, one which implies universal rights, rules, and impartiality (Gilligan, 1983), govern our school systems. They traditionally have set the boundaries for what is acceptable as caring in the public sphere (Tronto, 1987)

> . . . insofar as the boundaries of the private (in this case, private morality as expressed by care) are set by the categories and definitions of the public (in this case, public morality, that is, the ethic of justice), that which is relegated to the private is not judged on its own terms. Private morality is not perceived as independent of the "more important" public realm. It is by nature dependent and secondary. (pp. 454-455)

In essence, feminists neglect to address the reality that privileged males will judge what is useful, important, and what needs changing. And, the policies to implement an ethic of care, no doubt, would be standardized in order to "fit" the bureaucracy.

All of these questions concern extending the boundaries of caring, which is very important. In order to fully address that, however, it is necessary to examine the aspect of "connectedness" as an integral part of caring, for the boundaries of caring cannot be separated from relationships and connection.

Caring as Connection

Connection is a major tenet of an ethic of care. As a balance to extreme individualism and autonomy, it is necessary. Relationship is essential to living fully as a human being and to developing viable communities. But there is also a negative side to connectedness. Seeing oneself only in relation to others is problematic because connection may be a way of promoting illusory expectations or a way of escaping from old forms of coercion and constraint only to fall into new ones (Grimshaw, 1986).

An ethic of caring within schools would have the potential of giving women the illusion of power while continuing to oppress them. Those in power positions, usually males, may agree to the need for caring within their schools. Rather than their integrating themselves into the work of caring, they may pander to the women's egos as 'natural' care-givers. Female teachers and/or administrators, understanding the importance of caring and willing to work at it regardless of the time and effort required,[4] are delighted that males are finally recognizing their contributions to society. The men, on the other hand, will be the 'doers' because they got the job done, that is, they made the decision to implement an ethic of caring and saw that it was accomplished.

Women may become inextricably connected to others, unable to separate themselves from the act of caring. The latter may result in caring becoming a burden, done out of obligation in order to meet

---

[4]See Samuel G. Freedman's book, Small Victories of Teachers Who Cared Too Much.

socially constructed norms, one of which is woman as care-giver (Ungerson, 1983; Fisher & Tronto, 1990). Meeting those norms may even be done in self-defense; that is, if women do not conform to the expectations set for them, the assumption is that something is 'wrong' with them. Women are expected to care, to live their lives in connection with others. If they do not, they are selfish, self-centered, or out of sync with society's norms; there is something wrong, not with the norms, but with the women. Marilyn Frye (1983), writing about the relationship of women to men, could very well be writing about expectations of not only men, but of family and of the larger society for women to care.

> The arrogant perceiver's expectation creates in the space about him a sort of vacuum mold into which the other is sucked and held. But the other is not sucked into his structure always, nor always without resistance. In the absence of his manipulation, the other is not organized primarily with reference to his interests. To the extent that she is not shaped to his will, does not fit the conformation he imposes, there is friction, anomaly or incoherence in his world. To the extent that he notices this incongruity, he can experience it in no other way than as something wrong with her. His perception is arrogating; his senses tell him that the world and everything in it . . . is in the nature of things there for him, that she is by her constitution and telos his servant. . . . If woman does not serve man, it can only be because he is not a sufficiently skilled master or because there is something wrong with the woman. He may try to manage things better, but when that fails he can only conclude that she is defective: unnatural, flawed, broken, abnormal, damaged, sick. (p. 69)

People of non-European backgrounds and heritages also are subject to feelings of having to live up to the dominant culture's expectations of them. Studies conducted by Ogbu (1988) Peshkin and White (1990), and Olsen (1988) show the effects that expectations of

the white, middle class have on the lives of minority students. In virtually all cases, not living up to the dominant cultures' expectations implies, not difference, but deviance, inferiority. Therefore, these persons often feel compelled to make choices regarding who they are. They are often pressured to stop caring--for their cultures, their family values--in order to become 'connected' to the dominant culture. Like women, they are asked to sacrifice themselves to fit the norms of the larger society.

Will an ethic of care be enacted to allow for administrators and teachers, majority and minority peoples, to uncover the now unspoken grievances against one another? Or will the web of relationships, the connections that divide administrators from teachers and majority from minority persons into relationships of inequality be maintained, thus preventing caring? Will an ethic of care become the rationale for developing hatred and dislike of differences?

> Within a framework of inequality the existence of conflict is denied and the means to engage openly in conflict are excluded. Further, inequality itself creates additional factors that skew any interaction and prevent open engagement around real differences. Instead, inequality generates hidden conflict around elements that the inequality itself has set in motion. In sum, both sides are diverted from open conflict around falsifications. For this hidden conflict, there are no acceptable social forms or guides because this conflict supposedly doesn't exist. (Baker Miller, 1976, p. 13)

An ethic of care presumes connections, but, perhaps, those connections may be forged only through 'caring conflicts.' There is little to suggest that an ethic of care as an educational reform

measure provides for concrete thinking about the relationships between and among teachers, administrators, and other staff members. Such relationships require caring on a collective basis, as well as on an individual one. An ethic of care appear to be cast primarily from the perspective of an individual's caring; as a foundation for reform, it needs to be thought of from the perspective of collectives, that is, groups of people within a school, as well as the entire population of a school.

Living in connection can also mean living through another, not living one's own life, but a Quixotian existence. Grimshaw (1986) describes this kind of connectedness as 'mapping' others' needs and feelings, as one understands them, on to oneself, trying to identify with them. She uses as an example, a wife who lives through her husband, therefore connecting with him. To her detriment--and his--she denies her own existence. Caring becomes self-sacrifice rather than fulfillment.

Psychological data also suggest that women may find satisfaction only in activities they can rationalize as serving others. Jean Baker Miller (1976) forcefully indicated the degree to which that occurs, saying that "many women truly cannot tolerate or allow themselves to feel that their life activities are for themselves" (p. 62). Thus, they spend their lives finding ways to translate their own motivations into means of serving others. They believe that by devoting their lives to serving others, they will be loved and respected. The result is often the reverse: others resent their super-human efforts, feeling trapped and controlled.

Connectedness, in that sense, becomes power, a power that controls and manipulates others.

Exploring caring as control, Grimshaw (1986) referred to L.D. Laing's Sanity, Madness, and the Family.[5] Through her discussion of this study, Grimshaw pointed out the dark side of connectedness.

> The mothers described in Sanity, Madness and the Family are 'connected' to their daughters, in that they see them simply as a projection of a family 'phantasy' or of their own beliefs and desires. And they are also unable to imagine or conceive of the 'separateness' of their daughters . . . the result of this was that, far from being able to 'empathize' with their daughters, the mothers showed an almost total inability to understand what they were thinking and feeling. (p. 181, 182)

Part of being connected is to be separate from. Unlike the dichotomy of connectedness and separateness that feminists often use to describe human relationships, care for others requires understanding oneself and having the ability to distinguish 'self' from 'other.' To be able to care is to know oneself, to understand where oneself begins and ends in order not to see others as a "projection of self, or self as a continuation of the other" (Grimshaw, 1986, p. 183). To care is to relate and to separate

---

[5]This is a case study of eleven women who had been diagnosed as schizophrenic. The book documents their cases primarily through transcripts of interviews with the women themselves and with members of their families, especially their parents. Grimshaw discusses this book in some detail, noting that "what really happened, Laing Showed, was that absolutely any attempts to achieve any form of independence from parental control or wishes were interpreted as 'bad'; all attempts at autonomy were blocked. The progression from 'badness' to 'madness' was a result of the failure to achieve any sort of autonomy. . . . But the really crucial thing which lay behind this failure was not just the fact of parental control, but the ways (largely unconscious [emphasis mine]) by which this was achieved" (p. 177).

simultaneously (Arendt, 1958). On the other hand, an unclear or idealized vision of connectedness can lead to coerciveness and the denial of the needs of individuals to forge their own paths to develop their own understandings and goals (Grimshaw, 1986).

In a passage from "In and Out of Harm's Way," Frye (1983) describes "the loving eye" as being separate from the one she cares about and for. Caring occurs because she knows herself and knows that she will see the other with her own eye

> . . . the loving perceiver can see without the presupposition that the other poses a constant threat or that the other exists for the seer's service; nor does she see with the other's eye instead of her own. Her interest does not blend the seer and the seen. . . One who sees with a loving eye is separate from the other whom she sees. There are boundaries between them; she and the other are two. . . The loving eye is one that pays a certain sort of attention. This attention can require a discipline but not a self-denial. The discipline is one of self-knowledge, knowledge of the scope and boundary of the self. What is required is that one know what are one's interests, desires and loathings, one's projects, hungers, fears and wishes, and that one know what is and what is not determined by these [emphasis mine]. In particular, it is a matter of being able to tell one's own interests from those of others and of knowing where one's self leaves off and another begins. (pp. 74, 75)

The focus of an ethic of care in schools is usually on caring for students, which is as it should be. But, teachers need to understand themselves, their "scope and boundary," before they can begin to deal with the culture, values, and lifestyles the children bring to their classes. If the staff is not reflective about themselves and what they believe, it does not seem likely that they will be reflective about the differences their students present.

In a longitudinal study of social class and teacher expectations, Ray Rist (1970) found that a kindergarten teacher's expectations affected the academic placement of her students, not only in kindergarten, but each succeeding year. Some of these children were irreparably hurt academically because they did not meet dress, language, or hygiene expectations. Her expectations were not based on 'objective' evidence, but on her background, experiences, and lifestyle, all contributing to her idea of what a 'good' student should be.

Persons coming from the perspective of the dominant culture, unless they are able to step back to become consciously aware of their own assumptions, may not be able to separate themselves from their students. The result would be to expect the student to have the same values and concerns as they have. The implementation of an ethic of care will need to provide opportunities for staff members to connect with themselves; to see themselves as separate from each other and from their students. Only when they are able to see the students as different from themselves, may they begin to care. However given that most top-level administrators are male, will there be support, that is, time, for the nurturance of teachers and administrators to reflect on their own values? Will caring be valued enough to merit the time and money allocated to schools?

Caring as Community

Community is closely aligned to connection and is another tenet of an ethic of caring. Some educational reformers believe that

building community within and around schools is a necessity if our schools are to survive and students to benefit from them (Goodlad, 1988, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986, 1988; Noddings, 1992).

Community arises from a web--or circles--of relationships, that is, relationships that extend from those most intimate to us to those we do not know yet. An ethic of care presumes that our web of relationships begins with those most intimate to us. And, as Noddings (1984) points out, there comes a point at which "an ethic of caring limits our obligation to those so far removed from us that completion (of caring) is impossible" (p. 152). She goes on to explain:

> Painful as it is to give up romantic notions of loving everyone, we see that we must in order to care adequately for anyone. Further, there is, again, a way in which we may respond to those too far removed for caring to be activated directly and completed. When human beings call out for help, it is obligatory for those in proximity to respond. Those in contiguous circles [from intimate to unknown personages] must respond. If they cannot find the material resources to respond adequately, they must address the next circle and entreat aid. Eventually, the cry for help may be heard directly in my own circle. Then I must respond, and I must then depend upon the one who seeks my help to be thoroughly honest and responsible, both in his translation of the initial cry for help and in what he does with the material aid I pass along through him. My obligation is met when my caring is completed in this other who entreats me in direct encounter. Only a chain of trust links me to the faraway other. (p. 153)

From that passage, there are two salient points regarding an ethic of caring. The first relates to caring for students. Noddings (1992) speaks about students not necessarily belonging in the most intimate circle, but still in a relationship to the teacher that is, ideally, close. However, will teachers whose students are

not of their own backgrounds, cultures, and values be able to relate closely to them? Or will the teachers, using an ethic of caring as a basis by which to "address the next circle and entreat aid," find an excuse for continuing not to address the needs of children they do not instinctively relate to, hoping that some "other" teacher or staff person will take up the job? This dilemma brings us to the second point which returns us to a topic introduced earlier, the extent to which the boundaries of caring should be enlarged.

Realistically, we do not care equally for all people. We care most for those with whom we have most in common emotionally, physically, and/or culturally because it is 'natural' and comfortable. We can relate to like people with little, if any, effort. If connection and preserving a web of relationships is fundamental to an ethic of care, there is little basis for critical reflection on whether those relationships are good, healthy, or worth saving because we begin with our own webs, which we have already accepted as good and worthy. An ethic of care, then, "could become a defense of caring only for one's own family, friends, group, nation. From this perspective, caring could become a justification for any set of conventional relationships" (Tronto, 1987, pp. 559-560). By not reflecting on the connections, the web--or circles--of relationships, dislike and hatred of differences may grow.

Again, reformers need to consider the implementation of an ethic of care in terms of school staff needs and education, and from a larger perspective than the individual. If an ethic of care is to

be modeled and practiced as Noddings (1992, 1984) suggests, then it would seem reasonable to expect that teachers, administrators, and other staff will have to know how to care for each other; they will have to know how to model caring to persons not of their own cultures and values; they, perhaps, will need to be taught.

The notion of building community in schools raises issues that are often contradictory, especially those concerning individualism and connection. In recent years, there has been much emphasis on altering schools and curriculum to encourage and support females and minorities to recognize their individuality and to reach their individual potentials. If community building becomes the focus, what will it take to resolve the dilemma of maintaining a clear sense of one's own identity and individualism while concurrently embedding it in relationships with others? (Grimshaw, 1986; Fox-Genovese, 1991) If a school's vision of connectedness is ambiguous or idealized, will the expectations for community or for harmony among the people within it be unrealistic? If the latter results, will there be denial of the needs of others to "forge their own path and develop their own understanding and goals"? (Grimshaw, 1991, p. 183) Ultimately, will there be a loss of individuality?

Finally, there is the issue of self-interest and altruism related to forming a caring community. As background, consider Fox-Genovese's (1991) discussion of women and community. Women's commitment to building community is associated with their tendency to define themselves in relation to others and in the particular, rather than as individualistic and abstract. Ironically, however,

women's experience historically has been in individualistic societies and cultures, in other words, in unique family communities. That is, although they were excluded from public life and its achievement values of individualism, it is quite possible they achieved empowerment from their ascribed position--creating a sense of belonging and bonding--within families, the basic units of communities. By so doing, they chance falling into a "sentimental" (p. 39) conception of community. "In this conception, community is viewed as, in some sense, internal to the motivations and identities of the participants--a product of their commitment. This conception differs from a more instrumental or contractual view of community in attributing affiliation to benevolence or even identity rather than to instrumental self-interest . . ." (pp. 39-40). In modern society, women are strongly encouraged to be the care-givers. The question is, did/do women work at building community from altruistic reasons, or from self-interest, seeking empowerment by meeting the expectations of the "ascriptive values of the community"? (Fox-Genovese, 1991, p. 45) Or, perhaps from both? Returning to a question posed earlier in this critique of an ethic of care, is it possible for women to remain 'unchanged' as they enter the public sphere?

Building community may solely be done out of self-interest. An ethic of caring, implemented for political purposes, may be used to further self-interest under the guise of creating community when, in fact, it becomes a means for furthering one's own interests and ideologies. Claims of caring may be used ideologically in order to

mask more fundamental objectives. Take, for instance, union activities. Some local teachers' unions have set a cap on the number of students that can be enrolled in a class. On one hand this is a caring act, both for the students and for the teachers. Students learn better when there are fewer in the class and teachers can devote more time to each student. There are instances, however, when teachers choose to allow 'extra' students into the class--a student will stay in school if allowed to enroll in a particular teacher's class (Freedman, 1990); or adding two students to all teachers' classes (in a school where a fourth to a third absenteeism for classes is the norm) would free teachers to hold in-school suspension, thus, keeping students in school rather than sending them home or, more likely out on the streets (see Chapter 5). One would question whether the union is considering the students' interests, that is caring for students, or is concerned about maintaining its power within the bureaucracy.

One could question whether Joe Clark, the infamous principal in New Jersey, operated out of caring for the students or out of concern for his moving up the bureaucratic ladder. In both instances--the union situation and Joe Clark's activities--the judgment is not clear-cut. Perhaps one needs to examine whether the claims or accusations of failure to care are actually diversions from injustices and oppression that plague us, or ways to conceal intentions--gaining power, for instance--that have nothing to do with care (Grimshaw, 1986).

In modern society where there is tension between the sensed need for community and the strong tradition of individualism (Bellah, et al., 1985), it is possible for "community" to be created to serve the bureaucracy's own needs using the rhetoric of an ethic of care which those at the base of the "broken triangle" (McIntosh, 1983)[6]--women, minorities, working class and the poor--want to hear. The probability that the political process which creates bureaucracy will define what will be cared about and will tailor caring to meet the continued and changing needs, including self-perpetuation, of the institution of schooling is strong (Finch & Tronto, 1990). An ethic of caring could become simply another tool to maintain bureaucratic organization within schools, and to maintain the current inequality that permeates and governs the larger society.

Caring as Reciprocal

Noddings discusses the importance of reciprocity in caring, saying that the caring relationship is incomplete if the one-cared-for is unable to receive care from the one-caring. Additionally, the one-caring needs to know that her care-giving has been received, thus making the relationship reciprocal, each person receiving as well as giving.

---

[6]Peggy McIntosh (1990) examines the conception of race and gender in the industrialized West using a theoretical model which she describes as a faulted triangle. The faulted triangle diagrammatically illustrates the "overvalued, overdeveloped, 'vertical,' competitive functions at odds with undervalued, underrecognized, 'lateral' collaborative functions" (p. 6). She associates the former characteristics with the white, male patriarchy, and the latter with women and minority races."

From a bureaucratic standpoint, however, what the care-giver has in her power to give and what the care-receiver wants or needs may conflict. Women, most often on the lower levels of the hierarchy, are in the position of the actual hands-on act of caring.

> Women are expected to care about and give care to others. But because of their lack of control over the caring process in many contexts, women's responsibility for caring remains ambiguous. In the home, women often lack such control because they lack the resources for caring. In human service bureaucracies, women lack control because they occupy lower-level positions. The constraints of professionalization often limit caregivers' attention to a narrow sphere, so that it becomes difficult for them to approach a situation "holistically." If they attempt to widen the sphere of their attention and to take more responsibility, they are often told they have "gone too far." If they stay within institutional limitations, their caregiving often seems inadequate to themselves and others. Care-receivers frequently blame them for not taking enough responsibility. (Fisher & Tronto, 1990, p. 44)

As Fisher and Tronto clearly stated, bureaucracy limits the ways in which caring can be exercised. If an ethic of caring is created within a school that continues to operate within a bureaucracy, will the limits of caring be extended in schools? Will the resources--time, money, materials--be available to allow for reciprocal relationships, that is, allowing administrators and teachers to care for each other and students in ways they need and desire? Who will determine what is included in caring? Is it possible for caring to flower in a school while the system retains its ties to bureaucracy? Will a female principal be expected to make an ethic of care 'work,' but only within the boundaries drawn by her superiors? Will her staff, those she cares about, understand

that or demand more of her? Will the demands result in conflicts that undermine the ethic of care?

The ideal situation is that of the care-giver meeting the needs of the care-receiver. The definition of 'needs,' however, is not easily solved, particularly as power relations are unavoidable. As differences in power increase, there is a greater possibility for the dominant interests and ideas to take precedence in shaping the needs (p. 45). For instance, the local board of education may see low morale in a school in terms of aging teachers and poor kids rather than insufficient textbooks and other curricular materials. Or, a principal may interpret the faculty's demands for budget information as a need for more power, rather than their need to feel trusted. Dis-connection rather than caring occurs, and focus on the tensions between the care-giver and care-receiver usurp the attention from the complexity of caring.

No matter how close we come, the situation will never be 'ideal.' "Recognizing there will always be conflicts between human beings' needs and desires, our time may better be spent identifying and eliminating the most damaging and destructive forms of conflict" (Grimshaw, 1986, p. 186).

Whose Caring? "The Myth of Sisterhood"

The last section ended on a rather disquieting note with the notion that bureaucracy could define what caring will be in schools. Although that is a major concern, equally as disturbing is a phenomenon that Fox-Genovese (1991) calls the "myth of sisterhood"

(p. 28). She describes this myth, in part, as growing out of the 1960s and 1970s when middle-class, WASP and Jewish women recognized the similarity of their experiences. Gradually common autobiographies of those middle-class women became the archetypal experience for all women.

> In so doing, they closely followed the lead of their brothers, who had long claimed that the experience of white middle-class men constituted the substance of and model for the experience of men in general. And like their brothers, they subordinated the experience of innumerable less fortunate Americans to their own and claimed for themselves the right to speak in the name of all. In this perspective, feminist politics of the personal unmistakably emerges as a politics of race and class that perpetuates the injustices of American society. (p. 29)

Extrapolating that argument to an ethic of caring, I believe there is reason to say that feminists, perhaps without fully apprehending what they are doing, have established a white middle-class, gender-related interpretations of an ethic of caring, despite protestations to the contrary (Noddings, 1984; 1992; Gilligan, 1982; Seigfried, 1989; Tronto, 1987; Grimshaw, 1986). Tronto (1987), analyzing Gilligan's work in light of the psychological dimensions of women and caring, suggested that the difference in women's moral expression could be a consequence of their social upbringing and subordinate position in society. Subsequently, the morality Gilligan associated with 'women' might better be attributed to 'people' of subordinate or minority status.

As females have been quick to criticize males for conducting studies that focused only on males and then universalized the findings to all people, some of the more influential feminist

writings about caring and an ethic of caring are products of white middle class females studying privileged white girls and women. Those products provided the basis of an ethic of caring.

In recent years, however, women of color, as well as other persons, have challenged feminist theory and critiques because those works do not fit the facts of their lives; neither does an ethic of caring as currently perceived by white middle class women. Analyses of the socio-historical character of an ethic of caring by non-white women provides an alternative understanding of women's moral thinking. Eugene (1989) and Lykes (1989) point out that for black women, their history of slavery and of social and economic subordination in modern society, and their roles in the church and community have all impacted the ways in which they understand caring. Their lived experiences derived from their history and their material conditions derived from their social positions contextualize an ethic of caring.

Unlike white middle class women's perspective of caring as "women's work" implying oppression, black women have understood caring to be self-initiated acts that serve as a foundation for the survival of their race. Lykes illustrates the strength of that value through a discussion of a black woman's decision not to accuse the black man who raped her. Rather than accept the decision as the woman's failure to cope, Lykes views it as a decision based on the woman's knowing who she is, who her people are, and, perhaps, most importantly, on a "confrontation with and resistance to the structures of racism/sexism/capitalism" (p. 170).

Black women's commitment to community and the church move them beyond limited levels of care-giving. Caring moves many women--those called 'Mother' because they "care for those in need and [] make a way where there is no way-a way of justice, a way of equity, a way that may serve as a highway of righteousness for everyone who wants to walk with integrity" (Eugene, 1989, p. 47)--into secular and sacred positions of authority and power within their communities. They head black women's organizations and hold positions of power in the larger community and in civil rights organizations. They are pastors, evangelists, missionaries, deaconesses, and so forth. "The members of the community call them 'Mother' and their 'children' are often religious and political leaders who owe their power and authority to the sponsorship of such respected and revered women" (p. 47).

Their power and authority epitomize caring, for "women who are addressed and referred to as 'Mother' within the context and by members of the Afro-American community are those whose influential power, biblical righteousness, and personal authority embody the epitome of the liberational ethic of care alive and active within the group. . . . The leadership of black women who bear and wear the title of Mother within that religious and civic community is paradigmatic and exemplary of the transformation of power that the ethic contains" (p. 48).

In addition, many black women choose to live a "theology of servant-leadership" (p. 59), grounded in their faith in Jesus Christ and not to be understood as "slave morality and mentality" (p. 54).

Integral to servant-leadership is a balance between justice and love. Care is taken to ensure that acts of justice occur on behalf of those who have no practicable means of support, concern, or protection. The servant-leaders accomplish their caring by taking care of business rather than doing business as usual. Justice and care are intertwined. Servant-leadership "is precisely black womanist religious responses of endurance, resistance, and resiliency offered in the face of all attempts at personal and institutional domination that may provide a renewed ethical legacy of liberation for everyone concerned" (pp. 59-60) There is a commitment to the "survival and wholeness of an entire people, male and female. Not separatist . . . traditionally universalist . . . traditionally capable . . . [There is an] appreciation for the struggle, a love of the folk, and a love of self--regardless" (Walker, 1983, p. xi as quoted in Eugene, 1989, p. 60).

For some non-white females, an ethic of care has become a "liberational" ethic of care.[7] Rather than oppressive, these women view zaring as freeing, freeing people to assume the power and authority to care for others as well as themselves, to act to empower their people. In a liberation ethic of care, "connection" as discussed by Gilligan (1982) does not accurately describe relationships in the black community where the assumption is that there is community.

---

[7]For a more extensive discussion of a liberational ethic of care, see Bill Puka's Liberation of Caring: A Different Voice for Gilligan's "Different Voice."

> Responsiveness to the self and to others is not "connected" as Gilligan argues. To posit a connection is to imply and confirm a separation, that is, that they are separate entities and must be brought together (by the individual woman who develops this ethic of care). Eugene's analysis boldly demonstrates that for black women the other" is not other in our classic understanding of opposition. Rather "other" and "self" are co-constituting, co-defining. There is no self out of connection, no connection without self in the resistance to structural oppression. (Lykes, 1989, p. 170)

There is no dichotomous understanding of individualism and community. Recall the woman who refused to accuse the man who raped her. She was not skirting justice, but re-defining it and care. The dilemma was about neither herself in relation to the other, nor simply enacting caring, but about the more complex situation of self-in-community, opposing the structural oppression within and against which subordinate people act (Lykes, 1989).

Policymakers and reformers need to think seriously about what an ethic of care is--and for whom. School staffs and students, particularly from urban schools, are likely to be of diverse cultural background. If an ethic of care is endorsed as a way toward school reform, consideration of how to interpret caring is necessary in order to unearth its multiple understandings, many of which emanate from one's particular social community and life experiences and may conflict with others.' Particularly important will be the equanimity with which persons of the dominant culture are willing to consider--and wrestle with--understandings of caring that are not within their immediate intellectual and emotional grasp. Note the following example.

Most educators do not know/understand--often, are unaware of--the cultural values that poor and minority students bring to school. For example, adequate health care is a given for most educators and taken for granted by their children. Fine (1986) pointed out that health care is the first consideration in terms of social priorities for many black and Latino students she interviewed. She recounted an incident of a Latino student's leaving school because his grandmother was coming home after triple by-pass surgery; dropped out of school to take care of her. Fine asked the counselor why no social worker had been contacted. His response was, "Jose got over-involved, and was irresponsible about his own education" (p. 400).

The counselor's response is an example of not only inadequate understanding of particular students' backgrounds and experiences, but, also, of meting out caring in terms of only his understandings: Jose did not deserve caring because he did not have the 'right' values.

In terms of school staff, will implementing an ethic of caring ease the tensions between non-European and white staff members, both faculty and administrators? Will white teachers understand a black female principal's concentrated efforts to work with community church leaders and parents as caring for faculty and students? Will a black female principal understand the resentment of white teachers for her regular invocation of religious principles in the business of schooling? Will teachers understand mothers or fathers not

helping with a children's homework because their time is spent working two jobs and finding adequate childcare?

Noddings (1989, paraphrased in Noddings, 1992, p. 116) in Women and Evil cautions,

> We tend to associate all that is good and right with our side, and all that is evil and wrong with the other side. We project our hostility and a host of personal moral shortcomings onto the alien other. We exteriorize evil in order to destroy it, and thereby we perpetuate in ourselves and in the angry other the very evil we set out to fight so valiantly." (Noddings, 1989, as paraphrased in Noddings, 1992)

Perhaps it would behoove us to consider not only an ethic of care, but a **liberational** ethic of care, intertwining self and other, justice and care, individualism and community. Regardless, it will be necessary--imperative--for administrators and staff to work together to understand caring from more than the dominant culture's perspective.

Summary: A Politics of Care

To implement an ethic of care into our schools is to strive for an ideal, for doing so is not simply choosing another method of school organization, but is attempting to change a value system and system of moral reasoning traditional to Americans. Educational reformers supporting an ethic of care as the foundation for schools are, in essence, challenging the moral fiber of the larger society. They are suggesting that connection be as valued as independence, that community be as important as autonomy, that moral reasoning be based on the contextual and particular rather than on

universalizable principles, and that 'difference' not be considered 'deviance.'

An ethic of care is cast in feminist theory as moral reasoning. As caring becomes a basis for school reform, it also becomes a politics of care, centering on the dichotomy of female/male, in essence, on care/power. As a politics of caring, it challenges males to integrate caring into their public as well as private lives; it necessitates a collective effort to implement and support caring; and it posits a balance of community with individualism, connection with autonomy, and interdependence with independence. An ethic of caring contests the notion of bureaucratic hierarchy as Truth.

There are several concerns, however, associated with an ethic of caring. Of primary importance is the relatively little attention given to interpreting caring as a collective effort. More difficult than determining another individual's best interests, ascertaining what is best for a group would seem to require the wisdom of Solomon. In schools or other institutions where bureaucracy has been the organization of choice and where hierarchy is assumed, an ethic of caring would seek to balance top-down authority and decision making with collaboration and shared decision making. The question becomes how do people learn to collaborate, to come to agreement as a group, to agree to compromise or given individual interests so the group may flourish? How do people know when their personal interests out-weigh those of the group?

Other concerns emanate from the notion of an ethic of caring as female. 'Female,' in general, is less valued in the public domain than 'male.' The characteristics of females and males, subsequently, result in dichotomies which are judged by the gender with which they are associated, male qualities are of most value, female's of lesser value. With that as the circumstance, implementing an ethic of care in the public domain will require a different way of thinking about male and female, and an effort to consider qualities associated with gender in gender-neutral ways and within a continuum, rather than as stark polarities. An ethic of care needs to become gender-neutral. Finally, effecting an ethic of caring in school will require an understanding that different cultures contribute to the interpretation of caring. Of concern is that the dominant societal culture will impose the "meaning" of caring on all.

All of these concerns give rise to questions of power: are care and power dichotomous? If not, what is the relationship? How do we think about caring **as** power, that is, caring as 'power over'/ control/authority, oppressive? as **using** power, that is, sharing power--'power with'--in order to achieve connection and community? and as **re-defining** power, coming to a new understanding of power, perhaps power as the capacity to implement (Baker Miller, 1976)?

The following chapter tells the background story of Division High, its highlights and its nadir. Throughout we are privy to the nuances of power and caring as they affect the life of this school.

That history is the foundation on which any attempts to exercise caring will be built.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE STORY OF DIVISION HIGH

> People are always shouting they want to create a better future. It's not true. The future is an apathetic void of no interest to anyone. The past is full of life, eager to irritate us, provoke and insult us, tempt us to destroy or repaint it. The only reason people want to be masters of the future is to change the past. They are fighting for access to the laboratories where photographs are retouched and biographies and histories rewritten.
>
> Milan Kundera
> The Book of Laughter and Forgetting

Although Division High's teachers and administrators dealt with current reforms for future change, they really were addressing the past. They fought lingering memories of pain from the desegregation process; too many memories of past reforms that failed relationships between teachers and administration that refused to be anything but adversarial; and a host of other past events that burned themselves into the lives of the staff members. Understanding the history of the school is critical to an understanding of the ways in which changes, especially those directed at building a caring environment, were initiated, developed, and perceived by the staff. In terms of feminist standpoint theory, research is situated in locale and personal identity. Thus, the purpose of this chapter.

IMPRESSIONS

Division High looked much like any suburban school to me--long, low, one-story brick; athletic complex to one side; student parking lots that sported shiny, new cars; a faculty parking lot in the rear; and a sign board in front alerting passersby to the next home game, parent-teacher conference, or holiday. Flower boxes at the front of the school added color and a touch of softness to the otherwise institutional-looking building.

The school was across the street from a well-kept neighborhood of houses, lawns and gardens, and was next to the city's only Catholic high school. A few blocks to the west of the school were suburban subdivisions and farm land. To the east, where most of the students live, were poorly maintained houses in neighborhoods with broken asphalt instead of grass, and with dismantled vehicles instead of flowers in front of the houses.

As I approached the building the first time, my immediate impressions began to change. Only one set of double doors was open, although there were at least four doors within my view. Heavy chains hung from all of them, securing all but the one. Security guards with walkie-talkies in hand patrolled the hallways and monitored the exits. Students, all staff members and any person who might be in Division on a regular basis must wear an identification badge, which included her/his picture and status in the school.

Inside the building, the main hallway was light, with windows from floor to ceiling. The hallways were clean and devoid of litter, despite the radical cuts in custodial work hours. And, to

my surprise, the girls' bathrooms were not only clean, but had little, if any, graffiti.

Virtually no classroom had windows, purposely designed to save money on fuel. The walls were tile halfway to the ceiling and cinder block the remaining half. The colors were institutional drab.

Classrooms were particularly colorless, as none had much in the way of materials. Books, maps, and equipment were not immediately apparent in any classroom. What materials there were, were locked up.

The library was beautiful, light airy and well-used. The cafeteria was large with floor-to-ceiling windows on one side. There were a gym, swimming pool, and an auditorium, as well as special classrooms designed for vocational education courses, drafting, for example. There were several rooms with computers for beginning computer instruction and for computer use in business classes. Special education, as is typical of many schools, was located in the back of the school in several tiny rooms.

Students passed through the halls between classes with 'typical' student exuberance; security guards, administrators, and teachers all monitored the halls at those times. During classes, security guards patrolled the halls, checking students for i.d. badges and hall passes.

YESTERDAY

When its doors opened in 1964, Division High School was known as the 'country club' of the Newtown School District

[KG:10-30-91:1]. Its architecture was based on innovative educational concepts; it had amenities such as a swimming pool, auditorium, and drivers' education track, and state-of-the-art athletic facilities; and it attracted administrators and teachers who were interested in being "on the cutting edge" [KG:10-30-91:1]. Its location was at the northern most edge of the city adjacent to newly developed residential areas populated by economically and socially rising white, middle class families. The school, itself, was not within the city limits. Because of the tremendous growth in housing developments in the north and because the residents of those developments wanted the school to be a part of the city system, the Newtown Board of Education was granted a variance by the city council to incorporate the school site into the city. All property surrounding the school site, including the parochial school next door, remained solely a part of the township [fnEK:10-91].

The school population was large, with 2300 students in grades ten through twelve. Like the surrounding community, the student body was virtually white and middle/upper middle class; about 3% of the students were black and 1% Hispanic [KG:10-30-91:1]. The city celebrated Division's opening, and the newspaper regularly featured Division students and teachers for academic and athletic accomplishments, or for their involvement in innovative school or classroom projects [1964-1967 school scrapbooks].

When Division opened, Newtown, itself, was experiencing growth and prosperity due to a flourishing and expanding industrial climate. Newtown was, in essence, a factory town, with the majority

of the people in the city employed in some capacity by the big industrial firms. As demand for their manufactured products increased, the companies continued to expand and to recruit more people to work in the factories. People, including many African-Americans from the South, flocked to Newtown, for the working conditions, salaries, and benefits far exceeded those in other blue-collar jobs. All of these benefits were attributed to the intensity and success of the labor unions, nationally, and in Newtown, particularly [HF:1-23-92:2].

Newtown was a union town. The labor union of Newtown took care of its people and the people had great allegiance to it. Likewise, the school district had a strong union, patterned after the city's labor unions. Strikes were common, but they produced results for the workers and teachers--benefits in working conditions and increased wealth. The union also produced what some people have described as a 'union mentality.' A Division teacher who has always lived in Newtown, and whose father, brother, other relatives, and several friends work in factories, described the attitude of the general Newtown resident as one of the factory "owing" them a living and, more precisely, a more than comfortable lifestyle. She indicated that the general line worker felt little personal responsibility for job satisfaction and job advancement. That stance, in turn, lead to an attitude between management and labor that was adversarial and based on winning, not on compromise. She said that the workers believed strikes were a natural and necessary part of life, and that there was no way to better working conditions

or their lives without a bitter struggle against management. Workers' distrust of management was the norm; in fact, it was the expectation. That workers and management worked for different and conflicting ends was assumed. That workers would not progress without struggles was a given. Because of the unions'--labor and teachers'--success, however, Division High opened in a community that saw only continued prosperity and increasing wealth for all of Newtown's citizens [HF:1-23-92:1].

Division High benefited from the financial prosperity and positive outlooks. A member of the initial Division faculty recalls her first three years:

> The morale was high; staff relationships were great both in and out of school. We had high parent involvement, probably because most of the parents were upper middle class and professionals. There were very few minority students, and those that were, were treated badly. [The principal] ran the show; it was his ship. He gave the teachers responsibility, but the ideas were his and we usually agreed with him. But he did give us responsibility. Like he brought up an idea and asked us what we thought, then asked for or appointed volunteers to carry it out. It was great. [Division] was really seen as the 'country club' of the [Newtown] schools. Teachers wanted to be here and parents wanted their kids here. [KG:10-30-91:1]

Within four years, the climate at Division began to change. The building of an interstate through Newtown's downtown area displaced many black families, who subsequently moved to the north end of the city into houses constructed by the federal Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD). Ironically, the north end had been a "red line area" for blacks. That is, whites would not sell houses in the area to blacks, thus maintaining all-white

neighborhoods and schools [HF:6-892:18]. With the construction of the HUD housing, however, and the almost simultaneous federal mandates for desegregation of schools, there was a significant increase in enrollment of black students at DHS.

> The freeways were starting to come through [Newtown] in sixty-seven--well they were starting to buy the land for [the interstate]. . . . So a lot of the neighborhoods, which you call ghetto neighborhoods, down by [the plant], where it's not worth much, those families were displaced, at a pretty good price for their homes. And they moved out to other areas. And the only area that they could buy homes in was the [Division] area. And then, of course, blockbusting started. Do you know what blockbusting is? [No.] When the state kind of goes into a . . . house in a white district, and offers the people a fantastic price for a house, and gets a black person in there. Then they go to the other people up and down the block, and they say, "Hey, you know, there's blacks moving in down the block. You better sell and sell in a hurry. [NK:10-21-91:1]

The influx of African-Americans into the north end initiated the beginnings of 'white flight.' The suddenly developed white middle class community became as suddenly a largely black community, as whites left their new homes to flee from "those niggers" [fnGS:6-9-92:2]. A teacher recalled his having bought a new home across from the school. When black families began buying into the neighborhood "with the blessing of the Johnson administration," [fnGS:6-9-92:2], a white neighbor packed his family into the car, locked the door of the house, and never returned--and never bothered selling the house [fnGS:6-992:3].

By 1968-69, the percentage of African-Americans at Division had increased dramatically--to thirty percent, according to a faculty member there at that time [fnKG:10-30-91:1]. Racial tensions began

to build. A current DHS staff member who taught in another Newtown high school in the late sixties and early seventies, recalled his memories of that period at DHS and elsewhere in the district.

> In '68, '69, '70, I want to tell you that [Division] was an armed philosophical camp divided into two warring factions. I'm telling you it was ugly. It was ugly. I mean to the point where they had police cars screeching to a halt on the lawn with their sirens on, kids beating each other up, extortion in the bathrooms, faculty confrontations, threats against teachers, kids ganging up, beating up--not beating up--but it got to the point where the football coach left because he was threatened by his own football players. . . . At [my school] we had a group of kids that threatened to shoot the administrators who came in the building. We had the police over on the railroad tracks to stop snipers who were slated to be in the railroad tracks over at [my school]. I'm telling . . . we've gone through some really tough times. [There was] a principal [at Division] that was trying to bend over backwards when--this was right after, you've got to understand the timing of this. Martin Luther King had just been killed. Bobby Kennedy had just been killed. There was sixty-seven Detroit riots, and god, there was the animosity and the stress, and the racial tension was the proverbial so thick you could cut it with a knife. I mean it was really ugly. [WE:3-26-92:30]

On January 17, 1979, according to a teacher who had been at DHS, "all hell broke loose when Dr. King was assassinated. For two years it was an unmitigated nightmare" [fnKG:10-30-91:1]. Teachers at DHS during this time remembered that police were inside and outside the building, and the use of tear gas to break up fights. There were students fighting students, teachers fighting teachers, students and teachers fighting. A teacher was suspended for using a racial epithet against a student. The staff was split along racial lines and along liberal/conservative lines. The teachers recalled incidents where faculty members had fist fights in the halls, and to

avoid fights, the principal banned certain teachers from being in the lounge at the same time. When the police finally left the building, parents volunteered to patrol the halls [NK:10-21-91:8; NN:5-18-92:1]. According to one teacher, there was "total disharmony" for two or three years. "Nobody wanted to come here--staff or kids. [Long pause.] And we've never recovered" [fnKG:10-30-91:1].

Despite the fact that all the schools suffered from racial tensions and riots, the perception of the teachers in the district and of the community members is that Division had the most difficulty. Several current Division teachers believe that the media consistently used DHS to illustrate the problems stemming from desegregation [fnKG:10-30-91; WE:3-26-92; NN:5-18-92], and have all but concluded that the media was responsible for DHS's plummet from 'country club school' to 'district pariah.'

A Division teacher, African-American, who entered DHS in 1972 as a ninth grade student vividly recalled her high school years. Hurt and anger permeated her voice and her face as she recounted her struggles and experiences in dealing with the poor reputation given to DHS in the aftermath of the race riots, and in fighting to re-gain high academic standards, which were surrendered when DHS became primarily a "black" school.

> And then as time moved on and blacks started moving more and more, cause when I came over here [Division] in seventy-two, this was still pretty much a white area. And then when I came here in seventy-two, there was another mini-riot, so to speak, and that's when there was a mass movement out of here [by the whites]. But even then, in seventy-two, it's when teachers were saying that if they were going to be

> punished by somebody in the system, they would send them to [Division]. And it just became so abrupt. . . I mean you had a very abrupt change-over and you went from being seventy, eighty percent white to being a predominantly black school. . . . I can remember being a student here and we were protesting because they were reducing college prep classes and creating more general ed classes. . . . And we had little sit-downs, you know, little smart kids, I guess, and we had little sit-downs here and then they also went to the desegregation thing in the school. So I mean there were a lot of things that were going on that were kind of militant in nature. But I think in seventy-two I felt branded. I saw all of those things that were occurring; it was scary. It was really scary. . . . And then I would say that I fought up-hill battles for the rest of my time here to prove that this was not a bad school. You know, that we receive an adequate education so whenever we were in some kind of competition for the school, you had to know what you were talking about and then all of those kinds of your behavior, had to be really on target and those kinds of things. [HF:6-8-92:18,19]

Corroborating this former DHS student's perceptions of Division's reputation and struggle for higher level academic preparation are the reflections of a science teacher who transferred to DHS shortly after desegregation. As background, it is useful to know that the Newtown community elected to desegregate using magnet classes as their method of desegregation. Through a combination of choice and assignment, each high school focused on particular academic magnet classes; additionally, each also had specific vocational emphases. Division's magnet classes were to revolve around computers and technology. However, because of limited equipment and public relations, that was never very successful.

The school also was to be a science and math magnet, despite the fact that the high school closest to DHS also had that magnet

emphasis. The irony is not that there were two schools with the same magnet, but that

> . . . [DHS's] science and math magnet program in the early seventies was a second thought [for] the creators of the magnet program because that meant the black students would have to go where there were white students to get science and math. So they decided to put one here. [MU:5-28-92:12]

The magnet program was developed to implement desegregation, but it served to keep black students at DHS, a predominantly black school. It also resulted in a lesser version of the original science and math magnet classes at another Newtown high school. Funding was less because DHS could not attract students from other schools because of the transportation scheduling.

> [The] transportation scheduling. . . does not give you a chance for the [other high school] students to come here. Well, they could come . . . but would go to [] because of the fact that it was the same distance and they started earlier. The fact that we [DHS] start third in the sequence of schools, that once you come over here, I mean you've lost an hour just going back to school. And so the [magnet] program was helped by having its health occupation component here, like the dental program and the nursing program. All of those went elsewhere or just simply died . . . which means science program or math program did not take hold either. [MU:528-92:12]

Additionally, DHS's science and math magnet program did not begin until the second year of the district magnet program, thus falling behind the already established science and math classes at the other high school. In essence, Division was the last to receive magnet classes. They received the worst part of the transportation scheduling, thus mitigating against drawing students from other schools. They also were in a position of offering science and math

as magnet classes, thus, encouraging students--black students--to remain at DHS. Today, there are earth science, biology, and chemistry classes; the latter only one small class. There are no advanced chemistry classes or physics classes.

From another perspective, DHS teachers viewed the district magnet program as hurting the quality of academics offered at Division because any significantly above-average student was encouraged to take their academic classes in the other schools' magnet classes. Faculty members felt deprived from working with the higher quality students and, in fact, there were few advanced classes offered in any academic subject areas.

> I always felt bad . . . that our counselors were willing to send students to take upper level science and math at [the other school]. And they did it as a favor to the students. And, therefore, we did not have good, our own good students to enroll in our classes, let alone trying to entice students from other schools to come over here. [MU:5-28-92:14]

Because of the rioting and fighting reported at Division in the late sixties and early seventies, the school gained the reputation of being the roughest, toughest school in the area. Teachers, by and large, did not choose to go there because the academic program was weak as a result of the counselors' recommending the better students attend magnet classes, which were academically stronger, in other schools. The perception among the staff was that DHS had a disproportionate number of students who had trouble academically. Many parents believed the reputation that DHS acquired--rough, tough, and academically inferior. They did not want to send their children to attend DHS and did anything they could to enroll them in

another high school, even sending them to private schools. Division, once seen as the premier school, became the school for "misfits" [HF:6-8-92:17].

> One of the problems, the big problems, for our school has been the magnet program. I see that as . . . the program that screened out even our normal share of bright kids in the district. Kids that belong in our neighborhood school district that go to other schools. And the magnet program allowed them to do that. However, the reason they go to other schools is that their parents know of our undeserved reputation . . . many parents will do anything to keep their kid from going here. . . . Give a different address . . . to go to another school. Change kids' custody, you know, give the custody of the kid to an uncle who lives in [another school's] district. . . . I think we have a disproportionate number of kids who are in trouble academically. And they don't have the benefit of seeing as many of the bright school chums as they might, you know, in a positive academic world. [NK:5-26-92:1,2]

After the events of desegregation and the resultant downward adjustment of the academic program, DHS continued to struggle, fighting an up-hill battle to regain its positive reputation. The first black principal, who was appointed in the aftermath of the efforts toward integration, "was a disgrace, a thief. He was dishonorable toward women" [KG:10-30-91:1; NK:10-21-91:2]. He was removed from the school because of embezzling funds that band parents had collected for new band uniforms; he was never formally charged and was moved "up" to the district office [fnTE:5-26-92:1]. During the time he was at Division, the assistant black football coach was accused of "being involved" [fnKG:10-30-91:1] with cheerleaders and, subsequently, was dismissed. Unspoken and formally denied inferences to the problems at DHS as the result of black

leadership abounded among the white teachers and community members. Racial tension--unacknowledged and denied--hovered in the air and served to maintain or increase the split among faculty begun during the movement to desegregate [fnGS:6-9-92]. The attitude of the faculty, as well as community members, toward new teachers at DHS was, "What did you do to get on some principal's shit list?" [fnKG:1030-91:1]. The morale of faculty and staff, needless to say, was "low and sinking" [NK:10-21-91:2].

The next principal was no newcomer to DHS, having served as deputy principal under DHS's first chief administrator. However, he came from the rival high school bringing an entourage of teachers with him. The latter is generally not unexpected. A problem arose, however, when he replaced all the department chairpersons at DHS with 'his' people. The staff, already greatly split, became even more divided [KG:10-30-91:2].

When he left, another black male became principal. Generally, the faculty saw him as a sincere person and good with students. He was educationally ineffective and passive, having virtually no innovative curriculum ideas or evidencing little energetic response to school reform efforts. And, above all, he had "no clout" with "downtown" [KG:10-30-91:1]. The staff felt a lack of leadership from him.

As the second black principal who seemed to accomplish little, he was particularly berated by white, male teachers, especially those who had administrative aspirations and were continually passed over. Again, thoughts based on racial biases were denied by most

faculty members. ["I know that people unconsciously still believe some of these things, but they don't bring them to the surface, actually think about it and think it through" HF:6-8-92:28]. Teachers coming to DHS continued to be viewed as casualties of another principal's dissatisfaction with them. The splits among staff increased and deepened; wariness and distrust of each other grew; and the problems at the core--racial bias and tension, distrust of each other--remained silenced.

That principal had the longest tenure, thirteen years, of any at DHS. No major incidences at DHS, positive or negative, occurred during that time. Discontent with DHS, throughout the school and throughout the community, continued to fester and grow.

TODAY

Currently, Division is ninety-eight percent African-American, headed by a black, female principal, the first female high school principal in Newtown's history. About fifty-percent of the teachers are African-American and fifty-percent white. The prevalent description of Division is that of a school on the brink of collapse.

> [Division] is like a beautiful new house with a carefully manicured lawn, BUT the family within is falling apart. [fnXM:85-92]

> [Division] is like a house of cards that's going to come tumbling down." [fnTD:2-11-92:1]

Division High suffered from the effects of the city's dramatic decline. Unlike thirty years ago, the city is no longer thriving,

but is fighting for survival. The once active and expanding industrial plants are closed. Formerly prosperous and upwardly mobile families are without jobs or are with ones providing only subsistence living. Families have left the city, many returning to the South. The school population has decreased dramatically. Within three years, Division's student body dropped from over two thousand students to less than sixteen hundred. As a result, classes become larger and materials fewer [NK:10-21-91:2].

Students and teachers live with the rumors that Division will be closed if the district continues to lose students. This translates to both groups that DHS is the most expendable of the high schools in the district. Because of the rumors, teachers believe their budget is less than those of other district high schools, and the support from the district is generally less for DHS.

At the same time the staff lives with the threat of closing, the board of education and the superintendent has provided opportunities at DHS for school and curricular reforms. Site-based management [SBM], shared decision making, and alliances with the local business community and a local university are some of the opportunities presented to the staff. These opportunities, however, do not come without difficulties.

The threat of closing affects the attitude of the DHS staff toward making substantial changes. People either support change hoping to keep Division open, or refuse to waste effort on change because Division will close anyway. The latter feeling is

intensified by the belief that Division's district has little, if any, political power. These attitudes have had a significant effect in the attempt to establish site-based management and shared decision making as the method of school organization and operation.

> It's very difficult to make change. And I think most people feel that if a school is closed it's going to be [Division]. . . . I think there's a perception that why bother because it's [SBM] not going to make a difference anyway, and I think the other side of that is some people feel we have to make this work because it's the only hope we have of not being closed. That if we can, if we can do something that is so successful, and we can show that it's successful, then they're [the board of education] going to have to look at closing somebody else. . . . I feel that we have to do something that is so successful, that it will make it very difficult to close [Division] because I don't think this community has the political clout to keep it open. The other communities all have more political clout. [NQ:3-4-92:20]

Perhaps even more important to the establishment of SBM at Division is the influence of the teachers' union. Like the labor unions in Newtown, the teachers' union in Newtown was very strong, negotiating for teachers **against** administrators, viewing the relationship between teachers and administrators as adversarial. The union was powerful and its members were willing to strike in order to attain their goals. A DHS teacher, who has been actively involved in the union for almost thirty years, implied the attitude of its members was even more antagonistic toward administration than labor unions: "I've been on seven strikes as a teacher, which is more than any [labor union] member who's my age has participated in" [NQ:3-4-92:20].

The union has lost some its power in recent years and some teachers feel it needs to re-think its role. The membership is no longer fully supportive of union activities, resulting in a split between those who are union supporters and those who are not. This change in attitude among teachers toward the union presented difficulties to the development of SBM at Division High. There seemed to be general agreement that the union played an integral part in getting site-based management piloted in some of the Newtown schools. There ended the agreement. For non-union supporters, SBM was union-conceived and union-driven. They saw the union using SBM to grasp--or re-gain--power within the district by putting teachers in a position to make and carry out school policy. Some even felt that the union "convinced" DHS administrators, who initially voted against SBM, to change their minds--and their votes. For those reasons, the non-unionists, particularly, dragged their feet regarding the implementation of SBM, or actively rebelled against it [HF:1-23-92:1].

Union members, however, believed that SBM was the last chance for DHS--and the entire Newtown school district--to survive educationally, and the union had the strength to ensure its acceptance by administration; they did not view SBM as a way for the union to gain power. They saw the union, rather as an integral part in saving the educational system, generally, and Division High, particularly [NQ:34-92:21]. Nevertheless, the faculty members on the initial SBM steering committee were all strong unionists, active at city, regional, and state levels [HF:1-23-92:2; IZ:3-17-92;

fn:10-30-92]. The principal felt a strong unionist attitude from that initial committee, "an orientation of them against us," [MJ:10-28-91:2] which immediately caused tension between faculty and administration, and limited collaboration [HF:1-2392:2; MJ:10-28-91:2].

Teachers at Division believe that the media continues to slight or ignore Division's accomplishments and emphasizes the schools problems. State honors in a science and engineering competition were not recognized by the city's newspaper or local television station [AQ:518-92:3]. Crimes and assaults by DHS students routinely are in print and on the local T.V. station. A secretary and parent commented:

> One of the bottom lines I would still have to say is I know that [Division] could not have the best of reputations, but I don't feel that we probably have any more problems than any other school has. Ours are always spread out and everybody knows when [Division] has a problem. [TT:2-3-92:8]

Division seems to be fighting a losing battle because of its history and the reputation gained. Teachers rarely come to DHS voluntarily, that is they are most often transferred involuntarily from another school to fill needed positions at DHS, or choose DHS as the lesser of two evils in terms of the better course assignment. Division's reputation weighs heavily on teachers.

> If [Division] was seen to be a premier school like [], you wouldn't have staff members feeling this way. . . . They've always operated under a cloud. . . . People treat you like a hero because you've made it through another year. You know, you're a Rambo or something . . . [HF:6-8-92:20]

Parents continue to find ways to send their children to other schools in or out of the district. And Division continues to receive students no other school wanted.

> We are a dumping ground. We have blue slip kids in here all the time; they [administrators] don't bother to tell you they're blue slips. Those are the kids that are kicked out of another high school and told never to come back and then we have to pick them up. And then they don't let us know that they are blue slippers. And under the code of conduct, a person who has been kicked out of one of the high schools or one of the middle schools and put in another middle school are there on probation, and if probation is broken, simply by getting in trouble again, that's a rule that's never followed. . . . We have kids in the classroom now that are awaiting trial for felonies. That old man *hat was beaten and was still in a coma, those were our two dandies that did it. They're awaiting trial. One turned state's evidence . . . who is going to be tried for that, who was in class. We didn't know he had an ankle tether on until his trial came up and then he's gone. [XS:5-2692:12,13]

What are the teachers' reaction to these goings on? "The number one rule is cover your ass, the rest is bullshit" [XS:5-26-92:13]. And as another teacher summed up, "I guess if we look at the history of [Division], it's always been a school for misfits, so to speak" [HF:68-92:17].

With this history, Division High School--a school in a once thriving city now struggling to survive, a school with many divisions-embarked on making changes. Could its constituents pursue an ethic of care in a school that has been traditionally fraught with power struggles for control? Or would that prove impossible or personally too costly?

CHAPTER FIVE

THE PRINCIPAL:

POWERFUL CARE-GIVER?

There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous of conduct. or more uncertain in its success. than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things."

N. Machiavelli

As I thought about Mattie Johnson. I envisioned her as leading faculty, staff, students, and neighborhood community into a new era for Division High. She had prepared herself for years to someday be the principal--the leader--of a school. Now she is the principal, but her leadership is vastly different than she had anticipated. She is in the position of introducing "a new order of things."

Current school reform efforts, to varying degrees, focus on community-school partnerships (Goodlad (1990, 1988); Sizer (1985, 1992); Holmes Group;). The thrust of these partnerships is to balance authority and control of the schools through shared decision making and management involving teachers, administrators, students, parents, and other community members; to develop schools that are more people-centered, relational, and collaborative in their functioning. Reflecting on feminist conceptions of alternatives to

bureaucracy and hierarchy and on the thrust of the current school reforms, I suggest that the latter may provide opportunities to move toward organizational structure based on an ethic of caring. Allow me to elaborate.

In order to collaborate and to share decision-making power and management among many, thinking in terms of a hierarchy of leadership is counter-productive. Contrary to bureaucratic standards, a community school partnership would seem to require a fluidity, that is, a give and-take among participants, and a recognition and acceptance of multiple beliefs, values and viewpoints--interdependence. To achieve fluidity, an organization would need to accept the fact of differences and be willing to work toward the welfare of the group, as well as toward that of the individual. Additionally, I suggest that fluidity would result with the recognition that the organization is composed of human beings, with all their foibles. Such a recognition would necessitate adaptations within the structure as a whole and within individual positions within the structure in order to accommodate personalities as they attempt to work both individually and collectively. This acceptance, I suggest, would, ultimately, necessitate a climate and organizational structure supportive of, and conducive to, caring.

To establish an organization based on caring, however, would not be a simple task. The current organizational structure is based on power relations and, therefore, any attempt to establish caring would be embedded within the power of a bureaucratic hierarchy. Of primary consideration in the creation and implementation of an ethic

of caring in a school, subsequently, must be the ensuing relationship between caring and power. Power relations exist; an ethic of caring as a potential basis for organizational structure and culture, realistically, will co-exist with power. The latter will necessitate an exploration of what that relationship will or can be. In the following chapter, I will explore the ways in which Mattie Johnson, principal of Division High School, intentionally and unintentionally dealt with the role of caregiver which she gave herself, and the role of leader/authority, which was both assigned to, and willingly accepted, by her. Through her experiences, we begin to see caring and power in relationships that appear symbiotic or, perhaps, parasitic. Regardless of the labeling, the reality is a connection, not a dichotomy, between caring and power.

Mattie Johnson viewed her role as principal as being about "the business of really caring about people, really, truly, knowing everybody is important. The respecting, the dignity, the worth of every individual. . . . nurturing, caring, and understanding" [MJ:9-10-91:13]. Although she did not associate herself with feminism, her description of how she wanted to 'lead' and to be perceived as a 'leader' were very much within the rhetoric of theorists exploring organization and leadership from the perspective of feminist theory and, specifically, from the point of view of an ethic of care. I saw her as embodying my idea of what an ethic of caring could be in schools. Her intent was to effect an atmosphere of caring in Division High School--indeed, a new order of things.

In the process of effecting such changes, the concept of leadership needs to be re-examined and the role of "leader," perhaps, re-defined. In a community-oriented organizational structure, the intention is for teachers, students, parents, and community members to assume aspects of leadership by taking part in critical decisions affecting the school, the curriculum, and the students. In essence, the leadership role will be distributed among many.

With movement toward such organizational structure, principals will have to consider what role they will have, not only in the final analysis, but in the change process itself. There appears to be no model for them to follow as they re-think a change in role from primary decision-maker and building authority, to one involving shared decision-making and management with people from multiple positions and perspectives from within and, possibly, without, the school. Leadership conceivably could be shared and shifted among teachers, students, and parents and other community members, in addition to building administrators, at varying points in time. In the process of change from one leader--the principal--to shared leadership, there is the assumption that the principal's changed role will evolve, or, as some may speculate, devolve. In either case, the principal's role in the process of change deserves thoughtful consideration, for the way the role is viewed during that period will affect not only the implementation of the reform strategies, but also the conceptions and subsequent definitions of "leadership" and of "caring."

Several questions are pertinent to a deliberation of the principal's function in the process of change. How does she understand, interpret, and enact caring? Does she see herself as the primary caregiver? as a recipient of caring from faculty, staff, and/or students? Does/How does she promote caring among the staff and between students and staff? How does she understand, interpret, and enact power? Does she believe she needs power in order to enact caring? Will her evolving role affect movement toward an organizational structure that supports an ethic of caring?

These questions will be addressed through the story of Mattie Johnson, principal of Division High School. Through her experiences and reflections, we become intimately involved in her attempts to make a transition between the known--traditional concepts of leadership as authority and control--and the unknown--an amorphous vision of shared leadership; and in her attempts to move toward an ethic of caring while immersed in a structure of 'power over.'

MATTIE JOHNSON - BACKGROUND OF A PRINCIPAL

> People who really know me, know that I, for the most part, am very nurturing and caring and understanding. I am a people person. I really love people. I am really concerned about people. [MJ:9-15-91:13]

Mattie Johnson worked her way into a principalship; as one DHS staff member put it, she came up through the ranks, paying her dues to the system and working for everything she's ever achieved [JF:10-3091:2].

Although she spent her early years in the South, virtually her entire educational career was in Newtown. She began as a social studies teacher; and progressed to department chair, assistant principal, and, then, deputy principal, the position next to that of principal. During Mattie's years in a secondary position in administration, her principal was her mentor, grooming her to become a high school principal.

Financial cutbacks in the district in the past several years, however, forced teacher- and administrator-layoffs. Five years ago, Mattie, then deputy principal, was 'pink-slipped.' A few weeks prior to the new school year, she was notified that she would be back in her school, but not in the same position . Because an administrative position in another high school was cut, that administrator, who had more seniority than Mattie, bumped her down to assistant.

Mattie was glad to be reinstated and, particularly, to return to the same school. But, the return was not easy. She had to deal with her feelings of being demoted, which meant that she might very possibly have to wait even longer to have her own building; she had to deal with her feelings of being bumped by a white male, who had indicated he was going to retire but changed his plans because of personal circumstances; and, she had to deal with the fact that she, because she was committed to the school and to doing her best, would be in a position to provide him with information that she not only possessed, but was a part of her, about the school, students and faculty. She was hurt and angry, but did not want to begin the

school year with those feelings. So, she wrestled with them, using prayer and determination to make the most of a disappointing and frustrating situation.

As is typical of Mattie, she picked herself up, believing there must be a purpose for what she considered a set-back. After all, she had recovered from temporary blindness as a child and learned to compensate for her poor vision. [Of the thirty-five staff I interviewed, only one mentioned Mattie's vision difficulty which she described as looking through a "very scratched window" with one eye; the other eye is weak from overuse. Additionally, she must wear dark glasses in bright light and must limit her reading time (McDonald, M., Sept., 1991, p.A,11)]. She continued to pursue her goal of becoming a secondary school principal, believing she would achieve it if she worked diligently. There were no excuses for her not to achieve--

> . . . my upbringing, my father, my mother insisted that anything you do, you do well . . . every tub has to stand on its own bottom. That you don't expect other people to do your work for you. Blind or not, woman or not, poor or not, black or not, you just don't do that. I learned those things very well. [MJ:9-10-91]

She came back to school as assistant principal determined to do the best she could. Her sensitivity, warmth, and understanding permeated the school as I was later to find out. Throughout the year I spent at her school involved in a research project, I was to hear, unsolicited, time and again from teachers that Mrs. Johnson was a very caring person; that she could be tough, but she was fair; that teachers could argue with her, but always felt that she said

her piece and did not hold a grudge; that she was always honest with them and they knew where she stood on any issue.

The following year she was promoted to the position of deputy principal at Division High School. Her reputation followed her. Again teachers explicitly cited her strength, her fairness, and her charisma.

> She's loved by the custodians and food service workers because "she's a no-nonsense lady who's obviously in charge." [HF:10-3091:2]

> She's a good person. . . . [Mattie] is an educator . . . she's very rigid, very firm, but very fair . . . SHE CARES, she cares, she cares! [KG:10-30-91:1,2]

> . . . she's got charisma and she's smart. [TD:2-11-92:13]

> She's intelligent, she's dynamic, she's got tons of energy. I think she deals really well with people. . . . I mean I see her as fully genuine. . . . [H]er sensitivity or kindness or concern, that's the way she is. That isn't like something she turns on when she comes in the building and turns off when she leaves. That's the way she is. [IZ:3-17-92:6,9]

She used that year to learn about the school, to get to know the teachers and students and to move toward a few changes. She worked especially hard to understand the culture and community of the school, the nuances that made DHS unique, and the features that made it a pariah among the city's high schools. When she was appointed principal in July, 1991, she had a sense of the students, teachers, and other staff members; the breadth and depth of the problems faced by DHS; her general expectations of herself as a leader; and her general goals for the school. With those thoughts in mind, she set five goals for herself: 1) improve academic

achievement and promote excellence in education; 2) build trust (among staff and administrators, and among staff and students); 3) work to build on what has been started with site-based management and shared decision-making to include more people, especially parents, in what occurs; 4) improve communications between and among staff and the total community; and 5) improve school-community relations [fn:10-2-91].

Within the first months of Mattie's principalship at Division, she was feted throughout the community and school district. You see, she is the first female high school principal in Newtown's history---and she is African-American. Members of social organizations, friends and relatives, and the school district staff all celebrated her promotion. The community, the district, and the staff at Division High all looked to her as the ONE who would change Division. Hopes, expectations, and spirits were at a new high. Additionally, women, particularly Black women, were enormously proud to have a sister who had persevered and won.

But what did she win? She acquired a school with a faculty who wanted, yet resisted, leadership; who wanted to be cared for, but were accustomed to controlling. She acquired 'partnerships' with community organizations and a local university, both of whom wanted to help Division, but on their own terms and for their own purposes. She acquired the a position of authority, the principalship, but with a mandate to alter the organizational structure to accommodate shared decision making and shared management. She wanted to believe her position was one of leadership and power, one that she would

temper with caring. But, the ambiguity of her position--what she thought it should be and what it really was--and her power were quick to surface.

Mattie entered the school year "on a honeymoon," as she liked to say. Bouquets adorned her office on a regular basis; notes of congratulations arrived daily; several articles about her, including a feature story, were in the city newspaper; and parents, community members, business persons and others dropped in to wish her well. But, no one really told her what was expected of her. They just knew she would make a difference. They were counting on her.

MATTIE JOHNSON - CARE-GIVER

And she did make a difference. With Mattie Johnson's arrival as principal, the air at Division High was charged with expectations and a readiness, of sorts, for change. Faculty, staff, and community members looked forward to Mattie's coming, for she brought with her a reputation of caring, concern, and a sense of quality and pride for the school and all those associated with it. She was a breath of fresh air in a school that stagnated with painful histories; she was a symbol of change in a building where people and ideas lingered seemingly unchanged. Those characteristics, although not explicitly articulated, permeated the staff's illusions of the transformations that could take place. In the remainder of this section, I discuss the ways in which Mattie intended to develop caring at Division. She believed that her modeling caring; establishing pride for and within Division; building trust; having

high expectations for self, staff, and students; accepting her own and other's humanity; 'ministering' to faculty and students; and building community would lead to Division's becoming a caring place.

Setting the Tone

> Your leader will set the tone. People pick up on their habits of their leaders and I have found that to be true. . . . I feel, as an administrator, you have to model the behavior that you expect. [MJ:9-10-91:3,4]

The tone she wanted to set for the building was one of caring--for each other as well as students. In order to accomplish her goals, she believed she must model the behaviors she wanted to see faculty and students adopt.

Building Pride in DHS

Building pride would not occur overnight. Time and time again, she reiterated emphatically that

> . . . [change] takes time, and one of the things I'm working on with myself is that . . . I pray for patience, so that I don't try to rush the process. There is a sense of readiness, and we'll know, you'll know it. You'll know when [it is] the right time to move on . . . [MJ:10-28-91:4]

Mattie, knowing that major changes do not take place immediately, yet feeling a need 'to do something' both for herself and for others, began with changes that could be made, physical improvements to the building. She began by remodeling and re-furnishing the deputy principal's and principal's offices; removing a wall separating one secretary from all the others; re-furnishing the faculty lounge; putting flowers and plants in the

main office; making the floor-to-ceiling windows at the front of the building a virtual greenhouse with a variety of hanging and stationery plants; and installing a soup, sandwich, and salad bar in the faculty dining room so staff would not have to go through the students' lunch line. She insisted that students respect the building by keeping it clean. Whenever she saw litter in the hallways, she would either pick it up herself if no one was around, or ask a student to remove it. Discipline for students included, with parent and union sanction, students' scrubbing graffiti from the walls. Mattie believed that one's physical surroundings contribute to the feeling one has about the place and one's place in it.

Speaking about her impressions of the physical building when she arrived as deputy principal, she said,

> If we are about the business of servicing students, serving community, what do I feel? What do you feel when you walk into the main office? What do you feel like when you walk in? How do people treat you? What do you see when you first drive up to this campus? Is there a sense of business, but is it caring, is it friendly? Do you sense that people want to be here and you want to be here? I didn't feel that when I walked in [the main office]. Why are these windows up here? Why is the secretary enclosed away, and people told me that is the way it has been. What message does this send? I said, "Well, maybe it will go away. Maybe I will feel differently about this." I went the entire year and it still didn't. I got this appointment [as principal] and asked for some things to be done. Starting from the outside. Kathleen, we can be the best school in the world, but in my opinion, how you look [is important]. I know that people feel that this could be elaborate, but this has to be comfortable. It has to represent the person. When you drive up outside, you ought to see a clean, well-kept place because people drive by and make decisions about us, just as people drive by our homes . . . . I also believe that before we get a chance to do our jobs in

> our classrooms, that people make a decision about who we are and what we are by walking into this building and these offices. I really believe that. . . . You can have the cleanest [building] and have all of these things in place and you can have kids not being educated either. I don't want to cloud the picture there, but I do believe an orderly, clean, caring environment . . . helps with the mission. When I walked over there I just didn't see that people would get the sense of feeling safe, cared for, "I am here to serve you." So I asked them to knock those walls out . . . . [If] you say that you have a caring, safe, orderly, courteous friendly environment wanting to serve, then what do people see? [MJ:10-2-91:7-8]

Mattie intended the physical refurbishings to be a token of her commitment to the deeper, more significant organizational and curricular alterations that would "take time" to bring about. She saw this work, albeit "window dressing," as she called it, as a concrete way of showing the faculty she cared. Her dream was for faculty and students to be proud of themselves and the achievements they made. But she knew that the negative perception of the school, about and by its students and teachers, would not disappear because she wished them to. She knew changes necessary to alter those perceptions would take time. Therefore, she wanted to show staff and students in an immediate and tangible way her pride in the school, her faith in them.

Building Trust

Trust-building among the faculty and faculty and administration was a critical issue to Mattie Johnson. Relationships within the school, by teachers' own admission, were fragmented and distrustful. Moreso was the lack of trust between administrators and teachers.

The latter stemmed from not only the history of the school, but also from the history of the community.

Newtown was an industrial town with a strong union. A majority of the citizens were, in one way or another, a part of the industry and, therefore, a part of the union. The union, generally, operated from an adversarial position--workers versus management. The teachers' union, subsequently, patterned itself after the successful labor union and functioned from the perspective of teachers versus administration. That attitude carried over into the schools within the district. Given the difficulties faced by Division High during desegregation in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and its ensuing reputation as the 'roughest' and 'worst' school in the city, relations between administration and faculty had not ceased to be antagonistic. Mattie, well aware of that, believed trust needed to be built between her and the faculty.

> . . . there as been a real history of people in this building. At least there is a perceived reputation that there are people here who are anti-administration. One of the things is the building of trust, and as you well know that takes time, and talking to people; it wears me out. [MJ:10-2-91:9]

Central in her mind to building trust was her visibility among faculty and students and their access to her. Early in the school year, Mattie seemed superhuman as she appeared almost magically, throughout the building, hour by hour, day in and day out. She stood in the outer office in the mornings to banter with faculty members as they arrived; she joined faculty and staff in the hallways prior to school and as students passed from class to class;

she kept her office door open, inviting faculty and staff to visit with her at any time; she wandered through the student cafeteria during the various lunch hours to tease students or to ask them about themselves; she made a point of stopping by teachers' rooms just to say "hi"; she ambled into the kitchen to visit with the cooks and cafeteria aides; and she seemed always present to compliment and thank volunteers who came and left the building on no certain schedule. As she said, "If I stayed in this office, all sorts of things would go by me. I wouldn't know" [MJ:10-28-91:6].

Most important to her, though, was establishing personal contact with each teacher in order to open the door for communication between administration and teachers, as well as among teachers, themselves. She viewed communication as an integral part of trust-building which, she believed, was necessary for site-based management and shared decision making to be effective, to succeed. Because of the controversy within the staff regarding the understanding and implementation of site-based management (which will be discussed later), and because there was historically an antagonistic relationship between administration and staff, Mattie was convinced that communication between administration and staff had to be strengthened. Through individual contact especially with teachers, she hoped to convince them of her integrity and her sincerity about working together as a team.

Her goal at the beginning of the year was to have had an individual conference with every teacher and with groups of support staff prior to the end of the school year. Her intent was to show

her interest in the them as a persons; to discuss her expectations of the individual and/or group; and to encourage teachers and staff to voice their expectations of her as principal. She wanted the faculty to see her commitment to them as professionals, and to their striving together to develop the concept of SBM at Division.

> I bet I have not written one memo this year. What I have decided to do is to go to the person. Go to the source. . . . How do you think [we] have gotten where [we] have gotten? We have spent time and talked. We got a chance to know [each other]. That is what I want to do. For everyone who is working in this building--we are talking about **everyone**. . . . The more I talk to them, the better they know me. The more I do what I say that I am going to do, the more I get a chance to hear them out, the better job and the more trust will build. What I have as a goal for this year . . . is that I will talk one on one with everyone. . . . [B]ecause of the attention that you're giving to one person, you'll focus on that individual. And what you're doing is you're asking for that person's opinion. And you're listening to, you know, you're actually listening. What I heard said to me over and over again was that, "I really appreciate this. I never had anybody to ask me what I thought. And I got the feeling that you're really listening." And what a person will say to you one on one, it's very different than what a person would say if you had them in a group. . . . I feel that it's the basic need of an individual to get knowledge as being important, and that [he's] important enough for you to listen [to] [MJ:10-2-91:9-10; 6-25-92:6].

Building trust meant building relationships; building relationships meant changing the ways staff had learned to interact over the years. Mattie's approach was to talk one on one with staff, and to attempt to move faculty toward the concept of team work. That is, she, alone was not responsible for 'changing' Division High; it was to be a team effort. Ever aware that change takes time, Mattie committed herself to building trust slowly and

solidly, believing that patience and small, steady steps were more effective than flashy proposals or projects that dazzle like fireworks and fade as rapidly.

> Well, you deal with [changes] one at a time. You deal with, that some of it is just going to have to take time. That's why I'm talking to everybody one on one. . . . I cannot control what people think. They can only deal with what is. But some people thought that, "[Mattie Johnson's] coming," whatever it is that they wanted, [Mattie Johnson) was going to fix it. But what I had said is that, "Wait! Whoa! This is collaboration. This is team work. This is shared decision making. This is shared responsibility." That you just can't make this [happen], one person can't do that. Or a team of four people can't do it. But that takes time. And that takes time. [T]hat's why it's so important that time be spent building trust. I can't do that in a year. Can I do that in a year is totally unrealistic. That's why one of my goals is building trust. It is not easy. I often, often, that's daily, ask for wisdom and direction from my God. That I ask for patience from my God, that I will remain focused, in spite of all these things that I know. I know that it takes time to build relationships. And that's what we're building. [MJ:3-2-92:7,8]

Honesty and integrity were of utmost importance to Mattie, personally and professionally. Throughout the year she emphatically stated that, above all, she wanted faculty to see her as having integrity. From a professional standpoint, she saw that as critical to building relationships founded on trust. Making an effort to talk with people was necessary, but the bottom line for Mattie was that people trust she is honest and straightforward.

> It has always been important to me that people believe what I say. Integrity, I must have that. You may not like me, you may not agree with me, it really doesn't [matter]. I guess it does matter, but the real compliment is when people say that [Mattie Johnson] cares about people and that if she tells you something . . . it might not be correct, but at least that is what she believes. That is a compliment. [MJ:9-10-91:14]

She was particularly concerned about the "anti-administration" attitude of some of the members of the steering committee--which, loosely, was the governing body of SBM--who had strong union ties. She indicated it was useless to think that they would automatically trust her simply because the school was, ostensibly, site-based management, shared decision making. Her perception was that she and the members of the steering committee had not discussed her role or theirs in the framework of site-based management, therefore, they were unsure and tentative about what to expect from each other. She believed that she needed to work with them individually and within the group in order to build trust between her and them. She indicated that communication, on a number of levels, was necessary to establish enough trust to begin the process of defining their roles and their mission. Only then, might they be able to work together. And, that would take time.

> Now what I sense with a few of site-based steering committee members, that we are on opposite ends because, one, we have not talked about it. We have not talked about what is the role of a principal, what is the role of the steering committee, and how do we jointly work together. So right now, the trust factor is not there. Is not there with a few of the members. . . . With, let's see, probably three of those members on there, that there has been a history of conflicts with administration and that's a whole history. So, you don't come right into a situation with a new person that you don't know and suddenly that's going to change. Okay? It's just not going to, and with some of it . . . that just depends largely on what the motives are here . . . But you've got some strong union people on the site-based steering committee and some of them come from an orientation of 'them against us.' That's a long history of it. . . . [W]e've had three strong union people who have been accustomed, for whatever reason--again, I don't understand--is that

> administration is the enemy and that you've got to have this tug of war. And that's what I don't want. [MJ:10-29-91:2,3]

Despite her initial intentions, communication and building trust proved to be more difficult that she had imagined. About six weeks into the school year, Mattie twisted her ankle, requiring her to wear a removable cast and orthopedic shoes. That incident seemed to be a major turning-point in the way she began to function and think about her role as leader. Although she continued, on a limited basis, to stand in the hallway outside her office between classes, and to greet faculty each morning, she generally became less visible about the building. The accident limited her mobility, causing her to spend more time in her office. The more time she was in the office, the more time she seemed to need to be there to conference with people, take phone calls, or, perhaps do paperwork. By December, I noticed that her door was rarely open. Faculty began complaining about her inaccessibility. They complained about her office hours; having to make appointments to talk with her rather than just "dropping in"; and her being out of the building so much.

Mattie appeared unaware of the changes she had made, although they seemed more to have evolved from unplanned circumstances than having resulted from conscious decisions. Reflecting at the end of the year about faculty's frustration with her increasingly limited visibility and access, she appeared torn--wanting to defend herself, attempting to understand what was--and is--realistic, and yearning to reach her ideals. One got the sense that she understood the faculty's frustration with her; recognized that she wanted to move

away from their total dependence on her to an interdependent relationship; yet struggled with the desire to be in control.

> I saw teachers. I saw administrators . . . and I said. "Whoa." [They] were unrealistic; they saw me as being able to solve all of the problems, every hall problem . . . But it makes a difference when you are out here [in the halls]. . . . And that pays, being out there, which I'm going to always be visible. . . . visibility is critical. **But, visible in another sense of being supportive** and not being hands-on [emphasis mine]. . . . I heard people [from outside the building] say, "I can't ever reach you." And I didn't want that. My secretaries were aggravated . . . they'd have to hunt me down. So you don't want that. . . . I have to delegate; I can't survive if I can't do that. . . . But I didn't do as much being in here for those six weeks [with her sprained ankle], put me so far behind with observing classrooms. I'm not pleased with that. Now that was a goal that I was going to actually be more in classrooms. We have to make time to do that. That's important. . . . [T]he staff members became critical [of my not being in the halls and visiting classrooms]. You know, they saw that and it was important to me, and I should have communicated that more to the staff . . . I'm going to have to talk to them more and communicate the fact that it's a team effort. That they're burying me, they are literally burying me and I will become resentful because I will not be able to keep up that kind of pace . . . [MJ:6-25-92:4,5]

Listening to her, I had the sense that she bristled at the notion that the faculty thought they could control her, or that they seemed to think that she would be at their 'beck and call.' Being a leader, for Mattie, seemed to involve more than meeting faculty needs; it meant fulfilling her role in the bureaucracy. But, I ask, for what purposes-to better educate Division's students or to ensure her own success within the bureaucratic hierarchy?

Having High Expectations for Self, Staff, and Students

To Mattie, having high expectations for self, others, and students was synonymous with a school staff that cares for and about students. She believed that, as principal, she set the tone for everyone in the building; therefore, she expected as much, or more, of herself as she did from the staff. From her outward appearance to the minute details of a report, Mattie consistently attempted to model the best. As she said, whatever she assumed of staff, she was willing to do first--patrol the halls, pick up debris in the halls, get to know students on a personal level, show caring and understanding toward colleagues, and so forth. She saw herself as highly organized and efficient, not wanting to settle for anything less than perfection.

> I have high expectations of myself and [of] people with whom I work. A leader sets the tone. In the faculty meeting I was very up front with what I expected and what they can expect from me and I won't ask anything of anybody that I am not willing to do, that I won't do out there first. . . . I'm my own worst critic. If I satisfy me, then everybody else is more than satisfied. [MJ:9-1091:3,4; 1-25-92:3]

Because she was willing to put forth maximum effort, she expected faculty to do likewise. High expectations signified diligence and quality, both of which Mattie believed should constitute one's attitude toward work and learning. She expected that each part of the individual's work responsibilities would be carried out with care and accuracy, whether that meant filling out a report for the school or district office; completing the master schedule for a semester's classes; managing an athletic event with

pride, respect, and dignity or cleaning the cafeteria between lunch periods. She did not want to settle for less.

> I want the best, the brightest, the most committed people who are positive, who have energy, who love people, who really want to do their jobs . . . Fortunately . . . here we are very blessed with a lot of people who really love their work. I want[] to[] be very clear with expectations of my goals and I have said that to them [DHS faculty]. . . . When you expect nothing, you get nothing. Simple as that. . . . I am not a slave driver. I think people know that if we work together, that they must produce. We must do, that is what we are getting paid for. I don't like lazy people. I like people who are caring and nurturing and certainly I am not a perfectionist. . . . I do think that whatever we do, we must do it well. [MJ:9-10-91:3,4]

Mattie did not want to settle for less where students were concerned, either. Particularly important, was that high expectations for faculty reflect expectations for students.

> I see caring for students in the sense that you have high expectations. High expectations, believing that all students can and will learn. High expectations. That you communicate with students . . . on a daily basis. . . . You're concerned if fifty percent of the students are not passing. And you don't immediately blame the student. . . . [S]howing that you care means that you're going to communicate with the parent and the parent will become your ally, not your enemy. That you're going to join hands. You're going to ask, "What can I do?" You're going to show compassion. . . . You'll smile at the student. . . . One can be strict . . . I believe in that, but one can set those limits and one can do that in a very caring, compassionate way and still get results. . . . [You] must truly feel that you can make a difference, and that you care about people, [that] you care about the students, really believe that they can learn. and want to make them learn . . . [MJ:6-25-92:8,9]

At the same time that she had high expectations of herself and others, she was aware of her drive to be the best, drive she saw as arising not only from her innate personality, but because she was

female. When I initially questioned her about her position as the first female high school principal in Newtown, she implied that as a women, she was inclined to work harder and longer in order to 'prove' herself. She generalized that attitude to include virtually all women in positions such as hers and with ambitions to "climb the executive ladder" [MJ:9-10-91-11]. Because she was aware of her tendency to push herself to extremes, she had as a personal goal learning to delegate responsibility to others. She hoped that would enable her to relinquish the need to be a "super woman," and to establish and maintain a balance in her life, thus, encouraging her staff to do likewise.

> Women have to be very careful about being super people, super women. I am not saying that [men] don't work as hard. I am not saying that at all. I think that they don't work the same way we do. We drive ourselves. I want to be very conscious of that and not feel[] that [I] have to do it all. I want to actually work on the delegation and responsibilities. I don't want to fall into that trap where I feel that I must do it all. [MJ:9-10-91:8].

Because she was aware of her tendency to drive herself and, therefore others, she had as an expectation of herself and her staff members to find and maintain a balance in life. To her that meant having a life and an identity beyond Division High School. Throughout the year, she reiterated her struggle to find and maintain personal equilibrium.

> Planning and fighting for your--time is something that one has to be conscious of all of the time . . . . I want, have to have something else to go on in my life other than being principal of the high school." [MJ:9-10-91:2; 6-25-92:3]

She was also frustrated with teachers who seemed to resist the notion of balance in their lives as she interpreted it. Her motives for desiring teachers to spend less time involved in their jobs did not seem to arise solely out of care and concern for them as persons, but out of concern, as principal, for their ability to be the "brightest people" who had "energy to do their jobs."

> I have actually talked with staff members and said, "Now look, I'm not sure if you've ever heard this from a principal, but you need to go home." . . . If one has a family, and even if you don't, [you need] time with [] families. . . . When people tell me they stay here . . . that does not guarantee quality. There is only so much that human beings can do and you will wear yourself out, become irritable, less productive. . . . I'm concerned about . . . people spending too much time going in circles when they ought to be at home with their families or go to, whatever they do for recreation. I'm not impressed, not by any twist of the imagination, with those who, when people tell me that they're here until eight and nine o'clock. That doesn't impress me. Because they can't last long . . . you want people with balance in their lives. [MJ:9-10-91:4; 6-15-92:9].

I question Mattie's solely caring attitude regarding balance in faculty's lives. I felt there was a sense of expediency on her part. There were too many substitute teachers in the building on a daily basis already; she wanted teachers to maintain emotional and physical health so they would contribute to the building, not deplete it of its resources. In that sense, she may not have explicitly been caring toward faculty, but was caring about the students, about the overall management of the school.

Accepting One's Humanity--Self and Others

Mattie was torn between wanting to be and do the best, and recognizing her, as well as and others,' humanity, the inevitability of being less than perfect. She said she was not a perfectionist, but she had to work to accept that thought. As she talked about her humanity-the inescapable fact that she would make mistakes--I had the feeling she was trying to convince herself that she had to acknowledge that in herself. Accepting less than perfection was not easy for Mattie, especially as a woman, and as a woman making her way in the bureaucratic hierarchy.

> One of the things that I have learned to say is, "Yes, if you have any questions about whether or not a woman can be a high school principal, the answer is 'yes.' I know that. . . . I am not a super human being. I get tired, I hurt, my feelings can get [hurt], I make mistakes--all those things. . . . I want to be human. That human beings make mistakes because it is all right because all of us, if we live long enough, if we do anything, then we make a mistake. [MJ:9-10-91:1,3]

Accepting people's humanity comes with the expectation that if one made a mistake, s/he would acknowledge and learn from it. To Mattie, admitting one's failure, taking responsibility for one's actions, indicated one's integrity and desire to improve oneself. Included in "taking responsibility" was Mattie's expectation that the person would find a way to correct the mistake, thus, increasing his/her knowledge and competence. Her responsibility was allowing people to make mistakes. She illustrated that at the beginning of the school year with reference to her deputy principal.

> My deputy just came to me and I had asked him to do something. I know that he is new in that position. I have another new assistant principal and I am new, so

> we really have a new team and all of us are really working to stay ahead of the game. But he was supposed to have gotten something in and didn't. Well, he is a human being. He said he had it and it got put in another stack, and that can happen. . . . [B]ut I want to use it now as a lesson for him. Being understanding. Now if that gets to be a pattern, then I have to speak to him about that . . . I gave an assignment to [him] and I know that to keep from burning myself out that I have to allow him to do it. Find a way [to let him] make his mistakes and learn from them [MJ:9-10-92:3,8].

Multiple and repeated errors, however, were not acceptable. As the year progressed, the deputy principal continued to have difficulty with several of his job responsibilities, chief of which was constructing the master schedule of classes for the second semester. I perceived the relationship between him and Mattie to lose all pretense of warmth and caring, and become one of forbearance and tolerance. Mattie's caring and concern focused on how the deputy's work affected those within Division High, and less on the feelings of the deputy, per se.

Ministering to Faculty's and Students' Needs

Foundational to Mattie in the development of a school organization and climate that manifests caring was the necessity to minister to the needs of the people within. I specifically chose the word, 'minister,' because she described that aspect of her role as principal as "a calling" [MJ:3-2-92;12]. She did not choose it, but resigned herself to it, for the calling was "a gift that God has given me, and that I should not shun that, and that people see it" [MJ:3-2-92:12].

The "gift" to which she is referring was her sensitivity toward the needs of others, and her ability to listen to and counsel staff members. She viewed those as gifts because people seek her out for advice, comfort, and just to talk. She put a high priority on making herself available to staff members experiencing personal difficulties--divorce, impending surgery. death in the family, or other family problems. Additionally, she interpreted her calling as being available to settle day-today disputes, frustrations, or misunderstandings among teachers. In her estimation, that calling required more of her time and energy than she had ever anticipated. At times she wrestled with what she expected of herself and what others expected of her as principal. Was she making the best choice when she chose to minister to staff in lieu of patrolling the halls or observing a classroom? She believed she did, for when "people are hurting and if I don't listen to them, then that is going to impact what happens to children in the classroom."

> Right now we have about ten people who are going through some traumatic situations, traumatic to where you have to check on them . . . . I told this individual. " [] What you do is you tell [my secretary] that you need to see me. That will be a message that anything that is going on, she can change it." . . . [There] are about five people on this staff who are going through some divorces. Divorces, four of them are bitter. Bitter divorces where they need time to talk. . . . This is the part of the job that has been a real challenge. A real challenge. . . . A part of me want[s] to always be visible out there for students, but it can't always happen. [A] person called me and said, "I need to talk to YOU." I could pick up on the voice. "You just have to have some time. I can come now. Someone is in my classroom." So I had to switch gears. . . . Another individual has asked me to give her time to explain something because what she wants is to have a conference with me and about five other staff members because something needs to be

> settled. Now that part is a biggy. Squabbles or problems that happen between, among staff is part of [the job] that you don't anticipate. That happens on a daily basis. . . . [M]ost of what I do is listen. To listen takes time. People are hurting and if I don't listen to them, then that is going to impact what happens to children in the classroom. If a person has been battered at night, if that person does hot have some relief, then what kind of job is that person going to be able to do in the classroom with children? If a person is dealing with [his/her] own child who is now doing what he or she feels shouldn't be done--very painful things--then what do you think is really going to happen in the classroom? He is a human being. If somebody is afraid of a spouse, what kind of job [is she going to do)? Or, if a person is on the verge of a breakdown . . . these are some real issues that are happening right now that I have to deal with. [MJ:3-2-92-11,12].

And deal with them she did. In every school I'm sure there are teachers and students who must handle an array of personal problems. At Division High, however, many of the problems centered an violence, affecting teachers and students either directly or peripherally. Spousal abuse, drug-related incidents within families, and murder and mugging of one teacher's relatives all occurred in barely half a school year. In addition, one teacher had open-heart surgery; another had cancer surgery and died unexpectedly of a heart attack; there were several natural deaths of parents and other relatives of staff members; and major surgery for several spouses or close relatives of faculty. Again, all this in less than a full school-year. Add to this the traumatic events that occurred in the student body and one began to wonder what 'normal' was. Those were the reasons behind Mattie's decision to make ministering to faculty and students a high priority.

Besides listening, Mattie made programmatic changes to facilitate caring for those "who are hurting." One of the first changes she made as principal at DHS was to initiate grief counseling for students and for faculty. Within a month of school's starting, a student had been shot and killed. By January, three more students had died violently. Although the first incident put into practice what to her had been only vaguely thought-through ideas, she knew long before she was appointed as principal that grief counseling would be an integral part of 'her' school.

Mattie, in the various positions she held within the school system, saw the trauma that students were expected to manage on their own. She also saw that students were becoming hardened, that is, they were not allowing themselves to feel. The latter served to help them cope with adversity, but, on the other hand, allowed them to lose hope for themselves and for their future. The students, rather than examining their thoughts about the violence they witnessed or experienced, accepted it as an inevitable part of their lives and for which there was nothing that could be done. Through grief counseling, Mattie opened up the possibility for students to question the violence; to question their feelings; to allow themselves to recognize and, perhaps, feel their pain and anger. Mattie hoped that students would begin to feel again. She hoped that if they acknowledged their emotions, they would begin to allow themselves to think about their futures and the possibility of their working to change the lifestyle they think is unchangeable.

Mattie understood, also, that teachers needed help with grief. Many of Division's faculty have taught there for fifteen or more years. During that time, they witnessed the violence of desegregation where students rioted and faculty literally fought among themselves. Every year, some teachers learned about a current or former student who was maimed or killed. One teacher noted that in thirteen years, she had twelve students die violently. Like students, teachers tried to distance themselves from their grief by rationalizing the situations, or by burying it within themselves because they must teach their next class of thirty-plus students.

At Mattie's former school, I observed a teacher, who at the beginning of class, was informed by a student that a male classmate had been shot the night before. The teacher was visibly shaken and tried to elicit more information about the shooting from the student. The student flippantly replied that the young man had been dealing drugs and he knew this would happen eventually. As the teacher continued trying to find out more details, the student seemed to have forgotten the incident and was more interested in who was doing what after school. The teacher, on the other hand, continued to ask questions, but eventually stopped as the students appeared disinterested in the incident and wanted to get on with the class. Talking with the teacher later in the day, he told me that he had been teaching in the district twenty-five years, and no matter how many times he heard about a student's being hurt or killed, he was still shaken. But, he responded with resignation,

what could one do about it, but to go on and pretend it didn't happen.

Mattie's hope was that grief counseling would allow teachers to deal with their feelings so they did not have to pretend the incidents hadn't occurred; that if teachers were allowed to feel in these traumatic circumstances, they might be able to begin to feel with and for the students they taught; and that they might begin to see students who are not simply in their classes, but students who have a future.

In addition to grief counseling, Mattie supported teachers who wanted to begin a program of crisis intervention with students. In a way, this program built on grief counseling because students learned, with the guidance of trained peers, alternatives to fighting and violence to settle arguments and disagreements. Instead of physically fighting to resolve a verbal dispute, students were brought together in a room, mediated by pears, and instructed to talked out the disagreement until they came to consensus. If the latter did not occur within a session, another session was scheduled. According to Mattie, the teachers involved, and the student mediators, crisis intervention 'worked' virtually in every case, preventing what would otherwise have resulted in beatings or worse.

Mattie spent time counseling students. She met with a senior and her grandparents to let them know the young lady was not excused from school that day ("Girl, we got to get you graduated!.. [Your grandparents] are working too hard. You need to graduate for them;

she performed crisis intervention with two boys who were on the verge of physical combat, but who left her office after shaking hands and apologizing to each other; she invited several students to a special luncheon to celebrate their academic achievement; and she invited a young girl whose father had died into her office to talk with her. Those were but a few incidents that I observed. Students, as persons, were important to Mattie, and she tried to make time to listen to them.

Ministering to faculty's and students' needs was critical to Mattie's understanding of her role as a caring principal. As she said, "Most people really want to be validated as worthwhile human beings. To care about them. It does not take much. You can't be superficial about it, but you just genuinely care." [MJ:3-2-92-13].

Building Community

Mattie's 'ministering' now became her 'ministry.' Her most important goal in the community was to visit the neighborhood churches which served Division's students. She met with the local Concerned Pastors' Council to seek permission to visit their congregations during designated Sunday services to talk about the need for support from the church as a body, and the parishioners as individual parents and community members, to help improve Division High for students. [The Concerned Pastors' Council was a group of pastors committed to improving the community--safety, welfare, education, and so on.] Her plea to the congregations ranged from the need for volunteer help at the school and for financial aid, to

the need for parents and community members to convince students of the importance of an education and to make sure students stayed in school.

Mattie worked to bolster sagging participation and attendance of the parent advisory council. She encouraged the liaison between the school and community to sponsor events that would bring parents to the school. One such event was a breakfast in May for parents and students who would be ninth graders in the fall to meet teachers, counselors and selected students. Mattie advertised--through the media, through the churches, through letters to parents, and through word of mouth--the open house for parents and students in the fall; it was the largest turnout in years. Teachers, used to spending four hours at an open house to see five to ten parents wander through, witnessed over a hundred last fall [NG:5-19-92:2]. Mattie asked the journalism teacher to start a newsletter for parents. It contained information about happenings in the school, generally; information from specific teachers; and information concerning major events or requirements that affect students. The letter was sent to the homes several times throughout the year. Finally, Mattie seemed always to be available to parents-sometimes to teachers' annoyance.

Of the five goals that Mattie had at the beginning of the year, that of improving school-community relations was the one that she declared she achieved, and to a much higher degree than she had anticipated. During my final interview with her, she commented,

> I expected cooperation, but I did not expect it to the degree that I received it. Just outstanding to the degree that they would call and ask, "Now what can we do to help? What can we do?" They have been supportive all along by their presence and by their money. And, oh yes. Had the president of the parent advisory council to come and say about two representatives with him, to say, "What else can we do? We want to help." So that was refreshing. That was just--it's just a comforting feeling to know that you have the community backing you. You see, so therefore, you're not in it alone. EMJ:6-25-92:1]

Reflections on Mattie's Understandings of Caring

Caring to Mattie was intense and personal. It was much like Noddings suggests. Mattie attempted to understand--to get into the skin--of others in order to understand how to care for them. Mattie saw herself as care-giver to staff and students. She felt their need for caring and was determined to do all that she could in order to be nurturing and sensitive. She took her call to minister seriously.

I seems to me, however, that Mattie had difficulty receiving care from others within the school. At times, she reflected Noddings' perception of the one-caring who may at the same time be the one receiving caring. That is, there were times that Mattie's attempts to care for someone were really cries to be cared for. Particularly, in a new position in which she was uncomfortable dealing with ambiguity and often feeling she had only limited control, her acts of caring, at times, resulted in others allowing her to care for them. She, then, felt cared-for, that is, she felt competent and in a sense, in control.

Mattie as care-receiver was a difficult, if not an impossible role for her to choose to play. She indicated that she often felt alone and isolated, that she had one very good friend with whom she could really talk, and felt the need to build a network among the female secondary school principals in her regional conference. Never, though, did she indicate that she believed there was a possibility of receiving caring from staff members. A genuine concern that she held was that she did not have control of her situation as a new principal as much as she thought she should have. That disturbed her and seemed to make her feel not only uncomfortable, but less than competent. SHE was there to lead and to minister, not to be ministered to.

Caring for Mattie also seemed to mean attention to the maintenance of bureaucracy. She ultimately was the leader and, therefore, responsible for the success or failure of the school. Building trust, pride, and community not only were caring toward individuals, but were potentially the means by which DHS could regain respect within the district hierarchy and education community. Although she talked of working together with the faculty--of collaborating--she made the decision regarding who would collaborate and when.

Caring seemed to involve her vision and how it could be accomplished within the bureaucracy that she seemed to understand and respect. While I continued to see caring and power as binary opposites, she seemed comfortable using both together.

MATTIE JOHNSON - POWER

Mattie wanted to be known as nurturing, caring, and understanding, a "people person." There was another very important part of her, however. People liked her because she was a "take-charge," [KG:10-3-91:13], "no-nonsense" [HF:10-3-91:1] person, and because she was firm in her beliefs and was capable of taking a strong stand [HF:123-92:33]. Characteristics that she valued about herself included her preparedness, organization, and ability to set goals and develop plans to achieve them. She saw herself as others saw her--in control [MJ:10-8-91:23].

Through the years she has seen herself very much a leader--one who has a vision, has a sound sense of how to reach it, and provides the nurturing and encouragement to staff in order to attain it. As principal, however, she struggled with herself concerning what it meant to be a leader in a school that was community-oriented, one that was committed to shared decision making, to collaboration, to interdependence of staff and administration. She seemed to wrestle with her notions of control, authority, and caring, particularly as she felt they had been imposed on her by others--superintendent, board of education, university, business community, and faculty. Her discomfort lead me to question: Are caring and power mutually exclusive? Is it possible to be both caring and controlling? Is it necessary to have power over in order to achieve a cultural climate and organizational structure that supports caring, or is that notion an oxymoron?

Thinking about Mattie in relation to power--that is, power over, power that is dominating--was not as easy for me as seeing her in relation to caring. The power relationship did not seem as clean or as unambiguous for me. As I contemplated that thought, I realized that a key component in my assessment of her caring was her awareness of **wanting** to be caring, of her **talking** about herself as caring, of her **recognizing** the importance caring had in her conception of herself as a leader, and of her **believing** that caring among staff and students was critical for good teaching and learning to occur. 'Power,' on the other hand, was not mentioned; neither was 'authority' or 'control.' Power, implying authority or control, was only indirectly addressed as "accountability" or "responsibility" in conjunction with her role of building administrator. However, she did appear to assume her possession of power through her position.

Her conflict seemed to arise from having to 'give up' power through sharing decision making and management, a move in the direction that I identified as 'caring.'

Unlike her straightforward, confident talk about, and acts of, caring, her use of 'power over' manifested itself in seemingly uneven-and, sometimes, unexpected--ways. At times she seemed to stand straight and tall, wielding power like a magnificent protectress of The Good; at others, she seemed to be buffeted by the power of others, never fully losing control, but fighting to maintain her balance. Perhaps, she did not see power in caring as an issue; one could care and be powerful simultaneously, for one

used power, not for one's own aggrandizement, but to uplift those who had less or no power.

Despite the unevenness, she tended to frame her use and pursuit of power in an ethic of caring. Mattie saw her control and authority, not as ends in themselves, but as ways to gain ground to build communication and trust; to achieve high expectations, integrity, and community; and to minister to the individuals---to realize a school and district where people were committed to caring for each other. And, as she gained ground for an ethic of caring, she contiguously prepared her way to "move up" within the traditional hierarchy.

Taking Power - Working with External Forces

To most people, Mattie's beginning as principal could not have had a better start. Everyone believed in her and seemed to support her. She also inherited new partnerships with university and local business groups who were committed to helping the school financially and educationally 'turn around' this urban school where students dropped out at an extraordinary rate [about 700 students began as ninth graders and only about 230 of that class would graduate], where students' academic achievement was considerably below the state and national averages, and whose students faced lives of poverty and violence. If Mattie were a poker player, she might have said that her year began with a full house. But, instead, the house was built of cards, standing an a weak foundation and precariously balanced. The outsiders saw only the facade, aiming their help at

strengthening portions that appeared weak; Mattie was concerned about the foundation and the quality of the whole design. Thus begins the story of my struggle to understand Mattie's use of power in terms of my perception of her as a caring leader.

Because she inherited the partnerships with the university and business groups, she also inherited their expectations. These expectations were based on several things: their initial contacts with the previous principal, their own assessments and assumptions about Division, and their own needs.

Mattie appeared to put as much effort into keeping those outsiders, that is, the university and business groups, at arm's length as she did into building relationships with the community and staff. She seemed to fear a 'take-over' by them. She believed their intentions were sincere, but there was a reality that they and her staff either were unaware of, or did not want to face. These groups were outsiders who had limited understanding of DHS and of the impact that the school's history had on the present. Their offers of money and help to teachers beleaguered by a lack of resources and burdened by the citizenry's negative perception of DHS; their expectations of immediate and dramatic change; and their assumptions that the DHS staff would want and need the same changes they thought necessary caused her to fear another round of school reform that would do nothing more than increase the patchwork that already existed. And because many faculty members desperately wanted to make positive changes for students, they viewed those offers of help uncritically. Mattie, therefore, used her authority as

principal to control the changes within DHS and the rate at which they would occur in order to give staff the time to identify its own and the school's needs. The university and the business groups both indicated they wanted to work with Division High, and Mattie wanted to be sure that is what happened.

> We are going to have to work out some things with [the university]. . . . So that we are up front with each other and we can work together. Things are going to evolve and with everything it takes time. It does take time. Staff members will determine how much and how soon. [It's] a very good program, good things started, but you can't push; it does take time. [MJ:10-2-91:1]

Throughout the year, Mattie emphasized that as much as the outside groups wanted to help, there were pressing issues within the school that needed her and the staff's attention. Unless those groups could understand that, their 'help' would be nothing more than a hindrance. Consequently, Mattie continued, as was interpreted by many faculty, to drag her feet--or even dig her heels in, according to some--to prevent major changes from occurring too rapidly and without proper forethought and planning. That is, she wanted to stop the idea of change from luring staff--and, ultimately, students--into a rocketing roller coaster ride of superficial programs that quickly plunged into nothingness.

> We have to be very careful not to push ahead things that are going to happen here. They are going to happen. It is a matter of time . . . . The longer you are here, you will understand some of the in-house things that we are going to have to work out. We cannot deal with the pressures from without until we are ready. There are staff members that are ready. They want to use the resources . . . . [But] you can't push. One of the things that you and I both know that there have been many good programs that are in what i

> call the education graveyard because we didn't prepare the market for them, we did not assess. It does take time. [MJ:10-2-91:1]

Since I was involved with the university-school partnership, Mattie visited with me, formally and informally, about her thoughts regarding the university's role at DHS. She recognized that Division needed assistance in order to make the magnitude of changes she envisioned, and that the partnership with the university had the potential to contribute to an improved school organization and curriculum. The idea of a collaborative effort was appealing to her. However, she also believed that no one, or no organization, was truly altruistic; if something was given, something was wanted in return. She sensed that the university team came with an agenda of its own. That in itself was not offensive. The problem for Mattie, however, lay in the fact that it was unspoken. There was a contradiction in terms: the university entered Division with the intent of collaboratively working to improve the school, that teachers and members of the university team would share information, and would work together shoulder to shoulder to discover what Division had and needed. But, instead, the university folks seemed to tell her and the staff about Division's needs.

Collaboration, she concluded, was not occurring. Rather, she saw the distrust that some DHS teachers had for the university-school partnership concept, and nothing being done by the university to allay that distrust; she perceived disorganization when university team members were unable to supply her with what seemed like obvious information--what was happening with the

projects involving DHS teachers and the team or who was going to be in the building at particular times; and she perceived unclear goals for the university-school effort when she received contradictory statements from various people [fn:11-4-91].

For five months after her appointment as principal, the university faculty treated Mattie as the invisible Black woman. No one from the university contacted her to discuss strategies for working together. No one from the university informed her of the work with faculty that had been done to date. No faculty members even paid her the courtesy of introducing themselves until mid-October, six weeks after school had begun, and five and a half months after university faculty began working with DHS teachers. Although Mattie made no mention of this, a close colleague of hers told me that Mattie felt she had been ignored primarily because she is Black. According to the colleague, Mattie believed the university staff simply expected her to be thrilled with their attentions and help. She had the feeling that she was being used as a pawn to reflect kudos those people would receive for helping a Black female principal put this poor, urban school 'on track.'

Whether or not the colleague's interpretation was accurate, the university's treatment of Mattie was an affront to her personally and professionally. It was obvious to me that Mattie struggled to remain dignified and professional as she entered into an inherited schooluniversity partnership with faculty whose behavior had been arrogant and unprofessional.

Throughout the year, Mattie felt a lack of professional respect and colleague-ship as university team members came in with their preplanned agenda. Despite the collaboration rhetoric, they, like in myriad school reforms of the past, would use the school to accomplish the tasks important to their goals. She did not see their understanding of her role as principal, nor did she experience their appreciation for her position as a new principal. [Although Mattie would not expect this, I would add, there was no appreciation of her ground-breaking role in Newtown as the first female high school principal.]

> I hope no one has developed something outside of us [DHS] and that [they] are going to push it in because that won't work either. That will not work. Each school is different. . . . There is a common vision, a common mission, but this school has to chart it's [own] course. Certainly with their help. We can't do it by ourselves. First, that is the thing. We do need help. Everyone does. I think that we ought to be excited about the notion that there seems to be a thrust. There seems to be the theme [that] people are now willing to come and join hands and work together, but you can't have a driving force. People will push back. You cannot have that plan already mapped out and say, "Now here it is. You fit around it." It just won't work. As a new principal, there is just so much I have to learn. So much I have to get under my belt and [I] just don't need any bickering, any pulling, or pushing or prodding. That is not what I had in mind when we looked at any group coming in. You want to help. What I said to staff is, on the other hand, "Now keep in mind when people spend their time and money, they must have a say in what is to take place. That is the other side of it." All of it takes time. . . . [W]e have to communicate and keep our eyes open and be very sensitive to a whole history for this particular school. [MJ:10-291:2]

Mattie also had concerns about DHS's partnership with the local business group. The representative committee came with good

intentions, but with limited knowledge regarding the functioning of schools, generally, and about Division High, specifically. The year prior to Mattie's becoming principal, the committee came to DHS with a proposal to fund teachers for innovative projects and/or to assist in projects just underway. The participants were to outline their projects/activities, giving the purpose, the student outcomes, and a detailed account of the needed resources, including funding. Several teachers saw the proposal as a way to involve students in activities, previously unavailable due to lack of funds, to strengthen students' understandings of a particular subject area; other teachers envisioned larger organizational changes--schools within a school--to better serve students; and still other teachers saw the proposal as a way to restructure their classes to better meet their own needs and to purchase equipment they wanted. There was little, if any, consideration as to how the individual proposals for teacher-initiated programs/activities would support the overall mission of the school, or how they would fit into the overall curriculum. In some cases, the proposals were quite self-serving, having no sound academic basis for students and no clear student outcomes. The committee, however, approved all proposals within 'financial' limits, and if they met reasonable timeliness and outcomes according to business standards.

For the long term, Mattie thought several of the proposed changes had merit. However, proposals requiring major changes were occurring so fast and furiously that not enough time and thought was given to how they all fit into the total picture of Division High.

She, herself, felt that because of the influence of the business group with its offers of funding, the pace set for change was much faster than she was comfortable with. She wanted the staff to think about what was important for the school as a whole; that is, Mattie was a need for individual teachers to think beyond their own wants and desires to the articulation of a project into the existing programs and projected goals for student learning. She did not see that happening.

She perceived the business group's offer of money to do 'things to improve student learning' to be a signal for the faculty, conditioned to function with minimal resources, to generate proposals for projects, regardless of their pedagogical and academic soundness, and regardless of how they articulated with other classes, courses, or projects. She sensed a feeling of urgency among the staff, as though the funding they would receive depended on the alacrity--not quality--with which they submitted their proposals. Mattie feared that some faculty members viewed money as the primary factor involved in making changes.

> People see money as a way of doing all of these things, not recognizing that it takes time and it takes hard work, and . . . you build a foundation and move from there. And that has not happened. . . . So, therefore, there were those who wanted to take advantage of the fact that we'll take your money, but we won't be accountable for anything. And that concerned me. But even that, we worked through that in knowing, the assurance that no one had a timetable, but we actually had to just go to full bloom. . . . [W]e could in fact take our time. [MJ:10-28-91:9,11].

Mattie's focus was on systematic change, keeping in mind the 'big picture,' the ways in which each new idea could affect the

total school. The representatives of the business community were infringing on this process. In fact, Mattie's perception seemed to be that rather than promoting collaboration, both the university and business groups were fragmenting the staff and programs even more. Their offers of funding and other material and human resources, although not undesirable, were to Mattie another hurdle put in her way of working with faculty.

> Because we had to sort out some things here, the staff will continue to have to learn to work together as a team. And you have superstars, here, as I see them. Superstars. They are wonderful people. They are committed for the most part, to kids. But they're superstars, each having his or her own agenda. [MJ:6-25-92:2]

She sensed that the university and business groups, although perhaps well-intentioned, were not, as she liked to say, "singing from the same hymn book" as she was. That is, they were operating at their own cadence and in tune to their own needs. That caused even more fragmentation among staff, as the two groups overlapped in their work with faculty, but functioned independently of each other and, in essence, of DHS.

Communication between the groups was limited at best. The communication that did exist occurred between the management levels of the groups. Within the university team, the people who actually worked with the teachers rarely were privy to the information exchanged at the higher levels of the bureaucracy. Lack of communication caused misunderstandings between DHS staff and representatives of each of the outside sources, as faculty often heard one thing from one group and another from the other. Like

deprived children, some teachers tried to play one group against the other to garner the most resources and/or support, or to exert pressure on the other group--or Mattie--for their particular project. Mattie felt squeezed in the middle of two feuding 'helpers.'

> But I also had [the university] at the same time, also having both the [local business group] and all of these groups not quite sure about each other and not quite sure about their agendas was overwhelming at first. It was a surprise, the fight--and fight is a strong word--disagreement over turf, I saw that very clearly . . . I saw that [the university] and the [local business group] were pulling at each other and not clear, not comfortable with each other. I think they got better. I think that they had to work together and so I believe that I was going to have to say some things very clearly to both, that you only have to get your acts together and that, cause we're [Division High] getting caught in the middle, and staff can see that. [MJ:6-25-92:2]

Given the above situations with the university and business partnerships, Mattie had two choices: either conform to their wishes and take what they offered--Division High did need the resources and the teachers were eager to cooperate--or resist and, perhaps, risk losing the resources and, possibly, her support from some faculty members. The latter action would effectively acknowledge a struggle between Mattie and the outside groups for control over--for power over--the changes made at DHS, which would, in effect, determine the future direction of the school and the leadership. The latter action also had the potential to set up a power struggle between Mattie and the faculty. Mattie chose to resist.

Mattie resisted by not overtly opposing their ideas for change, but by resisting their impositions and implicit demands. She

attended meetings called by the groups, particularly by the university, only at her convenience and, then rarely, if ever, staying for the entire time. She stipulated her rules determining her participation in the partnerships, particularly the university, and ignored situations or 'obligations' that did not meet those rules. She allowed people, including her own teachers, to 'spin their wheels' on projects she did not want begun at that particular time by encouraging them to work on their ideas and to get faculty support for them, while she stood passively by. The effect of the latter, despite support from the external groups, was either to dramatically limit the speed at which changes would occur, or to sound the death-knell for a project she appeared to not want to support.

I saw Mattie's resistance as a declaration of power--of her power to determine what, if any, influence the university and business groups would have at DHS. I perceived her silently announcing so all could hear that the right to change Division High School would remain with those who were a part of it--teachers, students, administrators, and parents. It appeared that she saw the need to exert power--authority and control--in order to someday effect caring.

The themes of 'hidden agendas' and of expecting too much too soon permeated Mattie's conversation from October through June. She felt having to deal with the two external groups added to the strain of learning her role and of trying to bring the staff together to determine the direction that Division High should go. The

university and local business groups demanded--not asked for--her time, her assistance, her cooperation--and her appreciation. There appeared to be an assumption within each of those groups that they would determine what was best for Division High School and they, therefore, would orchestrate the needed changes. Mattie, however, believed otherwise: she and the staff knew what was best for Division High and must be allowed to establish and pursue their own goals at their own speed. If the external groups truly wanted to assist, they had to learn to collaborate with her and the staff; they needed to make the effort to get to know the community of Division High School.

> In terms of my own expectation. . . . I have to say now wait. Wait. This is pretty much on time. This is pretty much, as things go. . . . And what I had to make sure, from my standpoint is that my boss [Curriculum Director for Secondary Education] was not expecting something, or the superintendent was not expecting something. And when I got that reassurance, that it does take time, and then, I also have to deliver that same message to the [business community and to the university] and say, "It takes time." Because I had a sense that there were some forces out there that were, and could be expected as having some unrealistic expectations [of us]. So during winter break, I spent some time-I won't go into all the details--a conference with [a business representative], [the head of the business group] the week before; I had a chance to talk with [the university representative], and I'm going to have a chance to talk with [the other university representative], and I'm going to have another conversation with [both of them]. . . . Having all of these people in here, and the tugs that are taking place . . . has made it [adjusting to her job as principal and attempting to initiate and make changes] even more difficult. . . . it drains the energy now. However, we have to deal with that. . . . [We're] not going to be driven because at least I've got to have that much of a sense of what's good for this building. . . . [W]e're going to do this [participate in changes with help from the university and the business community] slowly. Now we're going to talk about a

> real change and we talk about true change, it's going to take time. . . . If [the university people] are going to be here, if you're truly committed to [helping Division High School], then if you're talking about change, it's not going to be done [immediately]. We will start this. . . . We will start to see some real things by the time I leave here. . . . I've said the same thing to the [business community committee]. You see, what has really hurt is that some people have some agendas before they came here, and that's not going to work. Now we can play games. . . . we can play the game and some folks can take your money, but nothing [will really change]. . . . So we will determine what it is that we want people, resources to do. . . . What does the school need? . . . If you come already with a set of [changes] it will not work. **It will not work.** [Emphasis Mattie's.] So, I'm going to hold fast to that. . . . We certainly know that we have to do things differently [from other schools]. But, we have to assess what it is that we're doing now. But teachers, those who work in those classrooms, they'll determine. . . . The portion of what bothers me, really bothers me, there's not enough time. That's a serious mistake for you [the university] to come in and think it's going to happen overnight. That was a real concern when I came in, as I've said before, that someone was expecting miracles. . . . But to recognize that it [change] does take time, and history as an administrator has told me that it does, but that you're really setting yourself up if you will not allow that time. So, having the goals of learning the community--the community meaning the students, the staff--talking to everyone one on one, and getting a sense of purpose and mission, also the goal of actually learning [MJ:3-2-92:1,2,3,4; 6-25-92:1,2].

Mattie used her authority to 'protect' Division High from the power of those external to the school system and community. There was no question in her mind that she was responsible for the future of that building and would do all in her power to maintain control over DHS. If Mattie perceived the basis for collaboration as mainly rhetoric, perhaps she saw no other recourse than 'power over' until the others could hear her well enough to talk with her and not at her. She did not seem to be compromised by her use of power over,

viewing it as the means by which she could fend off forces that had the potential to undermine her goal of establishing Division High as a school that was fundamentally a place of caring.

Maintaining Power - Balancing School and District Bureaucratic Expectations

Working within the building's and school's bureaucratic system presented different set of concerns for Mattie regarding power. Unlike her confident use of 'power over' with groups external to the school system, she appeared to be uncertain about her use of 'power over' with those within the system. Her uncertainty arose, perhaps, from the effects of her past on the present. Throughout her career as an educator, Mattie prepared herself to be a high school principal by observing traditional administrators whom she admired, and by accepting mentorship as it was offered. Qualities she developed and honed included being highly organized; being well-prepared; leaving nothing to chance; accepting responsibility and accountability for what happens within the school; and having respect for the authority that came with the positions in the hierarchy [MJ:9-28-91; 3-2-92]. Those characteristics, she believed, would enable her to be an effective leader in the school, that is, one who confidently made decisions unilaterally, or who orchestrated the conditions by which they were made by herself and others.

When she became principal, the role, as she had envisioned it, no longer existed--but neither was there a new model for her to

follow. Division High had become a site-based managed school with shared decision making. Although those concepts were not clear concerning their meaning and implementation, the general understanding among staff seemed to be that school management and policy-making would be shared among many, with the principal as only one among the many. Mattie's job, therefore, was to make the transition between 'the leader' and 'leadership by many'--personally, as well as professionally. Making the transition required her to share leadership, yet continue to be accountable to the district for the happenings and decisions made within DHS. She faced the dilemmas of how much authority and control did she exert in order to find how much she needed to give up; how much decision making, and with whom, was she willing to share when she, alone, was held responsible to the district hierarchy; how did site-based management and shared decision making in one school work in a system that operated hierarchically? For Mattie, there was "nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous of conduct, or more uncertain in its success" than facing a new principalship at a site-based, shared decision making school.

To begin, site-based management [SBM] had not been enthusiastically supported by the majority of DHS's administrators and staff. The year before Mattie's appointment as principal, the superintendent proposed that DHS consider re-organizing to become site-based. Much discussion ensued for no one really understood what SBM would look like. The understandings ranged from some teachers' view that teachers would have total control of the

building, to others' view that teachers would make the decisions and administrators would carry them out [NN:5-18-92; MU:528-92]. Still others saw SBM as something in between--teachers, support staff, parents, and students working together to make decisions and to implement them [HF:1-23-92; 3-31-92].

After two votes of the entire staff, SBM was approved as the organizational structure of choice for Division High. The first vote showed that administrators, as well as many staff members, were not in favor of that change in organization; the second vote, according to some teachers, did not really change matters, except there was pressure from 'downtown' for DHS to become a site-based managed school. Therefore, administrators felt they had little choice but to vote in favor of adopting SBM, for becoming site-based managed was conditional on administrative support [QO:1-29-92:4; fn:12-4-91].

Although several teachers speculated that Mattie did not favor SBM, she stated otherwise [MJ:6-25-92t2]. She did not, however, embrace it without reservations and frustrations. Administrators from the district office informed her that there were guidelines for her to follow concerning the district's goals and expectations for SBM in individual buildings--although each school with SBM was to be unique and to develop SBM to suit its own purposes. She did not know who developed the guidelines or how, and she had not seen them as of the end of the school year.

> We're not there yet [site-based management]. And I think the district probably has not helped and I'm, not being critical of it. It's just it's so new. You know? It's so new and what the district has said,

> "Well, now, you go and you decide how you're going to operate. And you don't have to be the same as []High School. Or you don't have to have the same as [] -----You don't have to be.." And that's good, and yet it can cause for some confusion. So, right now, I'm not comfortable with how we operate. . . . No one has given me those guidelines [for SBM]. . . . I was told that there guidelines, and in terms of amendments and what, the 'what' has been spelled out. Someone told me that those guidelines were being drawn up and I asked for them yesterday, and someone told me that they were not quite ready. There was going to be a notebook that would be given [to us]. [MJ:10-28-91:3,5]

Confusion also resulted from the lack of common understanding among teachers and administrators throughout the district of what site-based management was and what could be expected through such school re-organization. Mattie, midway through the year reflected that after a year and a half of working with the concept of SBM, the school was still not site-based. There were expectations from the district administration of which faculty either were not aware or had lost sight; the roles of the steering committee members, including administrators, were unclear; and the specific course of action for DHS had not been determined.

> What we have now going on is not truly site-based. As the district defines it, it has to be focused on student achievement. You have some, some misunderstanding in terms of what [that is] and that's not to be critical. I mean that's to be expected. But we have to first define what it is. The other thing we have to do is determine what the role of the steering committee, our governance board, will be. . . . I see confusion. I see people really not having a full understanding. But most of all, it's too soon to expect anything. . . . We do have to chart our course. We have not done that yet. . . . We have gone in many ways and it strains us. But then, that has to happen [MJ:12-5-91:4].

Although there were no guidelines from the district for making the transition to SBM, Mattie believed her "bosses" had some ideas regarding the process--they may not have been able to explain it, but they would know it when they saw it happening. The expectations were murky. Rather than being continually prepared and organized, and knowing the direction she wanted to take for DHS, Mattie found herself having to come to grips with ambiguity.

There was ambiguity associated with the newness of her role as principal.

> If I have to say that I have a skill, a talent, is that I'm not a last minute person. I do try to stay ahead. But all of us come short, and I'm uncomfortable right now because normally I'm more on top of things and I know why I'm not because this is all new. . . . I finally, as principal, had to settle and resign myself to know that, when you come in [new], and when . . . change is going to occur, what you have is probably, for want of a better term, things are so unsettled first. I mean, even when we are changing our personal life, the things looks so unsettled, [and then] they start to fall in place. In my sense, I felt that it was really going to take a year to chart our course. [MJ:10-8-91:3; 12-591:4].

There was ambiguity resulting from the lack of clarity in her role during and after the transition to SBM. As the building principal, she continued to see herself as the final authority, the one who was responsible for all that occurred within the school; she referred to Division as "her" building. What happened at Division was a direct reflection on her as a professional and as a person. In addition, her personal feelings of responsibility were supported by the district administrators' very real expectations of her accountability to them for the management of Division. The result

was a division within herself. 'Being in charge' was contradictory to the 'shared' leadership espoused by SBM and the concept of shared decision-making. 'Being in charge' connoted 'power over,' that is, control and authority. 'Shared' leadership connoted 'empowerment,' or 'caring.' Mattie felt caught in the middle, between traditional beliefs and understandings of leadership, and an emerging, yet murky, vision of shared leadership; between the past and the future.

> You put a person in charge [with SBM] and yet, that's somewhat contradictory of the whole notion of a site-based management. But, I do know I have a sense of being responsible because, and how I know that is I get the telephone calls. . . . And when something has not been turned in, site-based or not, it's been very interesting. It's been very interesting. I get the call. And, so . . . I know that some things have not changed. That there is a feeling, I get the feeling that the principal is held accountable. . . . [U]ntil this whole notion changes and until I feel that the accountability [specific reference is being made to a teacher-initiated program that was approved through SBM] does not stop, the buck doesn't stop here, then I'm going to have to know who's leaving here with whom, and what they're going to do, how they're going to get back here and what is it going to do for the students. [MJ:10-8-91:6]

Mattie continually "check[ed] with my boss" [MJ:10-28-91;4] to make sure that she was on track with SBM and that the district administration was not expecting more than Division was accomplishing. Although experiencing frustration because of the contradictory position created for her by the district administration, she was supportive and loyal to her "bosses." She looked to her immediate supervisor, the Director of Secondary Education, for guidance and support, and repaid him with respect and loyalty. She did not question his authority, and saw herself as

having to "pay my dues" in order for her, as a newcomer in her position, to earn the respect and authority from those above her [MJ:9-10-91:12; 6-25-92].

Conversely, SBM caused conflict between Mattie and some teachers, especially those who were strong unionists. As previously mentioned, there was a history of anti-administration sentiment escalated by strong union influence. From its inception at Division, the steering committee, the governance body of SBM, was dominated by active union members. Mattie--and many teachers--felt that the union pushed for SBM as a way to take over the schools. However, very few of DHS's steering committee members who were active in the union viewed SBM as a way for teachers to totally control the school, nor did most want to run it [steering committee members' perceptions of SBM will be discussed in the following chapter]. The attitude of the few who did feel that way, however, prompted Mattie to react in some ways that left no doubt about who was in authority, and that she backed the district's right to mandate Division's compliance--SBM or not--with policy.

> Now one person I think really feels that [SBM] means that you get rid of. . . . The principal has no role, or [no administrator] has any say. If you want to do it, you do it. Well. . . . I don't believe that. But you have two [other] people on there [steering committee] who feel very strongly that this school is truly site-based and that nobody else [referring to the district administrators] is going to give us any direction. Well, I know that that's not true. Now, no one has told me that, but I know that that's not true. We're not there yet. [MJ:10-28-91:3]

Mattie became impatient with teachers' thinking and talk about site-based management and shared decision making as solely a

mechanism through which they might gain more--or most--control of the school. In terms of the district mandates and Mattie's thoughts,

> . . . the whole notion of site-based is focused on student achievement. Now what it is not, is . . . not managing the building. . . . All of our endeavors with regard to site-based shared decision making has to be focused on this, on student achievement. How, what is it that we want to do to make learning, make it better for students in the classroom. . . . We have to have a common vision, which we don't [MJ:3-2-92:6].

Mattie, on the other hand, seemed to treat the steering committee of SBM rather cavalierly, attending meetings at her convenience and with little communication to members regarding when and why she would not be in attendance. Only the chair knew if or when she would be present. She did send another administrator to represent her, but that was insufficient for the teachers, as the representatives had virtually no authority to speak for her [fn:1-92; 3;92: EK:3-31-92:11]. The direction and the primary purpose of SBM--improving student learning-consequently was derailed in favor of topics that focused on the process of SBM and decisions having as their bottom line, teacher-administrator tug-o-war over building control. Mattie's response was that she was unable to be at all meetings and, therefore, delegated others [MJ:10-2892:3,4]. When she chose to attend a district athletic meeting over a steering committee meeting, however, hostility escalated among those very people with whom she said she wanted to build trust.

As much as Mattie maintained a power over position in relation to SBM, she struggled to understand how to share power through the

development of her role and the teachers' roles in the transition to SBM. She cited as progress the proposal which developed the mechanism by which faculty could initiate changes through SBM. She recognized the lack of role definition within SBM, and that, specifically, her role on the steering committee was nebulous. The latter was a problem. While staff members looked to her for direction, thus maintaining her authority, she simultaneously garnered hostility for not allowing teachers to make decisions autonomous of her.

> [W]e'll have to establish some boundaries somewhere, and we have not done that. . . . And I've said that to the staff, in the absence of some written guidelines, some spelled-out guidelines that we have mutually agreed upon---we haven't got that. So we're gonna . . . each step over those lines [boundaries] until we do that, and that's going to take some time also. Some give and take [MJ:1028-91:3].

Several teachers include teacher control of the budget--sans staff salaries--as an integral part of SBM. On numerous occasions, including the steering committee retreat [discussed in the following chapter], teachers requested Mattie to share the budget with them [EK:6-1-92:1; GS:6-9-92:5]. Mattie consistently said she did not have that information, or did not have an adequate understanding of the budget process to share it with the committee. As the year progressed, teachers continued to ask about the budget but narrowed their requests until they asked only about the money taken in from the pop machines. Mattie promised she would provide that information to the steering committee; at the end of the school year, the committee did not have it.

Budget information was a touchy subject for Mattie, one that was intricately connected to her integrity, her relationship to the district office, and her knowledge of past history at Division High.

Several years ago a principal was accused of embezzling funds from several sources within the school. Although the incident was covered up, the principal was removed from his position at DHS and transferred to another position where he could be monitored more easily. Veteran teachers of DHS recall the incident quite vividly [fn:5-26-92].

Mattie never mentioned the incident to me, nor, to my knowledge, did she discuss this with members of the steering committee. She, however, quite emphatically linked her integrity to her accountability, especially as it related to budgetary matters and the steering committee. She also, emphatically, refused to communicate to the steering committee or any group of teachers the budget information they requested. There was no doubt in anyone's mind--especially Mattie's-- that teachers would not have control of the budget unless she was so instructed by her superiors.

> [T]he one [] thing that I cannot give up at this moment, as I'm thinking, is this business of, of financial matters. That will kill credibility, that will kill us. Well, that will kill me, and credibility is so. . . . **Integrity**, that's the word I'm looking for. Integrity is important to me. It's so very important and 1 just know when you start to deal with money matters, that if it's not handled correctly--and that's a big one--a lot of things are going on in a school in a lot of ways and right now, I cannot turn that over to a committee of people yet. I do it to some degree. There has to be an accounting . . . making sure that every penny goes where it's supposed to go when it's supposed to go. That would be the one thing. And I'm more conscious of that, I guess, because of how I feel about integrity. And money can

> tear up a church; it can tear up a family; it can tear, I mean it really can. Although our mission is to deal with students and what happens with students, and that's where I truly feel that I want to impact. And that's where we can have this collaboration and we can jointly work together. **But, money matters!** (emphasis hers) [MJ:10-28-91:5]

Site-based management and shared decision making were imposed, in reality, on Division High and, therefore on Mattie. With the exception of her community building through her church contacts and with parents, her other goals were overshadowed by the time and effort she had to spend on SBM. Although Mattie said she believed in collaboration and sharing the decision making, I question whether she would **choose** SBM as the method by which to implement them.

> [My] actually learning [about] and pushing site-based, shared decision making. . . . that demands a lot more time than I had expected. And in just a traditional mold . . . it's easy, because you don't have to talk and work and collaborate and all of that. That's, it's a lot of work. And if anyone thinks that it [site-based management, shared decision making] isn't more work, then you're barking up the wrong tree. . . . [S]ite-based shared decision making, I believe in it. I believe that it can work and it's my personal philosophy, but it does take a lot of time. . . . One surprise that I had, I had to back off of the amount of time that it was taking, not only with site-based shared decision; that was just one component. [MJ:6-25-92:2].

Within the district bureaucracy, Mattie's commitment to establishing a caring community often became subsumed in the maintenance of the power of her position. The expectations, stated and implied, by the district administrators regarding her development of site-based management, and of her improvement of Division High School in general; her struggle to retain the vision of herself as a competent administrator while in the midst of change

which tested her capabilities to deal with instability, ambiguity, and continual challenge to her authority; and attention to the recognition that, as a woman, she felt the tendency to drive herself to prove to those at the top of the bureaucratic hierarchy that she was worthy to be the first female high school principal in Newtown [MJ:9-10-91:11] --- these all tested--and compromised--her power to build a caring community for Division High.

Pursuing Power - Climbing the Hierarchical Ladder

At the same time that Mattie pursued a course to establish an ethic of caring within Division High, she also was cognizant of establishing her own power--to earn respect that would broaden her scope of authority and to advance in the hierarchy of the school district. There is a tendency to view the establishment of one's own power as simply self-serving and at the expense of others. Conversely, the establishment of an ethic of caring implies that one acts out of altruism and that 'power over' is virtually absent. Mattie's case was not nearly so clear cut. As she strove to build relations and to nurture faculty and students, she also strove to further herself.

Mattie's goal was to become a high school principal. She worked her way into the position, moving up the career ladder, one step at a time. Arriving at her goal, however, did not mean that she was content to simply be principal. Although she did not evidence any ambition to become a district administrator, many of

the faculty speculated that her position at DHS was a stepping stone in that direction. Whether or not that was the case, Mattie was aware of the need to build her power base as a principal in the district and in the region--she wanted to be an influence among her peers.

As she reflected on her first regional secondary school principals' meeting, she commented that because there were so few females in the organization, she had to be aware of networking with the males. Her inclination was to arrive at the meetings in time to comfortably get settled before the business actually began. She learned, however, that if she wanted to have an impact on that group, she would have to leave her work at DHS, arriving at the meeting site early so there would be time to 'visit' with others prior to the meeting. Choosing to build her political network took her away from the building, which had the consequence of decreasing the amount of time she had to spend with DHS faculty and staff building the one-on-one relationships she believed were so important [fn:9-11-91].

There were two driving forces behind Mattie's decision to network. The first was to gain support on a wider basis for the need to build trust, not only in her school, but among schools so that teachers and administrators would work more closely and share ideas and thoughts about how to better prepare students. The second was that she could better "climb the executive ladder" [MJ:9-10-91:11].

Mattie worked hard to build her power base within the district by working closely with her "bosses" and with the community. By

doing that, she garnered support from them for grief counseling for students and teachers, for the student crisis intervention program, and for academic honors convocations for students. There was also speculation that her growing reputation in the district and community lead to significant input into the selection of principals to fill the vacancies occurring in the district because of the early retirement buy-out. Of the total number of vacancies, at least seven of the people who applied were either from Division or from her former school, and of those seven, four were female. They were people that Mattie mentored or who had similar values and beliefs concerning education [fn:8-5-92].

For Mattie, power and caring mingled, integrated, and became inextricably entwined. She was a powerful care-giver.

MATTIE JOHNSON - POWERFUL CARE-GIVER

As I listened to the tape of the December interview with Mattie, the strain in her voice was evident. My fieldnotes [fn:12-5-91:1] indicated that in answering my question regarding her perceptions about the changes faculty wanted at DHS and whether or not they saw any, Mattie became very serious and all business. She appeared uncomfortable--perhaps even fighting defensiveness--having to admit that everything was not running smoothly, and that, although she did not like it, she had to learn to function in a position and a situation that were not clearly defined. When she told me early in September that "once I get through this year, then I can know more of what to expect" [MJ:9-1091:3], her smile and

ebullient laugh then implied that she could not believe that she would not always have a clear direction in sight.

The pressure she felt manifested itself visibly in her look, her stance, and her voice. This once ebullient woman, with a laugh that resounded throughout the building, became more tense and controlled as the months progressed. When I listened to the tape again, I felt myself tighten and become almost frightened in response to the intensity of her voice. I could recall sitting in her office. Although her posture was normally dignified, she now appeared to me to be stiff, rigid, steel-willed, and immovable. Anger--perhaps frustration--seemed to boil within her, but, because of her enormous self-control, was translated into carefully monitored statements and responses. She exhibited power-to fight for an ethic of caring? The spontaneous, genuine smiles became 'proper' smiles, and her eyes were hard and set.

Reflections on Mattie's Understandings of Power

Mattie's education in leadership principles and behaviors occurred in the bureaucratic setting of school. She rose through the hierarchy-teacher, department chairperson, assistant principal, deputy principal, and finally, principal. Her former principal mentored her. She learned to lead, to take charge, to make decisions, and to take responsibility for her decisions. She developed vision for the 'big picture' of schools. She respected

the authority of positions within the hierarchy. She respected power as it related to position.

Mattie was ambitious. She was charismatic. She was visionary. She was caring. And she wanted the power associated with the capacity of principal to ensure the development of her vision.

Mattie had a vision for the school. She hoped for the day that students, faculty, and community members would be proud to be associated with DHS. She also envisioned DHS as an integral part of the neighborhood community. Her dream depicted Division as contributing to the social and economic welfare of the community through better education of its students' by opening its doors to people within the neighborhood, making it truly a community school; and by seeking parental advice for and participation in their children's education.

I believe that Mattie did not see power and caring as dichotomous, but as concepts working together to enable the realization of the vision which would empower black students and, ultimately, the black community. Through various interviews, she indicated that teachers did not understand the necessity of the need for high expectations of themselves and students; that she had to find ways to convince them of the need for excellence. She talked about her responsibility to make them understand, implying the use of power.

Mattie also understood the bureaucracy as necessary for order and justice to predominate. Her thrust was the need for a leader/principal who had vision to see the big picture, to ensure

that faculty ideas fit into the big picture, and to manage the school efficiently and effectively. Her stance was that until the district changed its organization, she would not give up any power that would endanger the school's or her position in the district.

At the risk of forcing an interpretation of power on Mattie, I would propose that Mattie's discussions of caring and power and her ensuing actions could be described as pursuing a liberational ethic of caring. She used her power to attempt to empower black students and the black community.

The following chapter looks at the staff and how they react to caring and power; how they care for each other; how they enact power over their peers; and how they respond to Mattie's caring and power.

CHAPTER SIX

THE STAFF: WARY CARE TAKERS?

> The word 'change.' . . has been given a new meaning: it no longer means a new stage of coherent development (as it was understood by Vico, Hegel, and Marx), but a shift from one side to another, from front to back, from the back to the left, from the left to the front . . .
>
> Milan Kundera
> Immortality

> . . . freedom shows itself or comes into being when individuals come together in a particular way, when they are authentically present to one another (without masks, pretenses, badges of office), when they have a project they can mutually pursue. . . . There must be a coming together of those who choose themselves as affected and involved. There must be an opening of a space between them . . . deeper and more significant than merely practical or worldly interests.
>
> Maxine Greene
> The Dialectic of Freedom

The faculty at Division is experienced, graying, and 'reform-smart.' Most have been in the district long enough to have seen school reforms come and go, and cycle again. With each 'new' change, there is a predictable mixture of mild excitement, cynicism, and apathy. The year Mattie became principal, however, was

different. The faculty, as a whole, allowed themselves to hope. They saw opportunity for a "coming together" of staff, administration, student body, and community to effect changes at Division High that were "deeper and more significant" than simply another educational reform.

In Mattie Johnson, they anticipated a leader who would establish an environment that would be conducive to building trust among the various groups throughout the school; who would work with staff to ensure the success of site-based management and shared decision making; and who held academic excellence for students as a primary goal. Above all, the staff members wanted to see in Mattie the person who would care enough about them that she would "take risks" [NQ: 3-4-92:7], and who would stand up to "Downtown" in order to support her faculty and staff to do what is best for Division High School. The staff looked forward to making changes, with Mattie's help that, in essence, would produce an ethic of caring in Division High School.

The atmosphere at DHS seemed ripe for the development of an ethic of caring. Mattie recognized that staff needed nurturing and support, both personally and professionally; she viewed her role as the "onecaring" (Noddings, 1984). The staff, recognizing their need to be cared for, looked to her leadership to direct the changes that would lay the foundation for trust, a trust that would serve as the basis for cooperation and collaboration between them and administrators, and, ultimately, for their own empowerment. But,

were they and Mattie really, as Mattie would say, "singin' from the same hymn book?"

From Noddings' (1984), perspective, caring has relation as its ontological basis and "the caring relation as ethically basic." (p. 3) Within the caring relation is a set of ordered pairs: the "one-caring" and the "cared-for." (p. 4) In order for caring to exist, the development of reciprocity between the one-caring and the cared-for must occur. That is, in order to care and be cared for, both parties must contribute to the relation. The one-caring must somehow feel completed in the cared-for if the relationship will be depicted as caring. The one cared-for, is not simply a vessel to receive caring, but must be willing to acknowledge the caring as such and, also, be willing to care in return.

Additionally, the one-caring must be willing, at times, to suspend justice, that is, the adherence to rules or regulations designed to ensure fairness via objectively judging a situation by criteria applied to all like situations. The one-caring is required to see each situation as unique and, therefore, cannot be bound by compliance to set regulations or directives.

In this chapter and the next, I will look at the relationships between Mattie and the staff, and among the staff members, themselves, in terms of an ethic of care. Is there a reciprocal relation between Mattie as one-caring, and the staff members as the cared-for? Are there reciprocal relations of the one-caring and the one-cared for within the staff? Is an ethic of caring, different from an attitude of caring, being developed? Is it possible for

caring and power to be so integrated that there is difficulty in producing the reciprocal relationship Noddings indicates is necessary for an ethic of care to exist? Or, conversely, is power needed in order to produce caring relationships that are reciprocal?

To begin addressing these questions, this chapter will focus on the staff. How do the staff members understand and interpret caring for themselves? Is there reciprocity in terms of caring among themselves and between them and Mattie? Do staff members see receiving and giving care as gaining power, that is, becoming empowered? Can power/empowerment be a necessary factor of an ethic of caring? Or are caring and being cared for subsumed in power-as-control?

I will examine the staff, through their voices and through my observations and interpretations, in several ways. First, I will look at the staff from the perspective of one body, that is, from the perspective of common concerns about their understandings, interpretations and need for caring. Following that section, I have chosen three groups within the staff to probe for their understandings and interpretations concerning their specific and, perhaps, different, needs for caring. Coming from a post-structuralist feminist stance, it is important for me to recognize the differences within and among the staff.

IN NEED OF CARING

The Staff as One Body

Common themes and issues surfaced among the general staff regarding their need for caring. Two main themes that incorporated many issues were 1) the lack of trust within the staff and between staff and administrators; and 2) the difficulty of caring for students.

For Lack of Trust

Virtually each staff member interviewed indicated, either directly or indirectly, the lack of trust within their ranks. The suggestion was that the distrust among them limited the ways in which they did or did not collaborate as professionals, and restricted their personal interactions. Fragmentation of the staff, as a result of 'unfriendliness,' extreme individualism, and poor communication among the staff and between staff and administration were foundational to the inability of staff members to trust one another.

Fragmentation

The reality of a severely fragmented staff appeared to result in even greater isolation than Lortie (1986) and Jackson (1975) identify as problematic for teachers, for isolation extended beyond the classroom. Social groups were hard to identify among the faculty. Few people made attempts to construct relationships,

personal or professional, and rarely did the latter occur without mandates.

> There are some of the 'old guard,' some older male faculty, who meet in the custodians' lounge for a few minutes before classes every morning, and a lot of the math teachers get together in the teachers' lounge. But, generally, people have to really seek [teacher's emphasis] their cliques. It's hard to know who hangs with who. I usually eat lunch in my room, or sometimes with []. I don't even know who eats together, let alone who socializes with who. I don't think many people at [Division] get together personally. We just work here. And we need to do more than that. That's why we don't work together--we don't know one another so we don't trust one another. [HF:1-23-92:1]

A teacher who had taught in the Newtown system for over twenty-five years, and who had taught in a variety of schools, had this to say about the relationships at DHS:

> There was a group that were basically what I would call the original group, or close to the original group, that had been here a long time. They seem to form a clique. Some of the departments, it was interesting, some of the departments [are supportive] and some are not. I think the math department is a very tight clique and very supportive of each other. Probably the tightest clique in the building. I think some of the people in the science department are, and then some are just not a part of that at all. That's another clique. . . . But, there is no central meeting place. That's another problem. [We] have all these little places people can go to gather, where . . . it's often hard to find people . . . I don't really spend time with a lot of people in the building. . . . And I would say that's pretty much the [same for most] of the group here. . . . I try to keep . . . the relationships professional. I don't seek out people that I'm not going to spend time with outside the building. . . . [T]his is the first high school I've been in. And, I found it one of the loneliest experiences of my life when I walked in here . . . and I've been here thirteen years. [NQ:3-4-92:16,17]

Other teachers note the lack of friendliness among the staff and attribute it to the size of the building and to a lingering

reaction to the desegregation process. The perception is that because of friendliness, it is difficult for staff to work together.

> I see people in this building that can't stand each other all the time, to the point that they don't even speak. You know, you walk by like they don't exist . . . And there's something really wrong here. I mean there's something **really** [emphasis the teacher's] wrong here. [HF:6-8-92]

> This school has never been a real friendly staff. From the time we started I think people were too separated; we never see anybody, you know. You can teach for a whole year but the person that's on the other side of the building, you don't even know who the person is. And it's always been like that here. [Before the desegregation riots] we had a six hour day, with lunches and everybody, almost all the teachers ate during [] period. And you saw more people. Then we went through a period, you know, after the riots, where we'd have a five hour day, and all the kids went home, and then everybody had sixth hour planning and we ate in our rooms. Cause they didn't serve any lunches, you know, you saw very few people. And I don't think teachers have ever totally bounced back . . . [NN 5-18-92:2]

> Well, we've been talking about getting along together, you know, the idea of the perception of trust and everybody sharing decisions . . . we've got ninety people here and they're all different, you know, coming together, this is difficult to get that many people to sit down and agree to work together. . . . We still aren't together. . . . We're still not working together. We still go off our own way. That's part of that is just simply the size of this. You get that many people. . . . See, prior to being here, I worked at a school where we had maybe thirty staff members. Thirty people will sit down and talk to each other. Ninety people don't do this very easily. [IZ:3-17-92:2,3]

Fragmentation resulted from the staff's individualism. Some teachers did not to want to identify with a group personally or professionally, and some were seen to view needs and change for Division from only one perspective--their individual one.

> We're a very fragmented staff. . . . It's just a very unique setup. . . . I kind of, myself, I feel like a loner, and I, I'd like to stay that way. I don't want to be a part of, of a particular group. I'd like to, you know, I'm a people person, not a group person. I guess I would say it that way. I don't do well in groups and cliques and things. And, and we're just that way here. [QM:1-29-92:1,2]

> People . . . [in this building] are so quick to judge. And they were so quick to say you know, somebody's a sell-out, and, you know, stupid and, I mean just those really, really hurtful things. . . . And it's not based on anything but what you want--"Well I think it should be happening this way." Well, that's one I in the building of one hundred. What does everybody else want? [HF:6-8-92:8]

The individualism of the staff serves further to alienate people and to increase power struggles among themselves, as well as between staff and administration. Not only do teachers have difficulty envisioning the 'big picture,' but they resist working together. A teacher generally described the way in which committee leadership is carried out. People volunteer for leadership positions, but rather than following procedures of working with the whole committee, the 'leader' accomplishes the tasks s/he thinks need to be done through informal contact. Often, decisions are made and actions carried out without the knowledge of other committee members and without the consensus of the faculty as a whole. The result is that decisions are too often made unilaterally by individual staff members, with the perception by others that the decision was made in light of particular people's needs rather than those of the faculty or entire school.

> There are a lot of people who assume leadership roles and they tend to make contacts with other people to get things done. They don't follow the process <u>they</u> have set up and the line is too often blurred between

> informal conversation and outright action. What I mean is that decisions are made in a vacuum. People are thinking about their own classes rather than everything that occurs in the building; they don't want to compromise. There are too many agendas. [HF:1-30-92:1]

An example of these unilateral decisions concerned the efforts of the lead teacher in an academy that was in its initial stages of implementation. Students were pulled from other classes to fill the academy's classes; students were transported to work-sites outside the school without following legal protocol; and teachers not a part of the academy did not know that students would miss their classes for academy internships. The teacher in question was so focused on building the academy that he did not think about the effects his decisions had on the rest of the staff. The result was that other teachers resisted active support for **any** academy, referring to this one with disdain and the reason for their distrust of similar efforts [fn:MJ:].

Inadequate Communication

Faculty members stated that insufficient and inadequate communication was a serious problem, especially between administration and faculty. Teachers said that they often found out about incidences, students, or policies at Division through the Newtown newspaper or from students. The main source of information in the school appeared to be daily announcements over the P.A. Several teachers felt that this was inadequate because the sound was often

not clear, and the noise level from student talking often prevented people from hearing the announcements

> [C]ommunication is usually over announcements, which are very hard to hear, because the kids are totally disinterested. . . . Sometimes when things are going wrong, you know, like things, incidents in the rest of the building, we hear a lot of rumors, but you never really know what's happened. And then we always find out from the [Newtown] paper. We've had some problems here. [NN:5-18-92:3]

Inadequate communication contributes to teachers' distrust of one another and of administrators because needed information is often not received. If teachers do not have necessary information, they often are excluded from decision making. A sense of frustration and isolation results, and, more importantly, there is the sense of exclusion from decisions. At Division, the latter intensifies the lack of trust, fragmenting and isolating staff members further.

> Until three or four years ago, everything was in writing. If we had a meeting, everybody knew it, they had a copy of it, they knew when and where it was. Now a lot of it is just kind of by guess. Very, very little is ever put in writing. I have felt this year that I have less information available to me than I'd ever had before. As far as knowing what's going on and when it's going on and if I'm supposed to be someplace at a certain time, what is that place then? For example, as at the beginning of the school year, it was said the department chair meetings will be the, whatever, fourth Wednesday of the month. I don't remember which one. The counselling meetings will be this day of the month. I wrote all of those down, just so I'd remember them. Several times they've been canceled and changed, but there's been no written communication that that's happened, and I hear a rumor about it so I would call one of the other people that's supposed to be involved and find out what they've heard and then we'll track down the information. And the person who has made the change may remember to tell some people. Often I'm

> forgotten because I'm back in the corner and it's easy to forget back there. But it, there is no good communication system. [NQ:3-4-92:1,2]

The lack of a "good communication system" is a major contributor to the maintenance of historically adversarial relations between administration and staff. Lack of communication between these two bodies regarding decision making has caused staff to become bitter and even more distrustful of administrators.

At the beginning of the year, staff members had hope that the new administrative team would work on building trust on all levels in the building. Toward the end of the year, they felt that there was even less exchange of information than in previous years. Teachers heard about decisions after they were made, and received little or no explanation concerning why a particular tack was taken; administrators asked teachers for input on decisions, then appeared not to use it, making the teachers feel used and patronized; the principal promised to have more communication with teachers, individually, but they felt they had less than in previous years. These feelings have lead to bitterness and less trust between administrators and teachers. One teacher's assessment of this issue seems to incorporate the essence of many teachers' comments.

> I think that a lack of trust amongst us has been a problem for a long time and I don't think it's any better than it's ever been. A good part of that is due to a lack of communication. It's my opinion, it is extremely important to make sure that everyone knows what's going on, to make sure that whenever possible, decisions are made by the group because then people buy into them. When a decision has to be made and it cannot be made by the group, either because it must be done in an emergency situation or because it's one of those things that fall strictly under the realm of administration, I think it's very important to let the staff

> know that the decision was made, why it was made, and why it could not be a joint decision-making effort. I think it's also very important to make sure that everyone knows what's going on in the building. Those things, in my opinion, are not happening. . . . Plus, decisions are made and sometimes I think there's a very legitimate reason for making those decisions, but because no one knows why they were made, it makes it very easy for mistrust to continue to, because there's already a problem with mistrust in the building. So when a decision is made and everyone is left to their own interpretation of why that decision was made, usually we don't come up with the best interpretations in the world. [NQ:3-4-92:1,2]

Finally, a teacher commented that by not knowing why Mattie is doing what she is doing, teachers are frustrated and returning to the belief that administrators don't care about the them. The staff disbelieved the rhetoric about collaboration, for they believed Mattie determined **which** decisions were made collaboratively, and which she made unilaterally, and, with no explanation.

> I am expecting, and this may be unrealistic, I am expecting when I go in [to talk with Mattie] and say, "[Mattie], when you were in the halls, when you were here every day and you were in the halls, and the kids knew you were in the halls and the staff knew you were in the halls, things ran more smoothly than they have in years. When you are not there, things do not run smoothly." I'm expecting her go back out . . . I'm expecting her to get rid of this other junk she' doing and go back and do the things that she was doing to start to turn the building around. Which, you know, that may be very unrealistic for me to expect that to happen. But I guess the other thing I'm expecting or that I'd like to have happen, if she can't do that, if she's involved in other things that she can't get out of, I want her to tell me what those are and why she can't get out of them, [emphasis mine] even though she doesn't have an answer, I know she doesn't, she's not obligated to do that. [emphasis mine] I would feel less frustrated, and I think that's what I'm talking about by communication. [NQ:3-492:17]

Through this latter teacher's voice, I sensed that communication meant much more than conveying information or giving encouragement and support. I believe she was asking for caring that required Mattie to trust her. Although Mattie was not obliged to disclose the reasoning behind her decisions, doing so would be showing caring to the teacher; it would be evidencing trust. By trusting the teacher, Mattie would also be opening the door to a reciprocal relation of caring that is all encompassing and critical to an ethic of caring: Mattie would allow herself to be the one-cared for by the teacher, who would then assume the role of the one-caring.

Lack of trust, generally, permeated DHS. Some teachers attributed it to an extremely fragmented staff; others said the lack of staff unity was the result of distrust. An inadequate communication system limiting--and often preventing--staff members' receipt of information also contributed to a growing distrust, leaving many people feeling isolated, inadequate, and powerless.

Staff members not only grappled with the latter in their relationships among themselves and with administrators, but with their connections to students.

To Care for Students

Staff members needed caring themselves in order to care for students. Professionally, many teachers felt pressure from the community and from school reforms to improve student learning. Yet, when they tried to improve student learning and achievement, they

received little or no support from colleagues and administrators for their efforts, or worse, they were criticized and stymied in their attempts.

Personally, staff members struggled with the trauma and violence of many of their students' lives. Recognizing the impact of their students' lives on their own was an unspoken issue with teachers as they discussed their relationships with students.

In this section, I will look at teachers' perceptions of their relationships and responsibilities to students and the way students' lives affect teachers and what they do in schools.

High Expectations for Students

Teachers were frustrated in their efforts to care for students. Frustration evolved from expectations for student achievement and learning. There seemed to be general agreement among the administration and staff that expectations and standards for students were not high enough. Yet, individual teachers or groups of teachers who attempted to ameliorate that situation seemingly did not receive the support needed. Recall the teachers who tried to develop the school-within-a-school and ninth grade team concepts. All felt unsupported and uncared-for by their peers and principal regarding the most important aspect of teaching: the continual pursuit of better ways to teach and learn.

Members of the mathematics department supported one another in their setting and maintenance of high standards for all students taking math, regardless of level. They, however, did not believe

other staff members and administrators supported them in their expectations for high student achievement. In fact, they seemed to feel that administrators attempted to dissuade them by pressuring them to pass students if they attended regularly and did not cause trouble; and that counselors discarded their standards by placing students in classes the math teachers indicated were inappropriate for particular students. Although supported by their own department members, the math faculty regularly was the recipient of snide comments--"Who do they think they are, holding such high standards?" "Do they think they're better than other departments?" "They can't tell us what classes to put these kids in"--from other teachers and from counselors. [SQ:5-18-92:2] The result is that the members of the math department have formed a tight bond amongst themselves, and a we-against-the-rest-of-the-school attitude.

Student Attendance

Teachers are frustrated by high student absenteeism. At the same time they talk about raising standards, they are agonizing over ways to keep kids coming to school and resentful of the criticism they receive for students not learning even the 'basics.' [The ninth grade team concept was conceived because of the extreme absenteeism and high dropout rate of ninth graders.] A social studies teacher showed me the daily absent sheet for DHS: 176 ninth graders; 65 tenth graders; 33 eleventh graders; and 30 twelfth graders were absent that day. On that same day in his ninth grade classes alone, there were fourteen absences out of thirty-five

students registered; sixteen out of thirty-one, second hour; and ten out of thirty-three, third hour. He commented laconically, "[I]f students are not here, you don't have any bodies, you can't teach. You can't teach without bodies." [NG:5-19-92:7]

When I asked him about the failure rate in his classes due to absenteeism, his reply was sardonic:

> The school board has a ruling that I may fail students after fifteen days [of absenteeism in one semester] if the work is not made up. But, we kind of bend the rules here. . . . As long as [a student] does half the work . . . or a little more [he passes]. This is what we talk about, lowering standards. [NG:5-19-92:7]

Ironically, although teachers are distressed by the high absenteeism, they bemoan the fact that the new assistant principal in charge of discipline is not suspending students from school. The teachers feel that he is not supporting them by keeping students in school when they are sent to the discipline office. Staff compare him to his predecessor, currently the deputy principal, who was "strong and dished out punishments and suspensions to keep the kids in line. [The current assistant principal] is a fool. He's not doing his job on discipline." [KG:1-23-92:2] Faculty resent his sending the students back to their classroom, feeling that if they could have dealt with them in the first place, they would not have sent them to the discipline office.

To better manage the discipline situation, the steering committee of SBM appointed a committee to investigate ways of keeping students in school. The committee recommended in-school suspension. That required hiring someone to monitor those students

and was, therefore, unacceptable, as the school board stipulated that teachers could do anything within SBM as long as it did not cost money. The committee presented an alternative plan which increased each teacher's class size by two students so that one teacher would be free each hour to monitor the in-school suspension room. There were so many complaints from teachers that the proposal did not even go to the steering committee. [HF:6-8-92] Teachers, generally, were most upset about the failure of support for the committee's recommendations. However, their interpretation of support referred to the board's adamant stance not increase the budget to provide for another hire; few staff members referred to the alternative proposal. There seemed to be the question of did staff really care about students and if so, how much.

Teachers battle a sense of futility as they try to keep kids in school, raise their expectations for students, and raise standards for student achievement, while simultaneously running into roadblocks from colleagues and administrators. The teachers, by and large, do care in various ways and to different degrees about their students. But, for each attempt they make at caring, I believe they are expending as much energy fighting for the right to care.

Students' Personal Lives

Conversely, teachers sought to maintain distance between themselves and students in order to protect themselves, not from violent acts, but from caring too much. As in Kotolowitz's (1990?) book, There Are No Children Here, trauma and violence were part of

the everyday lives of many students at DHS. The effects and residuals of that trauma and violence became part of the teachers' lives. Although many teachers tried to remain 'objective' and aloof from the almost routine traumatic events that involved their students, most found doing so impossible. Teachers regularly learned about current or former students who dealt with difficult domestic situations on a daily basis; who were involved in crimes, often associated with drug dealing; who were physically or sexually assaulted by relatives or friends; who were severely beaten as a result of gang fights; or who were violently killed.

Domestic Difficulties

Almost daily teachers heard of students who move from one household to another, who were pregnant, who had a parent who had lost a job, or who had left home with no place to go. [fn: ND:1-30-92] As a participant in a collaborative effort between the university and school, I taught a class of ninth graders for about six weeks. Through writing assignments and casual conversations, I learned that four of the girls in the class had borne children, two had two babies. Only one of the girls, with the help of her parents, kept her baby. She told me that she wanted to write a book about her experience as a black teenage mother to dispel the notion that black teenage girls are "no good" and that they "would get a good education even if they did have a baby." [fn:2-16-92:2]

I vowed to help her at least begin to write that book. We never even got started because she did not return to class after we

had that conversation. When I spoke to the teacher with whom I was working, he responded that he did not know she had a child and really did not know much about the students in his classes unless he had to. His reasoning was that he had enough problems of his own and could not take on the students' problems, too. He said he could not help them anyway. There was frustration and anger in his voice when he blurted out that yes, maybe he should learn more about the students, but he just couldn't afford to! [fn:3-3-92]

In another instance, a teacher regaled me and several teachers with stories about students' fantastic excuses for being absent. As he was about to leave, he became somber, saying that he had one more.

A ninth grade girl had been absent for several days. When the teacher questioned other students about her absence, no one seemed to know why she was not in school. A few days later as he was walking down the hall, he heard a student call him. He turned around to see the girl whom he had missed in his class. She approached him and began to explain why she had been absent. She had been in the hospital, she said. He was about to ask her why when she pulled out a glossy photograph from a manilla envelope and thrust it in his face. As he adjusted his focus to determine what the picture was, the girl told him she had an abortion; the picture was of the aborted fetus.

Before the teacher could think of something to say, the student grabbed the picture, stuffed it back into the envelope, smiled, and said she'd see him in class. She left him "standing with my mouth

open" as she almost bounced away, calling to a friend and waving the envelope. [fnSC:2-6-92:7]

The incident occurred several years ago, but remained vivid in his mind. He looked at us, particularly at me, and said that he's pretty tough, but "this really got to me. I still can't forget it. Yah, these kids really go through some rough things." [fnSC:2-6-92:6] This big, burly man slowly got up from his chair, shaking his head as if trying to rid himself of the image in his memory, and walked out of the lounge, leaving the rest of us in silence.

In both instances, the teachers were not unaffected by their students' personal lives. But, both chose to stuff away, as best they could, those aspects of the students they felt they could do nothing about. They were at DHS to teach.

Violence and Crime

Teachers heard about robberies, drug dealings and gang fights through the news media and immediately speculated about whether or not those named are or were students at DHS. One day as I was working in the library's media center, a teacher rushed in obviously agitated. A student had told her that _____ had been shot trying to rob a crack house. The teacher was looking for the morning paper to verify the story. She said the student in question was one she had taught the year before and, if the story was true, that would make five DHS students shot during the school year to date. She followed with the comment that she hated to turn on the T.V. or

radio, or read the newspaper because she feared hearing about more students hurt or killed. [fn:1-27-92]

Several teachers talked about the four student murders during the year. Each of their conversations with me would usually end in a shrug and a question like, "Well, what can we do?" One teacher captured the essence of teachers' attempts to simply absorb the violent and traumatic events in students' live when she said, "You get too depressed looking into the problems because every time you hear someone at this end of town gets hurt, you wonder, 'Is that another one of ours?' It doesn't make it easy" [NN:5-1892:4].

Defending DHS

Finally, because of the violence that has occurred to and among Division students, teachers often felt they had to expend too much energy defending themselves for teaching at DHS, and defending DHS students to the public. A teacher strongly made the point that

> . . . you're not constantly thinking of weapons, and who's out to get you, things like that. I mean I'm not scared to walk in this building . . . yet with the general public, you have to rationalize where you are; you have to be defensive. [NN:5-18-92:5]

The attitude of the community, in essence, added pressure to the teachers in their relationships to their students. The teachers feel the negative attitude of community members toward Division High--its students and faculty. The result was, according to a teacher who had been at the school for twenty-five years,

> I tend to defend [the students] . . . even sometimes maybe more than I need to . . . with outsiders . . . [I] try to push [the students] so it

> makes them look better outside, because if you see them out on the streets and when they're doing something dumb, you wish they wouldn't. [NN:5-18-92:5]

Regardless of the teachers' conscious decisions concerning the level of their involvement in students' personal lives, no teacher was left unaffected. Some developed "hard shells so we don't have to feel" [HF:6-8-92:13]; others felt, but often wished they did not. All, however, were frustrated and angry because they seemed to feel alone in their struggles, and unable to make headway.

The struggle to work and relate to students seemed to correlate significantly with the lack of trust within the DHS staff. The atmosphere of mistrust at Division created and maintained a fragmented staff; it also limited or prevented what teachers could do with and for students.

> I don't think there's been a great deal of real honesty that has gone on for a long time. And that's part of what breaks down communication, and that's part of what causes mistrust. . . . You take things out on the people who can't fight back and, you know, [that's the kids]. . . . [C]ertainly if you are frustrated and you feel unhappy, and you feel that other people perceive you as not doing a good job, we're like everybody else; it's that self-fulfilling prophecy. We live up to people's expectations of us. . . . And when you feel that you are not trusted, and you feel that you are not seen as doing a good job, you tend to look at other people, students, the same way. [NQ:3-4-92:30]

THE STAFF AS UNIQUE GROUPS

To this point, I have considered the staff as one body needing and struggling to find caring. In light of post-structural feminist theory, however, it is imperative for me that I locate the various groups within that body as they individually and collectively view

their need for caring. Post-structuralist feminisms "ground their epistemology on the foundation of difference," making "conceptual space for difference in subject location, identity and knowledges." (Gore & Luke, 1992, p. 7) In terms of this study, the concept of difference takes into consideration that although there are some common issues for the whole staff, they are not definitive issues that represent the interests of all individuals and groups within the whole. Therefore, I will discuss several groups within the staff as a whole.

Within the staff are any number of groups and individuals that would be interesting to examine. I have chosen, however, to explore three groups. Each of these groups has had a very significant impact on the faculty and administration as they pursue change and reform efforts at Division High.

The first group I will discuss is that of the senior members. This group was composed of teachers who had been in the Newtown school system for twenty or more years. They were older, more cynical, and more tired than the new staff; they carried much history with them that influenced their day-to-day teaching and the way they viewed the future. They comprised almost half of the faculty and, therefore, had a great influence on what occurred--or did not occur--regarding change at Division.

The next group were members of the steering committee, the governance body of site-based management. They were elected by their peers to implement site-based management, a system of organization no one really understood. Their roles, as well as SBM,

were ambiguous. As they functioned within ambiguity and attempted to clarify roles and procedures that would create an atmosphere of collaboration and empowerment for faculty, teachers and administrators viewed them as increasing the fragmentation and mistrust already prevailing in the staff.

The final group I will examine is that of teacher innovators. Because they attempted to develop and implement major projects that required not only changing pedagogy and classroom practices, but, also, school organization, they needed the collaboration of the different groups involved with DHS. They needed cooperation from fellow teachers, from administrators, from the community business committee, and from the university representatives. They also needed collaboration to occur among and between those groups. The teacher innovators found they were often caught in the middle of unspoken power struggles as they sought collaboration.

Senior Staff Members: Wary And Weary

As is typical in Newtown School District, the staff members at Division High were older, many of whom have taught in the district between twenty and thirty years. These people had been involved in numerous education reforms and had participated in a variety of university-initiated projects at their respective schools. They experienced desegregation of the city's schools and had been impacted personally and professionally by that process. They had seen the city grow and prosper, and are currently witnessing its rapid decline and fight for survival. Finally, they had experienced

their own growth and rise and, then, were facing aging bodies and souls with the resultant problems and dilemmas that often accompany such seasoning--personal and/or their partner's illnesses; death of parents; reduced energy; approaching retirement; and increased skepticism and cynicism about education, particularly, and about the world, generally.

Their longevity in the district and, particularly at DHS, had an impact on the senior staff members that is almost incomprehensible to others who had been at the school for shorter periods of time. Their extensive histories as Newtown educators have caused some senior constituents of DHS to reflect on the needs for caring they have that require an understanding different from that needed by their less experienced colleagues. One teacher summed up the relationships of the staff in this way:

> . . . there's so much meanness and resentment. I mean there's things that go way deep here and as, as one person's involved, there's five others that won't be just because of the dynamics of previous experiences. [TD:2-11-92:11]

Veterans of Desegregation[1]

Teachers and other staff members who were part of Division's community in the late 1960s have been indelibly affected by

---

[1]Previously, I have used numerous quotations from interviews to substantiate the issues under discussion. The reader will note that in this section, there are very few direct quotations. All staff members who spoke specifically about desegregation asked me to turn off the tape recorder. They gave me permission to use the essence of their comments, but did not want to be quoted directly. The quotations in this section are from teachers who spoke indirectly about the racial tension that exists today.

Newtown's citizens' decision to voluntarily desegregate the high schools in the district. [Recall that elementary schools were under federal mandate to desegregate. Secondary schools were judged at that time to be sufficiently integrated racially. Newtown, however, elected to develop magnet classes for each high school that would serve as vehicles to further desegregate the schools. Desegregation at the secondary level, therefore, would be locally initiated and controlled, rather than a hasty response to federal mandates.] Despite the 'voluntary' status of desegregation from the perspective of a city-wide election, the actual process of increasing the black student population at Division was not without opposition and incident.

As mentioned in an earlier chapter, Division High was the 'country club' school when it was built in the middle 1960s. When it went through the desegregation process, however, its reputation hit bottom and has never recovered. To this day, anyone who has any acquaintance with Newtown will react negatively to the mention of Division High School. Virtually all of DHS's teachers are sensitive to the reputation of DHS as the 'worst' school in Newtown, but those teachers who lived through all or part of the school's desegregation continue to live with the pain of the past.

What does this pain look like? It is not blatant or worn as a badge. It is something that undergirds people's thoughts and actions, something that is supposed to be buried, but which, on occasion, refuses to stay underground and surfaces to open old wounds people believe to be healed over with thick scars. Talking

about the past is not easy for these teachers. An automatic response when broaching the topic of 'the past,' was to rise from one's chair, close the door, and lower one's voice, for the past pivoted on one event: desegregation. Their thoughts of desegregation summoned images of police inside and outside the building, students fighting students, teachers fighting teachers, students fighting teachers: racial tension and violence. Massive distrust among and between teachers, administrators, and students, white and black, conservative and liberal ensued [fn:10-30-91; 11-12-91]. As one teacher commented, "You didn't **really** trust your best friend" [KG:10-30-91].

There seems to be yet today a continuing sense of wariness for those who lived through the desegregation period. As teachers talked about that time in their lives, their faces showed strain and their eyes looked haunted still. In their reticence to discuss, and in their caution when discussing the racial tensions resulting from and exacerbated by desegregation, one senses these teachers' present distrust of current colleagues as an extension of past uneasiness in racial relations. Consider the following exchange emanating from a discussion of desegregation.

Responding to a question about race relations at Division during desegregation, one teacher said that the racial tension "back then was awful. You were afraid to say anything to anybody. You couldn't trust your best friend." [KG:10-30-91] When asked whether or not racial tensions are obvious today, the teacher responded there are no racial problems among faculty now. However, later in

the conversation the person indicated that several "black staff members are getting involved with things [becoming heads of committees] and "can't cope with the power." What did the latter mean? The interpretation was that a black teacher who had become a committee head had gone from being a "nice, friendly person to being obnoxious," obnoxious seemingly because the teacher attempted to make other faculty members take responsibility for follow-through on the project they voted to accept. In another instance, a black teacher's seeking and accepting advice in order to become an effective chairperson was resented, particularly by white teachers who had been at Division during the desegregation process. Negative comments concerning the teacher's ambitions beyond classroom teaching abounded, often prefaced with, "Who does [he/she] think [he/she] is anyway? The next black principal?" [fn:6-9-92; KG:1-23-92; EK:3-31-92:12; 6-1-92;2]; HF:1-30-92:2; BK:2-5-92:2]

Another teacher commented on social relationships within faculty and the rarity of interracial groups. As an African-American, she also noted her feeling of "invisibility" in a school that is ninety-nine percent black. Additionally, she questions the degree to which African-American teachers influence policy for the students in DHS.

> If you looked at the cliques as they stand, many times you don't see interracial cliques. . . . [A]s a matter of fact, I didn't realize there was this many black [teachers] until I sat down one day to count because so many times I feel invisible. And, I mean, not me per se, because I get around and talk to everybody, but as a member of a group I felt that the group was invisible. You know, I actually had to sit down and say, "Okay, now who's here?" . . . It's a strange kind of feeling when you not only look at

> people who are existing in the building as being invisible, but you know, the reality of it, too, is that is you're looking at a school that has this very high percentage of black students, who do you think will be looking at the policies to truly impact black students? . . . Why is it that we as black people, understanding all of the obstacles for young people who don't have an education, why aren't we running these classes after school that's going to help these kids? Why aren't we making policies for this school? [HF:6-892:21,22]

Although not the sole reason for the distrust at Division, racial tensions may contribute to the lack of trust among faculty. Change in positions of power often brings discomfort and wariness among those affected by the changes. Jealousy, resentment, or a "prove-yourself" attitude is not uncommon when 'new' people take over; Mattie was in that position as a new principal. Underlying the expected skepticism and wariness associated with change, however, is a lingering sense of fear distrust, and, perhaps, anger, among white teachers who saw and felt the imposition of black students and teachers on DHS nearly twenty years ago. As the position changes took place, the veteran white teachers noted not only those changes, but that the positions were filled by black staff members. That is, the lack of trust and uncertainty stemmed not only from the unknown ability of the person to perform in a leadership role, but that person was black, compounding the problem in some staff members' eyes. Speaking about the impact of black principals, this teacher commented:

> I think it did not help that we had a black male principal that was laid back, you know? I think that for a black man to be in control of a building, he has to be viewed as being in control and brooking no nonsense. And not to the point that he's uncaring, but, just enough that you know who your principal is

> and you know where he's going to stand. [Mattie] came in as a strong, black woman. Well, there's a lot of stuff revolving around those 'black star sapphires' in your mind, and, so, all of that perception--a female, black--and for white men [to deal with] . . . [HF:6-892:27]

Another staff member was even more direct:

> I think that [Mattie'] being principal irritates the white, middle-aged men. They'd have a hard time with a woman, period, but with a **black** [emphasis hers] woman as principal . . . ! And to make matters worse, they have to deal with a **black** [emphasis hers] male deputy principal who we all feel is incompetent. [KG:10-30-92:3]

An additional complication is there appeared to be a tacit agreement among the staff to refrain from speaking about racial issues and anything that might lead to such discussion, among themselves. They were, in effect, denying the impact race may have on the general lack of trust prevalent among the staff. Failing to address the fundamental issue of race in a school whose student body is ninety-nine percent black and whose staff is fifty-percent black only continued to perpetuate distrust by preventing open, honest communication.

> /Racism] is what it comes back down to when I talk about those people-relation skills. The people-relation skills do need some work, I mean just communication with people and that caring, nurturing kind of sensation, but that is a very, very strong feeling, and people just don't deal with it. You know? . . . we need some real, I don't want to say confrontations, because I don't think people getting emotional and upset solves anything. But we need dialogue where people will listen and ponder and it will make you have to look at the things you say and do . . . [HF:6-892:21,25]

A member of the original staff of DHS, commenting on a questions concerning racial tensions currently among teachers

responded, "Did you notice how staff sits in staff meetings? Whites at one table and blacks at another. I think the racial split has gotten worse and worse" [KG:1-23-92:1].

Mattie viewed trust-building as a major priority in order to establish a caring environment for staff and students. She viewed personal communication with staff members, ministering to their personal needs, and having integrity as ways to build the foundation for trust between herself and them. Because of the history of Division, she will need, also, to consider ways of building trust **among** the staff, themselves. 'Caring' would seem to require Mattie's recognition of the lingering effects of desegregation on teachers who lived through the process, and the continued--or escalated--distrust among them as a result of unspoken and/or denied racial tension. A critical question is would she and/or the staff consider this recognition as laying a foundation for a 'caring' environment? Yet, if the issue of race is ignored, can trust be established at DHS?

Veterans of the District and of Division High

Change involving, among other issues, trust-building, re-structuring the governance of the school, and re-visioning the curriculum, is a concern among faculty members, generally. Those who have been at Division for many years, however, viewed these change efforts from a different perspective. Like the quote from Kundera at the beginning of the chapter, they no longer view change as "a new stage of coherent development," but see changes as

efforts using the same ideas, but simply shifting them "from one side to another, from front to back, from the back to the left, from the left to the front."

A theme that occurred throughout faculty interviews is that lack of trust among the staff was not a new issue, but one that continues to re-cycle. There was a weariness as veteran teachers talk about past efforts to establish trust among themselves and to make changes, generally. They saw the current concern for change as just another round of activity that would swell with momentary interest and enthusiasm and would deflate as quickly. Speaking about colleagues' efforts to build trust, a teacher commented:

> Well, we've been talking about getting along together, you know, the idea of the perception of trust and, everybody sharing decisions so, we've been talking about that. . . . Anyway, . . . that's been an on-going thing. I mean we've been talking about that. I came here fourteen years ago and we were talking about it then. . . . we tried when I first came here to work on something for getting the staff together informally. Well, we tried a little something and it didn't work. . . . [F]or a while we didn't do anything, and then we tried again. The staff dinner, the staff potluck, this kind of stuff. Those sort of things. We've done this repeatedly.

When probed to think about efforts to build trust that do not revolve around simply social situations, but that are directed to develop interdependence among staff members, the teacher replied that the staff was still not working together. The faculty member indicated, again, that she had been in the district and at DHS long enough to know that past efforts had failed and, most likely, the current efforts would also.

> I mean this is not some, suddenly this year all of a sudden we're going to get together, you know, and work together. We've done this over the years. . . . [T]here's an approach made, sometimes the same one, sometimes different ones, and little variations. But it's not, we didn't just discover the wheel this year. [IZ:3-1792:1,2]

Another veteran of the district spoke about the attempts to institute site-based management at DHS. This reform effort would provide for shared decision making among staff and, therefore, would require that a least a modicum of trust exist. She reflected on the current efforts in light of her past experiences at a different school with some teachers with whom she is now working at DHS. Her comments represent an attitude toward change typical of teachers who have experienced and participated in numerous reforms over many years. There was a tiredness in her voice and a plea for understanding. Above all, there was an appeal to be valued for what she can contribute and not discard her for what she cannot.

> The three of us were together. We taught in the high school together. And, we were together for four years. We were like brothers and sisters. We've done this, we've done site-based. You know? It worked . . . kind of. I don't want to do it again. I can't It's like . . . I can't do that. I can't go through that again. I can go through the ninth grade thing, you know, with that, because that's kind of different . . . that's because it's an internal thing. I don't want to worry about the things that principals and [administrators] worry about. [TD:2-11-927,8]

These teachers were not opposed to the attempts to build trust and to implement other changes. They did wrestle, however, with the past knowledge of other efforts that failed, with the amount of energy required to accomplish the changes, with their experience of what works and what does not, and with how much they felt they could

commit to their involvement in change. One teacher spoke of the trust-building efforts related to site-based management in this way:

> I'm getting also older. And I'd love to deal with how one sees problems [from different sides]. . . . I hope I'm seeing some things, some problems in a balanced [way]. I even got criticized one time for being too conservative . . . that's what [I was] clearly labelled when I was younger, but maybe I'm not, I'm not afraid of that label anymore. But I'm not ready to just tear down everything and start new. After seeing something, there has to be something good, otherwise this whole thing [site-based management, trust-building] would fall apart [of] its own weight. [MU:5-2892:19,20]

A senior teacher recently was appointed department head and was asked to serve on a committee to determine how Division would meet new state requirements that would involve re-thinking school organization, curriculum, and student achievement and evaluation. Although seen as 'actively participating' in change by faculty members and administrators, she did what is expected, but felt she was not necessarily committed to the changes.

> I just don't concern myself a whole lot with policy unless it's something that really disturbs me. And right now I can't think of anything that really disturbs me. I guess . . . and this is probably, again, my problem, I have a tendency to ignore what I don't want to deal with and shut the door and do my own classes. Forget about the rest. I mean, you know, I've been here a number of years and sometimes I've seen things--that policies that are for administrators [and] even they didn't like [them] . . . And, you know, [the policies] aren't going to be here forever. So, if I stay out of the way, eventually things will get better. Which, doesn't make me a real active person, but I guess it keeps me sane. [NN:5-18-92:13]

Again, there was another senior teacher who had chosen her way of continuing to work as a part of the school community and, yet, maintain her distance as a result of many years of experience with

various change/reform processes within schools. Hers was not so much a plea for understanding, but a personal reconciliation to the effects that consequences of age, time, and numerous encounters with school reform have left on her. Caring for her could mean the acceptance by others of her resolve.

Finally, age and experience were a major consideration--and, at times a major roadblock--to innovation or to educational reform. A teacher, struggling to begin an academy, was faced with the realization that older staff were reluctant to pledge the necessary time and effort major curriculum changes would require. Although many supported the effort in theory, they hesitated to involve themselves based on past experiences of failed efforts, and on the fact that their workload would, again, increase.

> [We're] trying to just get an organization structure, what [the academy] might look like. And then this summer we're going to work on curriculum in the biology area. Now, I thought, with the number of our students that aren't successful, I had thought that everybody in the building would be willing to sign up for something like this. And I'm the only one that's gone to every department and talked to them. . . . It was an eye-opening experience. The staff is older. We've been through a lot of changes, we've seen things come and go--and not work. And it's part of the problem, we're not--people are not so gung-ho on something like that because it's going to be work. . . . [But] everybody [said], "Well I hope this goes. I wish you luck, but I don't want any part of it." . . . But nonetheless, I've had people come up and say they're interested. And I'm having trouble getting a math person . . . I've got somebody in social studies, in English, and myself, and my department has been very supportive. And I've been to all the departments. The comment that I heard was, "Well, show me a little bit more structure." "Do you have any problems with this extra teacher?" "Do you have any money to make this go?" And of course, we have to say no, that nothing's

> in place. But then when I talk to Mrs. [Johnson], she says, "Well, you've got to have a team before you can go any further." See what I mean? [ES:5-11-92:4,5,]

Senior staff members were skeptical, were wary of committing themselves to projects that theoretically are sound, but, according to past tradition, have been ill-funded, both financially and in human resources. Age and experience provided these teachers with increased skepticism and a reluctance to expend energy that was not as easily renewable as it was twenty years ago. As I think of these teachers, I see a group of people who are using their power to protect themselves by caring for themselves.

A veteran teacher of almost thirty years eloquently spoke about the necessity to recognize the position and place aging teachers have in any change process. She indicated a need for caring that recognized the interest of older teachers to be a part of the process, but realized that they no longer want to shoulder the efforts. Her thrust was that older teachers do not want to be discounted because they are choosing-for a variety of reasons--to limit their involvement, but to respect and value them for the experience they bring and for what they can do.

> [A]nother problem, and hopefully a lot of us retire and it will change, is that in any situation you need to have older teachers because they are seasoned, they have experience, and they know how to handle some situations just because they have had experience and that really helps. The other side of it is, you need young people. They bring in the enthusiasm, they are the ones that really are, they are really the change-makers. Because they're willing to jump in, they don't know enough to know that everything's never going to work. So they're willing to jump in and they're willing to do everything and they bring along a lot of the folks with them. And I have heard some of my colleagues say, "I'm old enough to jump on a

> bandwagon. I mean I can still jump on a bandwagon and I still would like to see things change, but I'm too old to be the head cheerleader." And I feel that way, too. You know, I'm not ready, I have been on so many bandwagons and have been a part of enough that I'm not sure if I'm ready to do what it would take. [NQ:3-4-92:27]

There is the acknowledgment by many of the older staff members that they desire to be valued and understood for what they have accomplished in the past. They also want to be respected for what they are capable of doing now, and not feel as though other staff, particularly those less experienced, are demanding more of them than they can give.

In addition to school reforms and other changes they had experienced, senior staff members, were aging and were having to physically and emotionally deal with the affects of getting older: encountering physical ailments themselves, or having to manage spouses and/or parents with physical problems; and having to deal with deaths of parents, siblings, or in-laws. Within the ranks of senior staff and within a period of less than a year, one teacher had heart surgery, one died of a heart attack, two were out for lengthy illnesses, one had a spouse who had major surgery, several had a parent or parent-in-law death, and one had two relatives murdered by a former student. Additionally, several senior staff members were in the process of divorce procedures. All those events which are the 'normal' processes of life only compounded the senior staff members' need for caring--the need to understand their skepticism and to accept what they can give to change [fn:6-5-92:1; HF:6-8:92:13].

Site-based Management Steering Committee Members: Dealing With Ambiguity

Unlike many of the senior staff members, the members of the steering committee (SC) wanted to believe SBM would bring a "new stage of coherent development" to Division. Their intent was to pave the way for collaboration and shared decision making among and between all groups, thereby, flattening the traditional hierarchical, authoritative model of organization. However, they virtually had no model to follow as they embarked on change they hoped would be more than moving from front to back or side to side, and were unprepared for the personal toll that trying to find clarity and direction in ambiguity took. The SC members needed caring as they dealt with ambiguity either unrecognized or unacknowledged by teachers and administrators.

A deep sense of frustration penetrated the SC members as they attempted to understand and define their roles. They held a meeting at the beginning of the year, bringing in a facilitator from the district office to help them address the following:

1. DISCUSSION OF STEERING COMMITTEE SITUATION:
   - Some agreement that we lack effectiveness
   - Do we need a "retreat" in order to define ourselves? Discussion centered on the need for a facilitator for such a meeting
   - Role clarification - What are we supposed to do? Why are we still talking about the process at this date?
   - A leading indicator is the absence of many members
   - Agreement that we would need to know the outcome that we expect from such a meeting prior to holding it
   - Why is it that we aren't getting closure on our projects:
     * Is it because we aren't communicating?
     * Is it because we don't have the time to communicate?
     * Is it because we have no source of money?
     * Is it because the Steering Committee doesn't know what its job is? [scmin:10-1-91]

They found themselves striving for unity, yet exhibiting fragmentation, a quality they hoped SBM would diminish in the whole staff. From minutes of an SC meeting, their continued struggle to define their role was evident.

> ROLE OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS: at Fishbowl Meetings [whole staff meetings to discuss and vote on school policy, new school projects]
>
> Problem: We have agreed to act as one and speak as one - we did not, conveying a message of fragmentation of the Committee. A good deal of discussion took place about what it means when a proposal from this Committee goes to the Fishbowl. [scmin:11-591:1]

The SC members became the target of blame for a heightened sense of fragmentation and distrust among the staff. Teachers accused the committee of not "accomplishing things for kids" when the committee saw itself as the facilitator for faculty members to take responsibility for making changes that would lead to those accomplishments. The members discussed charges made by one faculty member during a steering committee meeting.

> Mr. ____:
> The Steering Committee needs credibility - which he means accomplishing things for kids. He thinks the staff is fragmented, feels that the whole variety of projects underway produces more fragmentation, instead of being unified. He wants to see something completed - the Site-Based process isn't credible because we haven't completed anything. He wants colleagues to support each other. He feels completing a project will cause many who doubt our viability to join the process. [scmin:11-5-91:1]

Although the teachers elected the members to the steering committee, and although the steering committee was vaguely understood to be the body that would assist teachers in gaining

empowerment, many faculty members saw the committee as only another layer of bureaucracy and not a part of them.

> Now when [we went] to that site-based, I was . . . excited about it. But what I've seen over the year and a half, there's been a lot of meetings, a lot of meetings, a lot of talk. Nothing gets done but goes from the steering committee to another committee. I've always felt the best type of government was a dictatorship. [CK:5-18-92:9]

> You look at the steering committee and you see who persistently is there. It's an isolated group. . . . [T]he rest of us in the building, really, have no perception of them as a part of us. [IZ:3-17-92:11]

The ambiguity associated with SBM fostered misunderstandings and misconceptions about the role of the steering committee. Teachers wanted to tell the committee what to do and have them carry it out; administrators feared the committee would take their authority. Those attitudes affected the individual members of the committee in numerous ways. Members felt personally attacked, isolated, alienated, bitter, and ineffective.

The chairperson saw her role as leader, the one responsible for keeping the 'big picture' in mind. She said that her role was "investigative," checking out the "hidden agendas" behind the information and proposals brought to the steering committee. She felt responsible for keeping the committee and faculty focused on "[Division's] overall vision," the "overall direction of the school and the school as part of the district, and the overall improvement of the school," [HF:1-23-92:2] as they considered initiatives for policies and projects from teachers.

To accomplish her responsibilities, she sought mentorship from the principal, whom she admired, to learn how to conduct efficient meetings; to work with people; to keep 'the big picture' in mind and not become mired in detail or side-tracked by projects that did not contribute to the overall vision for the school. She was determined to do her best to represent the teachers in a leadership position. Rather than seeing her as representative of the faculty and working for them, the teachers and committee members often made her the recipient of comments that suggested she used her role to gain power.

> She's just a butt-licker, a clone of [Mattie]. Who does she think she is, the next black female principal? [fnSC:3-31-92:2]

> A lot of them (teachers) say about me, "There goes 'The Suit'" (calling attention to her dressing more professionally since she took the position of steering committee chair). Everybody sees it [seeking mentoring from Mattie] as . . . "she just wants to be an administrator, too." They don't realize I'm working for them [emphasis hers]. It's hard to empower people who don't want to be empowered. [HF:1-30-92]

> She rubs people the wrong way. We can't get in to see [Mattie] because she's always in there. She's feeling power and doesn't know how to use it. [KG:1-23-92:1]

Additionally, the chairperson noted that shortly after she was elected to the position, faculty members began treating her differently.

> They would present issues at lunch time, trying to manipulate me by putting me in a position of having to take a stand for or against an issue the steering committee was discussing and that was maybe going to come up to the whole faculty. There wasn't any more light conversation. Now I'm pretty much left alone at

> this point. They don't trust me because of my position. They can't connect me with any particular group. [HF:1-30-92:2]

The faculty elected her to the steering committee; the steering committee elected her as the chairperson. Yet, her leadership position only contributed to increased isolation and mistrust by both groups. Although they chose her to 'lead' in the development of the SBM process, they were ambivalent about what control and authority she was to take and what they want to take.

One member of the steering committee ended the year feeling frustrated and alienated from some of the teachers. He felt that as a member of the steering committee, he had pushed too hard to make changes, changes which would give teachers more decision-making power and more support from administration. He found out, however, that the teachers wanted the policies, but did not want the work and responsibility for carrying them out. They wanted the steering committee to "take care of it."

> The question is not necessarily as to what the teacher should do, the next question would be what do you do for teachers who do not follow the rules. What happens if you make a rule and nobody follows it? [GS:6-9-92:11]

His comment indicated particular frustration, for the "you" in the comment "you make a rule," referred to the whole staff. That is, the steering committee may present an initiative from a teacher or committee of teachers, but the steering committee <u>per se</u> did not decide whether or not it would be effected; the staff does. His frustration emanated from experiences where the staff voted for a policy, then wanted the steering committee to carry it out. For

instance, the staff voted for a policy stipulating that anyone attending DHS on a regular basis (students, all staff, and university people) must have an identification badge. The intent was to ensure a safer environment by keeping out persons, particularly dropouts and graduates who were drug dealers or involved in gangs, who had no business at DHS. Teachers were not to allow students without i.d. badges into their classrooms, but to send them to the discipline office. Teachers seemed unclear regarding the exact procedures--if students were to be sent each time they came without a badge, or if students had a grace period. Teachers questioned who was responsible for checking that teachers wore their i.d. badges and that they checked students for wearing theirs. The lines of authority were not clear. The teachers, generally, as well as members of the steering committee, really did not know who was responsible for implementing the policy--the teachers, themselves; the administration; or the steering committee. Or was it to be a collaborative effort? If the latter, how was the collaboration formed?

The teacher felt discouraged and ineffective, ready to consider leaving his position on the committee.

> I think my effectiveness school-wide is almost nil. I have pushed so hard for so many people, now I've got people who are opposing whatever I say just because I say it. . . . So I'm just going to back off for awhile and say, "Okay, you guys, let's get some people in here to work together for the good of the school. Go out there and work hard." [GS:6-9-92:12]

Another member of the committee discontinued attending SC meetings toward the end of the year, feeling that he was tired of

confronting issues for which he could not make a difference. This teacher believed the principal usurped the authority of the steering committee and that no matter what the steering committee recommended or did, it meant nothing without the principal's approval. He did not see administrative support for shared decision making and collaboration, but only continued top-down authority.

> I don't think I'm interested in being a member of that committee anymore. It's just too much. Too much time, too much frustration. The rewards have been very intangible. . . . I hoped we could make some changes and that we'd begin to share decision making. And there sure is not any interest as far as I can see on the part of the administrators of sharing decision making. [EK:331-92:11]

Substantiating the committee's frustration regarding the lack of administrative support for collaboration, a teacher on the steering committee stated with some bitterness:

> . . . I suspect that a lot of administrators look at site-based management like it's psychotherapy for teachers. Basically they're just letting us blow off steam, have a wonderful time going through our little song and dance, and when we're done with it, they're going to do what they want to do anyway. I think they're just playing mind games with us to tell you the truth. [GS:6-9-92:6]

To add to the frustration, the teachers sought 'approval' for change initiatives from the principal before bringing them to the steering committee. They believed that if they did not have the principal's support, there was no point in going to the committee [SK:1-30-92:5,13; 4:7-92; SM:5-12-92; AQ:5-18-92; ES:5-11-92]. Members began feeling ineffective, tired, and angry.

> Because of the way things have gone the last [] years at [Division], it has taken more energy out of me than I am willing to give. . . . I find myself becoming so frustrated with what I see going on and when you ask

> me what can I do to change it, at this point I don't know what I can do to change it. I can try to keep pushing it [SBM] in the direction I think that that's appropriate, but I really don't see myself making that much of a difference . . . [NQ:3-4-92:15]

This member also resigned from the steering committee.

Having to function within an ambiguous situation when others were expecting clarity only increased the sense of frustration, isolation, and distrust experienced by teachers on the steering committee. Caring for them would require more than an understanding of their feelings. It would require an understanding of the ambiguous nature of their roles and how that ambiguity affected what the committee could accomplish. It would require an understanding that collaboration and support were necessary.

Faculty Innovators: Needing Collaboration

The story of the innovative teachers centers around two themes: teachers' victimization by the educational and community bureaucracies, and their victimization by their own colleagues. In this story, power and caring become inseparable, as teachers, administrators, and 'outsiders'--the community business committee and the university representatives--indicated their intent was to work for better education for children, to show caring for students, yet each group struggled to gain and/or maintain control over each other. In all cases, those teachers who strove to care for students through the development of curricula to improve student learning, were victims of those power struggles, albeit, sometimes casualties of their own colleagues' quest for power.

In a Nutshell: What Is Collaboration?

Division High was the experimental school for many of the school reform initiatives proposed for the Newtown School District. Particularly, DHS became the pilot for the school partnership concept which had as its foundation, collaboration among business, community, university, and school. Integral to the partnership at DHS were the community business committee (CBC) and representatives from the local university (UR), both of which encouraged teachers to propose various innovative plans and projects designed to improve student learning.

Teachers working on ventures to improve student learning needed the cooperation of administrators; of 'outsiders,' that is, the CBC and university; and of other teachers. Rather than stimulating collaboration, however, the 'partnership projects' gave rise to power struggles among the various groups, causing not only the demise of educationally sound projects for students, but also an attitude of futility among some teachers toward any attempt to alter the current system. Instead of feeling unity in working together on joint projects for students, faculty members felt they inherited only more masters, that is, the bureaucracy of accountability only increased for them.

The community business committee, having pledged itself to help Newtown schools better prepare students for the world of work, offered financial backing and, to a more limited degree, the expertise of the Newtown business community, to teachers who proposed innovative curricula. The local university representatives

(UR), formally dedicated to educating all students and to empowering teachers and students, pledged their support by offering human resources, expertise in disciplinary knowledge and pedagogy, and to a limited degree, material resources, such as a computer and a fax machine. However, with these offers of support came obligations for accountability which, often, was contradictory between the groups, as the teachers, CBC, and UR each had different goals.

Additionally, the new administration, particularly the principal, was determined that the staff of DHS would develop the mission and direction of DHS without the aid of outsiders; if the CBC and the UR could support those goals, the school would welcome their help with resources. The teachers, however, believed they needed the cooperation and resources of the CBC and the local university, as well as support and cooperation from administrators and other teachers, in order to implement the ideas they believed would benefit students. Teachers feared that if they did not involve the outsiders in the planning, the latter would withdraw their offers of financial and other types of support. A steering committee member discusses the frustration felt by teachers attempting to develop and implement projects needing the cooperation of the administrators, the CBC and UR.

> I think the [CBC] is not going to be with us a whole lot longer. I don't know. That's my opinion. But I don't think they're going to slow things down [for us] and they're a group that wants to do. "Look, we have money. We want to do these things. Let's get this show on the road." And if we're not willing to do it, they're going to find schools that are. They don't have to sit and wait for [Division]. They don't have to wait for [Newtown]. There are twenty-two districts in [] County. They don't have to wait. And it's my

> perception that they're not going to. And we can't slow everything down. I had a conversation . . . with one of the people on one of the academies. They feel very frustrated because they don't know, okay, here we are, where do we need to go next? What do we need to do to support a multi-managed project? What do we need to do for support to get this show on the road? [NQ:3-31-92:5,6]

These fears strained the relationship between the administrators and the faculty even more, for teachers participating in projects advocated by the CBC and UR believed that the principal, especially, was working against them, that she did not want change, that she was threatened by their working with the outside groups, and that she wanted to maintain total control of Division [SK:4-7-92:1,2]

> She's not willing to give up some of her control. That's the whole issue. She's more controlling than she comes across. That's what I find to be so fascinating about her. . . . She's resistant to change, and I'm so disappointed in her. [XM:5-12-92:6]

The distrust that permeated the staff and faculty prevented or greatly limited the collaboration needed in order for the projects to succeed. Teachers who had allowed themselves to risk--to tentatively believe that collaboration might be a viable concept at DHS--were plunged into an even greater morass of suspicion and paranoia regarding their relationships with administrators, and felt betrayed and used by the CBC and university. They felt victimized in their attempts to do something good for students.

On the other hand, the partnership projects caused teachers to vie for power among themselves. Although teachers were victims of power struggles by those within the educational and community

bureaucracies, they also were perpetrators of their own victimization through individual efforts to gain more control and authority. Some teachers saw the partnership projects as opportunities to advance themselves in the district bureaucracy and, therefore, sought to gain power for themselves at the expense of the projects, ultimately, the students.

> XM: . . . the people that were picked to be on the team were not truly supportive of the whole idea. And that's what blew that apart. . . . And one of them wants to be an administrator and will do whatever is necessary. Which means, she does, if [Mattie] says, "I don't like that idea," she'll say, "I don't like this idea." So that was a component that we had no control over. We didn't even think about that--about her aspiring to be an administrator-and how that would affect us. [XM:5-12-92:3]

Other teachers agreed with the rhetoric of the innovations. They, however, refused to take part, or to even support the projects by voting to allow teachers to try the ideas because they did not believe the local university would come through with the necessary financial support to make the projects work. Still others feared that the teachers proposing the new curricula would receive benefits--an extra planning period, fewer and better students, and new equipment--than they would. Consequently, they spoke out against the projects, the teachers behind them, and the outsiders who advocated the creation of the new curricula. One teacher commented on the academy concept proposed by several teachers:

> Well, from an administration standpoint, what they were talking about is . . . what the teams concepts were talking about two hours of planning. Well, that would involve other staff persons. Well, from my understanding, there wasn't any commitment as far as money from [the local university] to fill the positions. Until you have the cold cash or the money,

> there's nothing that they can, as far as change, changing the policy to work with now. It's easy to talk about different changes, but in reality, if you don't have the money to make the changes, then you can't do it. . . . [Also] some of the other staff people . . . just thought the extra planning time was extra hours of free time. And they think these academies are going to cream the top kids and leave us with the low ones--which most of our kids are anyway. And if you take even those that are some brighter, what does that leave the rest of us with? [TE:516-92:5]

The story of the ninth-grade team illustrates the complexity of these struggles. A teacher who tried to care for students by creating an innovative program to decrease the dropout rate of ninth graders and, ultimately, increase the rate of graduates from DHS, continually faced barriers erected by other groups--administrators, the CBC and UR, and other teachers--who also had as their intention caring for students. Yet, many of the actors, as well as the observers, interpreted 'caring' as a struggle for power--power to control faculty and students. And teachers, particularly, felt caught in the middle of those more powerful than they.

The Ninth Grade Team

The ninth grade team concept was initiated by one teacher who believed that if the dropout rate of ninth graders could be decreased, the chances that those students would graduate would significantly increase. This teacher, who I will call Marty, taught only ninth graders. During the previous year, she had written a proposal to the community business committee (CBC) who had offered financial help to teachers to develop innovative ways to increase student learning and better prepare students for the work-world.

The committee liked the original proposal and encouraged her to expand her ideas. She, then, proposed the ninth grade team concept.

In the proposal, she outlined the need for a teacher representing each of the academic subject areas--math, science, English, and social studies; she indicated the need for smaller classes (25 students) for each of the four teachers; a need for scheduling so that all students would rotate among those teachers; a need for an extra planning period so that the four teachers could spend time each day discussing students and jointly planning their classes; and, finally, the need for an orientation prior to the opening of the following school year in order to begin the bonding process among students and teachers to begin. The proposal was accepted with enthusiasm by the community business committee [rtmin:10-91:2]; with a 'jump-on-the-bandwagon' approach by the university representatives (UR) who saw it as an opportunity to get their foot in the door to begin their part in fulfilling their role as a partner in school reform at DHS [fn:10-25-91; 1-22-92]; with an 'I'mrunning-this-school-and-we'll-see-what-goes-on-here' approach by the principal [fn:10-91; MJ:10-5-91:3]; and by some faculty, distrust of its innovator, distrust of how it would impact on them, and distrust of the actual--other than rhetorical--commitment of the principal, the CBC and the university to the project [fn:10-25-91; TE:5-26-92:5; HF:6-8-92:5] Additionally, the three teachers who agreed to work with Marty and who were interested in the ninth grade team concept, each had her/his own agenda as a team member, and none

was as convinced as Marty of the importance and the viability of the concept.

> I guess what I'm thinking, that the other piece is that [Laura, pseudonym for a team member] very much wants to be an administrator. And that she and [Nadine, pseudonym for another team member] kept talking about how they couldn't do this [start the ninth grade team] this fall. [Nadine] and I had this one conversation where she said, "You know, [Marty], this, we just can't do this. We just can't do this. And I said, "Well, [Nadine], I hear what you're saying. I really want to do this, but I can't make the decision for you. You have to make your own decision. . . . Obviously I was the person who felt strongest about this whole concept. [SK:4-7-92:1]

Marty began work on the ninth grade team with the approval of the CBC, and with enthusiastic offers of help from the UR, who assigned university people to help the ninth grade team members write a detailed timeline and proposal for the development of the project, and to think through the curriculum implications. With the exception of Marty, however, the actual team members were skeptical and not totally committed.

At the same time, the principal and the chairperson of the steering committee cautioned the team that the project had not been approved by the faculty through fishbowl [the voting body of the entire staff] consensus, that the steering committee had not approved it for fishbowl presentation, and that the principal needed to see how every detail for the project would be accomplished before she would support it.

Marty asked the principal if they should go ahead with the proposal sanctioned by the CBC and was not told to cease working on the proposal; she was, however, again cautioned that Mattie would

not allow the ninth grade team to begin the following school year unless everything needed was in place.

> Mrs. [Johnson] kept saying to me, "We need to talk about this and look at this before we get into the situation." So I kept asking questions, "O.K., how are we going to do this? How are we going to do that? What's going to happen here?" And we wanted to do this [keep communication open between the team and administrators]. And I kept talking to [an assistant principal] and I talked with Mrs. [Johnson] about this and she would say I need to talk with the assistant principal. I need to talk with [] my department chair. That she wanted these things to go through channels. [SK:1-30-92:6]

The team held several meetings to plan the development of the project; each time they asked Mattie to attend so she could give them input about what they were doing and what she expected. She never attended [rtmin:1-22-92; SK:1-30-92:6].

One of the significant changes the team required was in scheduling students to rotate among the four teachers and in scheduling a planning period for all four teachers to meet on a daily basis. The team members designed alternative schedules for themselves, taking into consideration the requirements, in addition to the four academic areas, for ninth grade students. Marty presented them to the deputy principal, who was in charge of the master schedule. She asked him to work a schedule in for the fall semester that would accommodate the needed changes in order for the team to function. His response was that he could not alter the schedule until he had notice from Mrs. Johnson to do so [KX:2-20-92:7]. Marty went to Mattie, who said that the ninth grade team could not begin the following school year unless the scheduling

was in place, and that there was almost no point in bringing the proposal to the steering committee until that was done. She advised Marty to work with the deputy principal on the needed scheduling changes. Marty returned to the deputy principal with the message from Mattie; he responded that he could do nothing until Mrs. Johnson advised him.

> She's made no effort in terms of her administrative team, in terms of working with those guys and pulling them together. Discussing any or taking an notions of the ninth grade team, or any kinds of changes don't seem to go through that process at all. They don't seem to be involved. It became very clear [the deputy principal] did not know what was going on with this ninth grade team. He said, "No," and he talked with a [university person] about the fact that [Mattie] doesn't discuss all this with him. [SK:4-792:11]

The CBC wanted reassurance that the team had the backing of the faculty and the administration. They also wanted to know exactly what the ninth grade team expected of them, particularly in terms of financial support. They began gently, but firmly, requesting the team to give them specifics regarding the timeline and what it was the team needed. [rtmin:1-10-92] Marty recounted:

> I had to get approval from the steering committee first before the [business committee] would see this as a viable project and a unified [Division High]. You know, it was like [Division] had to get their act together . . . before [the committee] were going to fund it. [SK:4-7-92:9]

Because the UR viewed working with the ninth grade team as part of their role at DHS, they provided help to the team with an all-day planning session to work on the details of the proposal that would justify the project and that would address Mattie's concerns. They

also brought in a person to work with the deputy principal on the computer scheduling. Significantly, neither of these arrangements was discussed with--or even mentioned to--the principal prior to their implementation. Additionally, the UR noted they had arranged to bring in people on a regular basis to DHS for re-allocated time, that is, to substitute in classes so teachers could have school time to work on the team proposal and other academic concerns. The team members were pleased because they thought the university help would advance them in getting the team proposal another step closer to the steering committee and a staff vote. The principal, however, did not want teachers released from more classes, and was not pleased that the university had made such unilateral decisions.

> It's like when it came time to reschedule the ninth graders. She didn't want, she didn't even really care about them. But when I said to her, "Well, look, I'm getting this money, I'm getting the support [for scheduling] from the UR. I'm getting this money, this part of a project from CBC, and she was concerned about other people thinking I wasn't getting support here in the school. That's when she said, "Your students will be scheduled for next year." So my hope always was that, I mean she didn't have any basic support for it. I thought there would be enough political pressure, if her consuming interest is the image of the school, she would support it. [SK:4-7-92:11]

On March 18th, almost a year from the initial discussions of the ninth grade team project, the team met with faculty members who were proposing academies and with one of the assistant principals to determine what exactly needed to be done in order for these projects to begin in the fall. As the discussion progressed, it became obvious that there was great confusion about the status of the academies and of the ninth grade team. The assistant principal was

under the impression that all had been approved, that they did not have to go to the steering committee or the fishbowl, and that they just needed to complete the detail work. The teachers and the assistant principal spent a considerable amount of time debating those issues. One teacher summed up the difficulty this way:

> One of the things that I saw happening here was that teachers, everybody on the steering committee, not just the teachers and the administrators, or whatever, the people that were going to the steering committee initially were having a lot of difficulty because the steering committee didn't even have its act together and what the steps were and step-by-step processes--you had to have this completed, you have to have this completed. And then you had to go to a fishbowl, and then you had to get the support of the staff at the fishbowl. And then, when did you go to the [CBC] or [UR]? And if the [CBC] or [UR] wanted something before you went to the steering committee or fishbowl, what did you do? [XM:5-12-92:3]

The meeting adjourned with the tentative belief that the ninth grade team and the academies, with one exception, had to present their proposals to the steering committee and, if they were approved, present them to the fishbowl for a vote; the assistant principal would seek information to verify that. [fn:3-18-92; facmin:3-18-92:2]

On March 31st, the steering committee had the ninth grade team proposal on its agenda. On that date, not only did the proposal die, but teachers were caught in power struggles among themselves and between themselves and administrators, and between administrators and outsiders. This is the story in Marty's words:

> . . . and nobody ever disagreed with me. "No, [Marty] this is a rotten idea. We're not going to do this. Everyone agreed with me in theory. . . . And then I didn't realize until that day that we were back on the agenda again. I'd gone in that morning to talk to

> [the deputy principal] about the [] master schedule, setting up the meeting for the master schedule and he was just disputing, he just brushed me off, he blew me away, said, "I don't know anything about this. We're not going to be able to do this." And I said things to him like, you know, "What's wrong? Aren't you administrators communicating? Don't you have a responsibility to communicate as an administrative team?" . . . [S]o I went over to share that with [the SC chairperson] that I was shocked that he said he didn't know anything about what's going on. "Why isn't anybody talking to him?" and so she said, "Why you know this is on the steering committee tonight." And [she] wasn't going to be there so [a representative of the clerical staff on the SC] would run the meeting. [The SC chairperson] said, "Are you going to be at the steering committee?" and I said yes, I would be there. And the same person went over to [Laura] and said, "Are you going to be at the steering committee?" and Laura said, "No, I have a hair appointment on Tuesdays." She doesn't go; [Nadine] and I have gone before and I didn't see it as a big deal. Mrs. [Johnson] called me down to her office and said, [Laura]--and I don't know what the whole conversation was--but, yes, [Laura] would be there at the steering committee . . . I feel there was some manipulation there on Mrs. [Johnson's] part, clearly. . . . [S]he came on very strong to Laura and I about, you know, [her] greatest concern, "I can't support this because you [the team] people are not together." And when [Laura] came out [in the SC meeting] and said we can't depend on just four people, we need to have at least eight people [a substitute for each of the original team members], I'm sure all of that was coming out of the meeting she had with Mrs. [Johnson]. . . . [T]hen when this came out in the meeting, at the steering committee meeting, I was just, blown away. That hurt. . . . I said to [Laura], "You just pulled the rug out from under my feet." She's been very offended by that. . . . It was not until that meeting that I really knew this was over. This is not going to happen. But the thing about it that bothers me the most is I feel that it appears that it was totally a team problem, and not the manipulation from outside the team that caused this to happen. [SK:1-30-92:6; 4-7-92:2,3,4]

Marty intended to show caring for students by developing a curriculum that encouraged students to stay in school, that raised expectations for them, and provided teachers with opportunities to

help them reach those expectations. Instead, her attempts to arrive at caring resulted in the dissolution of her relationship with Laura ("I went to talk to [Laura] and it just became so painful, I left . . . she even feels she has to leave the building because of this situation"); a cold, formal relationship with the principal ("Since the dissolution of the ninth grade team, she has not even talked to me about it. A 'Good morning. How are you?' That's all I ever get from her.") [SK:4-792:7]); and a sense of futility regarding changes that involve anything but her own classroom.

> One of my frustrations in the past couple of years, it's like I've been here for ten years working on that Earth Science curriculum, so to speak, and I've sort of gotten to the point where I just felt like the kinds of changes that I was making in terms of refinement and things that I was doing in my own individual classroom didn't, I didn't feel like I was getting that much of a return from what I was doing. I felt like I needed a broader support system in terms of change for the kids. In terms of doing different kinds of things. And so, that's why that the ninth grade team seemed like such a good idea to me and was so difficult when the whole thing just fell apart because I'm feeling like . . . do I just pull back and do things in my own classroom? Knowing where I was at with that, and why I decided to try and get some support other places, in terms of what happens with the kids. So, I don't know. I just don't know. [SK:5-12-92:1]

Unraveling the Story

The story of the ninth grade team illustrates the complexity of the concepts of caring and power. Through this story we see that the concepts of caring and power are not so easily defined and separated. The terms, themselves, are interpreted differently depending on one's background and experiences. And, as important,

caring and power are integrated--authority and control are often needed in order to effect caring, and caring as a relationship involving sensitivity, understanding, and compassion is needed to effect a positive use of power. In the story of the ninth grade team, we see the yearning of one teacher, particularly, to give and to receive caring, of an administrator who believes she is caring, and of two outside groups formally committed to the idea of caring for students through improving education. We see the idea of caring used to gain power, of power used to promote caring, and of caring and power misinterpreted. To better understand these relationships, I will explore the dynamics of the situation by examining Marty's perception of herself, other teachers, Mattie, the CBC, and the UR in relation to the uses of caring and power in regard to the ninth grade team.

Marty proposed the concept of the ninth grade team with the encouragement of the CBC. Because she had successfully implemented an Earth Science project which improved student achievement, the chairperson of the CBC asked her to submit a proposal that would involve more students in learning improvement. She was eager to do this, as she saw it as an opportunity to work on a school-wide level to push for higher expectations and achievement for students. Throughout all my interviews with her and in informal conversations which I noted in my fieldnotes, she reiterated her belief that caring for students was inextricably connected to higher expectations for the youngsters. She repeated her concern that teachers and administrators did not care for students because they

were not willing to change the current structure, and were not willing to risk implementing something new that may not be perfect immediately.

Marty viewed herself as willing to take risks for the students. She sought the support of the CBC, seeing it as a source of funding, without which there was no hope for implementing the ninth grade team concept. She compiled research data for the proposal to demonstrate that a team concept has been effective in retention of high school students. She recruited teachers to work with her, offering them the leadership role of the team and offering herself to do the detail work. She volunteered to talk with Mattie and the deputy principal to explain and justify the concept; she fought, however unsuccessfully, for changes in the scheduling procedures for the team's teachers and for the students who would become part of the team; she talked with other teachers to gain their support; she worked with the UR to negotiate financial and human resources. Each time another roadblock was put up, Marty tried to find a way over or around it. Her reasoning was that she believed the ninth grade team really would positively impact kids. By pushing as hard as she did, she made enemies and lost credibility among the administrators and among teachers, including those on the ninth grade team. One teacher patronizingly said, "God bless her, [Marty's] always been a crusader, always will be. No matter what it is, she has to have a cause. You know? And it just wears you out." [TD:2-11-92:12] Another teacher said that Marty "is just trying to promote herself. She'll never do it 'cause no one supports her. She pushes too

hard" [BN:8-3-92:2]. Finally, the principal said, "She has to learn that just because you have a good idea, that doesn't always mean it's time for that idea. She has to learn that." [MJ:3-31-92:1]

Marty interpreted Mattie's role in the ninth grade team debacle as one of increasing and maintaining the principal's authority. She viewed Mattie's insistence on a detailed plan for the ninth grade team, including rationale and implementation methods and resources, as Mattie's desire to exert even more control over teachers, to be the authority in the school. She construed Mattie's lack of overt support as her not wanting to take risks for fear of failure and damaging her reputation with central office and in the community, that is, not wanting to 'weaken' her power base. Marty concluded that Mattie did not really care for students, but used the rhetoric of care to promote her own interests. Interestingly, Marty did not question Mattie's caring for her as a teacher. There seemed to be the assumption that if Mattie had actively supported the ninth grade team concept, she would have overtly and concretely shown caring for teachers by her trusting their professional judgment concerning the benefit of that program for students.

Reflecting on the individuals on the team, Marty felt betrayed and hurt that they did not have the professionalism and/or the trust to discuss their skepticism about the team with her. She recognized that she was by far the most committed to the project, but hoped that as they worked together to develop the project they would become as excited as she was. That did not occur. She was dismayed because they did not support a change that would give students a

better opportunity to 'make it' through school. This was a chance for teachers to support one another to actually make changes and she could not get them to do it. Her biggest disappointment, however, was the fact that they sabotaged the whole idea because they did not simply resign from the team when, in fact, they were not really committed to it. She felt personally and professionally betrayed. She felt that the other members, in effect, lied to her--and, perhaps to themselves--telling her they were supportive, yet indicating only their skepticism to others. She felt the pervasive mistrust that enveloped the faculty; a mistrust so great that it virtually prevented them from working together to make changes for themselves and students--even when they professed wanting change. When the proposal failed in the steering committee, Marty left believing that here were more teachers who did not really care about students.

> What I didn't understand is, if there was a team problem, and I said this to [Laura], "[Laura], why didn't you just say you weren't committed to this?" . . . Why couldn't they just say, "I don't want to do this," so I could have gone ahead with it? There are other people. That's the one piece that puzzles me. I understand that there's that team problem, but why did that have to be the death of it? Why did, why was it so important that. . . . Why would [Laura] say, "We'll do this. We can do this next year." She's not committed to doing this next year. No commitment whatsoever. She has a specialist degree. . . . I'm sure another piece of this is [] said something about [Mattie] had talked about getting [Laura] an administrative internship here at Division. You know what's scary to me, it's what people will do to become administrators in this system. . . . I guess it's something that's so hard for me to understand why change, any idea that somebody proposes seems to be so threatening to so many other teachers, or why other teachers are not supporting the teachers. . . . If we stood together as a group and supported each other we could do whatever

> it is we wanted to do. But we don't. And that's the piece I'm, and from my experience with, like trying to last year get the science curriculum project accepted, get that through the steering committee. Every time you are suggesting something different, there is a lot of resistance from everywhere. . . . Why is it that nothing, absolutely nothing, happens around here without the most incredibly painful struggle? . . . Nobody ever really cares about what impacts on the kids. [SK:4-7-92:6,7,8,9]

Marty's perception of the CBC and UR was that they were outsiders without whose help the ninth grade teams and the proposed academies would not succeed. Although she had some difficulty with each of these organizations--CBC not having the funding they had, originally indicated for the projects, and the UR not having the support of the administration and a large segment of the faculty--she looked to them to give her leverage to get the ninth grade team past the principal and the steering committee. That is, she hoped that if she could show the principal and the members of the steering committee that she had funding and human and other material resources, in addition to encouragement for the project as an educationally sound innovation, from those outside organizations, the project would receive the sanction of the administration and the governance body of SBM, virtually assuring its passage among the faculty. Marty saw Mattie's passive support for the ninth grade team--her not stopping it, but not actively endorsing it--as endangering her support from the CBC and the UR. Since CBC would provide the bulk of the funding, she particularly resented Mattie for not allowing her to go to CBC with the proposal until it passed through all the formal procedures of SBM, many of which she was

uncertain, and the informal contacts Mattie suggested she make. Marty viewed the CBC and UR as critical in the development and implementation of her project.

Although Marty saw herself as caring for students, other teachers viewed her attempts at innovation as a way for her to gain power for herself--to get better students in her classes, to have an extra planning period, and to get more materials and help from the CBC and UR. Marty viewed Mattie as using power to block efforts for change, rather than using administrative power to empower teachers to enable them to effect ways of caring for students. Finally, Marty was the recipient of care and power, as well as the pawn of power, from the CBC and the UR. Both groups empowered her through their gifts of resources to enable her to concretely plan for the ninth grade team. Both groups also used her to facilitate their goals--the CBC to show the community they were involved in helping the schools, and to gain some control over the curriculum in the school; and the UR, to fulfill what they saw as the university role in school reform.

Marty needed the principal's, the CBC's and the UR's power in order to effect caring, that is, to develop and establish a program that would increase student retention, achievement, and learning. She needed Mattie's caring and understanding as she attempted to work with a distrustful and fragmented staff. She needed overt, concrete, active support from Mattie--Mattie's attendance at the ninth grade team planning meetings; her authorizing the deputy principal to work with the master schedule to explore ways to

accommodate the team concept; her explaining to staff the necessity for, and logic behind, having a team planning period as well as an individual one for the teachers involved with the ninth grade team; and her calling for volunteers to work with the initial team. Or, perhaps Mattie needed to use her power to talk with the team members to clearly state her objections and her concerns, and her preference for and reasoning behind her wanting to move more slowly on the project. Perhaps, she needed to indicate her need for caring by explaining the pressures and insecurities she felt from being in a position of leadership for which there was no model--no one really knew how SBM should function; no one knew how a partnership between schools and business and between schools and a university worked; and, most of all, no one really understood what 'collaboration' meant.

Although the CBC and the UR ostensibly provided caring for students in a tangible sense of granting funding, expertise, and human resources, they also wielded--or attempted to wield--power over Marty and over Division. Marty saw the CBC and UR as agents who could supply her with the extended resources needed for the ninth grade team that the economically ailing Newtown District could not. She saw the CBC as having political influence in the community, which could possibly lead to more 'outside' support for DHS in the form funding and other resources, as well as support for changes leading to community support of teachers. Although she became somewhat wary after learning the CBC did not have the money they originally promised ("As it turns out they were playing games

with us and they don't have any real money either" [SK:4-7-92:9]), she continued to see the committee as a caring component for the ninth grade team--caring in the sense that she received encouragement to develop and attempt to carry out her ideas to better serve kids.

She saw the UR as bringing expertise and human resources to enable teachers to make educationally sound programmatic changes. She also viewed the university as having political power over the central office administrators. Since the university was well-known for its work in school reform, the district administrators were eager for the university offer to help Newtown's floundering--and failing--school district. Because of the political implications, she thought that if the UR supported her and the ninth grade team, the principal would have a more difficult time resisting the team's efforts. Marty sought the help of various university representatives for their expertise, but also for their willingness to use whatever political influence they had to advance her cause. In a sense, she seemed to feel that she needed to 'fight' power with power, and since as a teacher she had very little, she used the university. Because the UR were willing to assist her in every way possible, she believed they really cared for teachers and students.

There was another way of looking at the CBC's and UR's involvement. Each of these groups used Marty to advance their own agendas. The business community complained that the students graduating from the Newtown schools were ill-prepared to function in the work world. They used low scores on achievement tests and the

increasing rate of students dropping out of high school as their basis. Through a coalition of the state, corporations, and universities, the Newtown business community opted to become partners with the schools in order to assist in improving schools so that students would be better prepared for work in the community. The goal of the CBC was to help teachers generate innovative programs by offering primarily financial assistance. By their controlling the funding, however, they also gained the right for input into the programs that would receive their support. Those that were at the top of their list were academies directly related to business--the Financial Services Academy, the Technology and Engineering Academy, and the Health Science Academy. The ninth grade team was an outgrowth of a science project and could conceivably be the CBC's attempt at altruism; the ninth grade team was the CBC's symbol to parents, students, and educators that the business community wanted to help all students. Thus, the CBC offered support to Marty in terms of funding, but funding less than originally had been promised her. Through the ninth grade team, the CBC could be seen as truly interested in aiding all Newtown's students.

The UR, too, had their own agenda. The local university was committed to the partnership of the state, corporations, and universities; it was a front-runner in school reform citing collaboration among the State and many of its institutions to improve schooling, especially that in urban schools. The school district of Newtown provided a challenge befitting the reputation of

this university. Consequently, DHS, as the worst school in an economically depressed and crime-ridden city was almost akin to grabbing the brass ring for the UR. If the university representatives could effect changes within DHS that improved student achievement and improved relationships among the school, home, and other institutions, the education component of the university would receive acclaim and prestige in the field of education nationally and internationally. Now this does not mean that those university people working at DHS did not believe in students. Quite the contrary. As one of those people, I can attest that those of us who actually worked with teachers and students saw that as our primary goal. However, one must not forget the political concerns that emanated from those hierarchically above the workers. Marty, and the ninth grade team, were used politically by the university to advance its own goal: to do research and to gain national acclaim for bettering a failing urban school. The university used the ninth grade team to experiment with collaboration and with partnership--without really investigating how their work coincided with the mission of the school and the direction the staff wanted to take in order to work toward the goals the DHS community envisioned. Because of the latter, the university could be seen as using Marty to accomplish its own agenda, using political power in the guise of caring to advance itself.

The incident of the ninth grade team was one small episode in one school. In it we saw that the teachers were both the victims and the perpetrators of power struggles. This episode opened up for

question the degree to which mistrust and fragmentation among teachers affect their ability to work toward an ethic of caring.

REFLECTION

An ethic of caring is "an ethic of relation" (Noddings, 1992, p. 21). There is an "emphasis on living together, on creating, maintaining, and enhancing positive relations"; an ethic caring "does not posit one greatest good to be optimized, nor does it separate means and ends"; and finally, "it does not regard caring solely as an individual attribute," but "recognizes the part played by the cared-for" (p. 21). In an ethic of care, caring is not simply a response to a moment of decision making involving justification or moral choices; an ethic of care requires continuous working together to build and sustain affirmative relationships with others. It requires reciprocity, one who cares and one who is capable of receiving that care.

As I reflected on the staff of Division High, I saw inadequate communication and fragmentation among the teachers that lead to a serious distrust among themselves. The distrust perpetuated their fragmentation and inability to work together, preventing or severely limiting them from making changes they professed to want and/or need-changes to build trust among themselves in order to collaborate, to develop and implement leadership emanating from their own ranks, and to develop innovative curriculum for students. The changes they desired necessitated trust, and trust required

relationship. Rather than forming relationships, teachers appeared to have disengaged, to have pulled back into themselves even more.

Teachers recognized the need to build trust among themselves before they could collaborate effectively to make changes. Yet, the history of the school and the history the senior staff carried with them seemed to stand in the way of establishing trust. They talked, individually or in small groups, about the severe distrust among the staff brought about by fragmentation, lack of communication, and extreme individualism, but would not address those issues as a faculty. The tendency was to transfer their own problems as a staff to the traditional adversarial relationship between teachers and administrators. That is, rather than confronting their own problems and seeking ways in which to deal with them, they resorted to blaming the administration, particularly the principal, for the failures to accomplish what teachers wanted to see happening at DHS.

Teachers wanted support for various projects, ideas, or plans. But they were unwilling to support each other as a staff. They complained about the low expectations for students, but when the members of the math department raised standards, other teachers criticized them and attempted to work against them. Teachers bemoaned the high dropout rate, especially of ninth graders, and recognized the 'unfriendly' atmosphere into which the middle schoolers were coming. Yet, when a teacher initiated the concept of the ninth grade team, no one volunteered, few teachers backed the project, and many worked against it.

They wanted leadership, not only from the principal, but from their own ranks. They, however, were not connected as a faculty, preventing them from taking stances as a group and providing leadership that was representative of the staff. The teachers were divided in their conceptions of leadership, some wanting teachers to have virtually all decision making authority concerning policies within DHS and others wanting only the freedom to do what they wanted within the confines of their classrooms. To some, leadership implied unquestioning support from the principal for whatever teachers deemed beneficial for students; for others, leadership meant shared decision making between faculty and administrators, with authority to see policies were carried out resting with administrators. Teachers could not agree among themselves what leadership meant to them and if, or to what degree, they wanted to lead.

They used the word "support" to imply their need for caring--from their colleagues, from the administrators, and from the outsiders. How did they understand support? Too often, it seemed as though teachers felt supported--and cared for--only when others agreed with them as individuals or small groups. They did not see support as the opportunity to explore issues, challenge each other, or work together in relation to each other as persons and professionals. Efforts toward building relationships were seen as threats to their individualism and to themselves as individuals. The staff did not function as a unified body.

Given the distrust and lack of unity among the staff, pursuing an ethic of care is a difficult, at best, goal for the faculty at DHS. Some teachers have attempted to extend care, to be the one-caring, but other teachers find it hard, if not impossible, to receive care. Some senior teachers evidenced their willingness to work on change, but their efforts were not enough for others; care offered, but not received. Teachers' attempts to improve teaching and learning, thus benefiting both teachers and students, were resisted and rejected; care offered, but not received. Teachers chosen by their peers to lead them through new ways of governance and organization were verbally maligned and their attempts at leadership were undermined; care offered, but not received.

Complicating the situation was the interpretation that care offered was often seen as power, power by other teachers to take control of their colleagues or to gain 'perks' for themselves, or by teachers in collusion with administrators to move up the bureaucratic hierarchy. Fragmentation and lack of communication as a faculty contributed to the invidious distrust that pervaded the staff, turning efforts to care into power struggles. Noddings (1984) states that if an ethic of care is to develop, there needs to be modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation. Some teachers attempted to model caring; there was little or no dialogue or practice, and virtually no confirmation of their efforts to care. As important, there was virtually no one who seemed to know how to receive care. Most often, caring was interpreted as control.

In the following chapter, I will explore the relationships between care and power as they affect both faculty and administration. Is it enough for staff members, including administrators, to simply possess an **attitude** of caring, where there is a sympathetic or empathic **reaction** to others in response to particular circumstances? Is it possible for staff and administrators to pursue an **ethic** of care, requiring the creation and maintenance of relationships, the ability to give **and** receive care? How is power a part of caring--or is it? If an ethic of care necessitates care-giving to be situational, suspending adherence to rules or regulations designed to ensure fairness via objectively judging a situation by criteria applied to all like situations, does that give the one-caring power over others, that is control over others? Can caring **and** power lead to freedom--freedom for change, freedom for the individual as well as the group? These questions will be explored with the intent, not of finding answers, but of finding directions that will encourage us in the pursuit of equity and freedom in our society.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CARING-POWER: A CONUNDRUM

> I, who saw power linked to oppression in everything, did not want caring to be about power, and thereby about oppression . . . I wanted the "ethic of caring" to be pristine, to be somehow beyond issues of power that I considered to be essentially hegemonic and masculine.
>
> George W. Noblit
> "Power and Caring"

Like Noblit, when I entered Division High, I, too wanted an ethic of caring to be "pristine." I envisioned caring and power as dichotomous, if not diametrically opposed. For me, caring was relation, connectedness, concern, giving and receiving; it was harmonious community. Power, as I envisioned it, had no role in a caring community, for power projected negative qualities--authority, control, domination, force--that produced oppression. I expected power to be almost as "pristine," in a perverse sense, as I wanted caring to be in a real sense. That is not what I learned. Thus, the conundrum--the intricate riddle--of caring and power.

The complexity of the relationships between caring and power become apparent as we recognize that both caring and power are

relational, reciprocal, contextual, and socially constructed.[1] But as you might expect, there are differences within the similarities, thus, adding to the challenge our puzzle presents. In the following section, I explore those characteristics of caring and power, including their similarities and differences, in light of Division's attempts to effect reforms, in the midst of a bureaucracy based on power, that reflect elements of an ethic of care .

CARING AND POWER: SHARED ATTRIBUTES

Webs of Relations - Individual Caring and Collective Caring

Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (1984, 1992) both conceptualize an ethic caring[2] as involving a web or circle of relationships that leads to connection between and among individuals and builds community. Power, although often viewed as a property of the individual, is, I believe, similar to caring in its dependence on the interaction of persons. It functions within a web of relations, or like a machine with each cog dependent on the others and in which each person is caught (Burbules, 1986; Foucault, 1980; Gliddens, 1979). In terms of educational reform, I believe it is necessary to look at the power relationships already in place, for, realistically, the creation and implementation of an ethic of caring, if it occurs, will evolve from within those relationships.

---

[1]For a detailed discussion of power as relational, reciprocal, socially constructed, and contextual, see Burbules (1986).

[2]I will use Burbles' work as a guide to my discussion of power as relational and reciprocal.

The question, then, becomes what is the web of relationships for caring-power? Let us begin to think about this question by reflecting on the story of Division.[3]

As part of the Newtown school district, certain power relations[3] at Division were inherent, that is, they were not chosen but were necessary simply because of the circumstances under which teachers and administrators came together. As part of a bureaucratic hierarchy, the staff were in positions that reflected a background of conflicting interests and a continuous tension between compliance and resistance. The relationship between teachers and administrators in Newtown was particularly strained because of the historically strong union mentality and ties within the city and, subsequently, within the school district. Whenever change in policy or practice emanated from the building or central office administration, teachers, generally, were suspect and distrustful that the changes would benefit them. The assumption was the relation with administration was adversarial.

To complicate matters, the union no longer held the power in the district that it once did. It was weakened and in the midst of attempting to re-define itself. Although it was the vehicle through which the teachers negotiated with the administration, increasingly more teachers decried their relationship with the union, publicly

---

[3]I define "power relations" using Burbules' (1986) perspectives, as activities, attitudes, barriers, and so forth that bind and constrain the activities of both persons or groups and which coerce each to define its purposes and range of alternatives partly in terms of the other.

citing their dissatisfaction. The union, however, retained the power to speak for all teachers.

The union representing the support staff--food service, security, custodial, and maintenance staff--affected, and was affected, by the teachers' union. Depending on the negotiating packages, the two unions intersected, supporting each other, or separated, working against one another. Relationships between teachers and support staff, however, were not strained, for both felt they were in submissive positions to the higher power of building and district administrators and the board of education.

At Division the relationship between teachers and support staff was hierarchical, although I would suspect the teachers would not describe it as such. The support staff, unless their jobs--security guards or maintenance, for example--directly affected teachers, were barely acknowledged by the teaching staff. The teachers had the privilege of choosing when to make them visible, thus, maintaining hierarchy and power, to a degree, over support staff.

The relationship between levels of administration at Division generally did not appear adversarial, but were definitely driven by power, each level accountable to the one above. The deputy principal and the assistant principals would not make decisions without Mattie's approval, and Mattie would not sanction non-routine requests or activities without consulting the rules of the organization, that is, the district, or without consulting her "bosses," the secondary curriculum director and the superintendent. That sense of always being accountable to the power level above

resulted in not only a hierarchy of power, but relations among the Division administrators and between the administrators and the teachers, and between teachers and support staff.

A school challenged to care faces the reality of already existent power relationships. Within those relations are separate, unique entities, all competing with and struggling against one another for scare resources--materials, funding, time, human resources--or for power--authority, control--itself. The result is tension between fulfilling themselves as individuals and meeting the needs and desires of others and the community as a whole (Kreisberg, 1992). The challenge I see is that of attempting to develop an ethic of caring from within relations of power.

The organization and leadership in place is so ingrained in our institutions, including schools, that even when people want to change, it is difficult for them to do so for they continue to envision and measure all changes by the known structure. The struggle to implement site-based management at Division is a good example of a staff working toward building community, but choosing methods that actually perpetuated and increased the bureaucratic organization already in place. By creating the steering committee and the fishbowl meetings, the staff and administration intended to remove decision making from solely the principal's purview. Mattie, however, retained primary decision-making authority and new layers of bureaucracy--in this case, the steering committee and fishbowl meetings--were created.

There were several reasons for that happening. Site-based decision making was a change in organizational structure for Division; the district office, however, continued functioning as it always had. There were no changes in organizational protocol between the school site and between the district to accommodate changes in structure at the school level. The central administrators continued to communicate with Mattie about issues related to school and district policy, budgeting, and accountability, and to hold her responsible for the management of the school.

Mattie's role was ambiguous, at best. She was charged with 'leading' Division to become a site-based managed school with all staff, including support staff, sharing in the decision making that affected the school. Yet, in the eyes of the district, she, alone, was responsible for the successful operation of the school. She knew her role as leader would be different in a site-based managed school, but she did not know how it would change and no one from the central office availed himself to explore that issue with her. Her models were those of top-down authority encouraging her to work with staff to decide school policies, but to shoulder the responsibility for whatever decisions were made. Consequently, Mattie vacillated, offering to share decision making, but, essentially, determining when that would occur.

Teachers, too, had difficulty understanding their roles in a structure that purported to build community, bringing people together rather than forcing them apart. They continued to view

reform efforts to move Division toward trust, connection, and community through a lens of bureaucratic rules and regulations, and from the perspective of a hierarchical organization. That was most evident when they continued to allow the principal's explicit support, rather than the school-wide SBM process, to govern whether or not a proposed project or activity--the ninth grade team concept, for example--would move forward.

The teachers wavered in their thoughts about shared decision making, leadership, and self-governance. Despite the faculty's choosing a member of their own to work with the administrators to develop a collaborative model of organization, SBM, few members actually supported her, and several worked to denigrate her efforts at collaboration. Teachers talked about the need to build trust, to cooperate, and to develop a caring atmosphere at Division, but they chose means--working independently, failing to trust that their colleagues' intentions were honorable for the individual as well as the collective--by which to maintain the current system and climate.

Some teachers felt the administration from central office and the building was simply pandering to their calls for empowerment, placating them by allowing them limited leadership and decision making opportunities; others did not trust their unionist peers any more than they trusted the administrators. Although many teachers strongly evidenced a desire to change the organizational structure to one that was less bureaucratic and hierarchical, they were unable to imagine a structure in which they collaborated among themselves and with the administrators. Therefore, they limited themselves in

the efforts they made to work toward understanding and defining collaboration at Division.

Each change the staff considered they viewed through the bureaucratic model; each problem they encountered, they tried to solve using the tools of bureaucracy--more committees, more authority, more control. Seemingly, the more Mattie and the teachers attempted to flatten the hierarchy, the more restraints, emanating from both administrators and faculty members, evolved. They faced difficulty constructing caring relationships for the collective, that is, for the whole staff and for groups within the staff (for example, ninth grade team, academy developers, and steering committee), as they continued to work within the well-established power relations.

Caring-Power: Individual Effort

Caring relations were more easily formed, however, when caring consisted of relations between individuals. Consider Mattie's ministering to individual faculty and staff members who experienced personal crises. On a personal level she listened, attempted to "apprehend the others' reality" (Noddings, 1984), and offered care appropriate to the individual. A web of relationships developed as she extended her caring to others who, in return, accepted her caring. Some, in turn, offered care to others, students and colleagues.

When the issue of caring was not political, that is, when caring did not involve changes affecting the established

bureaucratic organization, caring relationships were accepted and encouraged. Consider Mattie's development of grief counseling. She received little, if any, opposition from faculty, other staff members, or other administrators. She also did not require everyone to participate. Staff members volunteered to work with the students or faculty who needed their help; the expectation to care for the majority of the faculty was limited to allowing students to attend grief counseling sessions.

In the instances of caring for individuals, caring did not impact power relations. The acts of caring done at a personal rather than collective level did not require the collective staff to act within an ethic of caring. Although Mattie asked some faculty members to extend caring to those in personal crisis, they could choose to follow through or not. In the case of grief counseling, the program functioned sufficiently within the power structure to allow those who did not choose to be care-givers to abide by regulations set up for the program. Since the program required little of staff members, compliance was not difficult, even for those who may not have totally supported the idea of such counseling; staff did not experience coercion.

The conundrum of caring-power is quite apparent in the issue of grief counseling. One could say Mattie used her power--her authority and control--to institute a program based on an ethic of caring. By embedding it in the power structure, but not disturbing the power relations, Mattie received support for the program. One could debate, however, whether the teachers acted from the

perspective of an ethic of caring or from that of bureaucratic principles, that is, compliance with rules.

Caring-Power: A Collective Effort

Before I continue, it is necessary to explore the issues of a an ethic of caring as a **collective** issue and as an **individual** issue. Recall in Chapter Three I noted that a primary concern among feminist thinkers is that an ethic of care is too often viewed as a female ethic. Connected with that notion is the issue of private/ public. Women are expected to be care-givers in the home, sacrificing themselves for their families. Feminist concerns arise from the transference of that sacrificial caring from the private domain to the public. As long as women are willing to shoulder the efforts required to care in the public sphere, caring is encouraged and supported.

A collective effort, presuming an integration of males into caring work, receives little support. Recall the response to the Family Leave Act. Consider also Ghiloni's (1987) study of women in corporations, hired for their expert interpersonal skills to manage personnel and public relations departments, yet whose work was seen as significantly less important than that of making aggressive business deals. As long as Mattie confined caring to her own efforts, or to efforts involving volunteers, most of whom were women, she received tacit approval from the staff.

Caring as a collective effort proves much more difficult, for as a collective it becomes a **politics** of caring. The presumption of

educational reformers and feminist writers is that caring as a basis for organization will involve males as well as females. That understanding, then, must lead to the acknowledgment that school organization founded on an ethic of caring impacts power relations, for the responsibility of caring no longer is solely female and confined to the private domain, but becomes shared among all, regardless of gender. The impact of caring on power relations is the recognition of a need to reconceptualize power 1) as a response to the private (women's caring work) becoming an integral part of the public sphere (men's task accomplishment); 2) as valuing of caring commensurate with that of doing; and 3) and as focusing on the continua rather than the dichotomies that traditionally polarize men and women. An ethic of caring is a politics of caring purposefully disturbing the web of power relations.

Reconceptualizing power relations will require addressing the dichotomies set up by the notion of caring as female. Such a notion, in essence, distances women and minorities from men by polarizing characteristics associated with them: private/public, connection/separation, relation/autonomy, community/individual, particular/universal, and caring/power. Implied within the dichotomies is a judgment: elements associated with males are valued and those with females are of lesser or no value. Polarization maintains the web of power relationships, keeping those in power separate from those who are powerless.

Burbules (1986) stated that power relations change those who occupy them, restricting their autonomy, and narrowing their

horizons. Teachers attempting to work collaboratively with peers on student academies faced attitudes of distrust, as others preferred to maintain their autonomy in the classroom and separation from the rest of the faculty. Having no model for 'school as a caring community', and coming from experiences that continually reinforced their positions in the hierarchy and the values associated with bureaucracy, teachers talked about community and cooperation but strived to gain more independence and autonomy, and the power that they hoped would come to them through SBM.

Ironically, they restricted their autonomy by continuing to view changes that could lead to a greater degree of self-governance and independence through traditional bureaucratic relations. With each change proposed that would open the door to freedom, they responded with distrust and cynicism, and within the limitations they were accustomed to fighting. They worked hard to develop a program to ensure greater safety in the building by requiring all students and staff to wear I.D. badges. But, the faculty was unwilling to shoulder the responsibility for carrying it out. I think that occurred for several reasons. The faculty did not trust the administrators to allow them to take responsibility for the program; they were unsure about **how** to carry out the program and, therefore, it was easier to fall back on the bureaucratic tradition of "it's the administrators' duty" to see that policy is enforced; and they did not know how to work within the ambiguity of a new way of functioning, that is, they did not know how to work **with** the administrators to determine how to use the power they potentially

had through SBM. Their action--or inaction--resulted in Mattie's insistence that they make the program functional; the teachers felt coerced to complete a program they had originally suggested.

The teachers did not/could not trust their peers, were unable to cooperate and collaborate among themselves, or resisted joining together to support those whom they elected to leadership positions.[4]

Faculty narrowed their horizons when they continued their pattern of viewing the principal as an adversary. Rather than give Mattie a fair chance to prove herself, they fell back into their web of power relations when miracles had not occurred within a few

---

[4]Foucault (1979) discusses the exercise of power as control through Bentham's imaginary architectural figures, the Panopticon. The function of the building was to "induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of the power" (p. 201); that is, to put those inside under the allusion of continual surveillance so that, ultimately, those who are under surveillance will monitor themselves. ". . . This architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers" (p. 201).

As I listened to and observed the staff at Division, I was impressed with the degree to which they had maintained the bureaucratic hierarchy and the control it has over them. Dissatisfied with their situations and presented with opportunities for change, they were unable to free themselves to think differently which, in large part, included trusting one another, trusting that their peers were not part of the "surveillance." Foucault stated that Bentham "laid down the principle that power should be visible and unverifiable. Visible: the inmate will constantly have before his eyes the tall outlines of the central tower from which he is spied upon. Unverifiable: the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at any one moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so" (p. 201). Mattie was the visible power. But the teachers did not trust the working relationship between Mattie and the SC chairperson. Did they fear she was part of the invisible power that "spied" on them?

months of her arrival as principal. By November, teachers were complaining that Mattie had failed them, that she had not made changes, although many teachers found it difficult to define what they meant by change.

They expected care from Mattie, but had a difficult time caring for her. She needed them to understand the ambiguity of her position and that she--and they--needed time to accomplish goals to improve Division. Had they simply supported the SC chair, Mattie would have felt their support in exploring SBM together. Instead, they chose to criticize her for not leading and to find reasons detailing why they could not. They narrowed their horizons, for they were unable to see beyond the past to a relationship with administrators that was cooperative and not adversarial.

Mattie's involvement in power relations illustrates the tensions between individual fulfillment (being a 'successful' administrator in the traditional sense) and meeting the needs of the faculty. She initially planned--and began--to converse individually with all faculty and staff, visit their classrooms, be in the halls, and be in the office to greet staff as they came in mornings---all because she wanted them to know she cared. Within a few months, staff complained because she was becoming less and less available. She was out of the building at district meetings; her office door was closed most of the day, presumably because she had conferences; teachers had to make appointments to talk with her.

It would be easy to say that she was overly ambitious in her initial thoughts about the ways she would handle her job. That is,

she did not realize how much was expected of her by the district in terms of meetings and other out-of-building obligations. On the other hand, perhaps she was caught in bureaucratic expectations. If she wanted to achieve success--recognition, promotion--in the organization, she needed to meet the expectations of those who had power over her.

She had wanted to be a principal for years. She worked her way "up" through the "system." She had studied the system and knew how it worked. Now, although I believe she really wanted to build trust and community at Division, she chose to abide by the rules, informal as well as formal, of the bureaucracy. She would work to create harmony, to build trust among teachers and administrators, and to collaborate, but those changes would have to fit within the established hierarchy. She would not make changes that threatened her position, nor would she challenge her bosses' individual or collective wisdom.

As an example, she wanted to decrease the number of students who were suspended from school, yet she did not work with the teachers to implement an in-school suspension program. She would not risk opposing the mandate of no budget increases in order to negotiate with the superintendent to find a way--perhaps some dollars--to at least pilot a program that she and many teachers believed was critical to improving students' educational opportunities. She would not use the potential power she had as the first woman--and the first black woman--to put pressure on the superintendent to show more than verbal support of Division's

efforts to create a caring environment.[5] One would almost say that Mattie was more concerned about maintaining the power relations as an end in themselves.

Division staff struggled with the dichotomies of individualism/autonomy/separation and connection/relation/community. As a collective--a faculty, an administration, and a total staff--people at Division had a difficult time working together; they seemed to fear connection for it might bring loss of autonomy; they balked at community because they did not trust their peers or those at other levels of the traditional hierarchy. As a collective, giving and receiving care proved troublesome, for that demanded everyone's willingness to work together, not just isolated individuals disposed to this approach.

Caring and Power: Reciprocal

The conundrum posed by caring and power increases in complexity as we realize both require a reciprocal relationship and are affected through the relationship. Noddings describes the reciprocal relationship of caring as one in which the care-giver understands the needs of the care-receiver and responds in a way to aid the other to achieve his/her goals. The care-receiver, in turn,

---

[5]Ironically, a faculty member stated that Mattie was given "free rein" by the superintendent to spend money, money that was not accessible to other administrators in the district, to refurbish Division. That would be in line with the notion of caring as a female ethic--Mattie was capable of beautifying the school, but not of "doing"--implementing a critical program for students.

acknowledges the receipt of the care offered. Each is affected and enhanced by the other.

Power as reciprocal is similar. Unless it is purely domination through which all social relationships are destroyed, power "seek[s] to maintain at least a surface legitimacy to the relation itself" (Burbules, 1986, p. 100). Tension between compliance and resistance is necessary in order to maintain power relationships. The alternatives of the person with power are constrained by working to maintain the relation; and the one with power must allow for a range of autonomy, including some resistance, to maintain the involvement of the person with less power. Without the tension between compliance and resistance, there would be either consent, involving no conflict and, therefore, no power relation; or domination, through which all social relations are destroyed. Those with power, then, affect and are affected by those with less or without power. Mary Parker Follett (1942) describes the relationship in terms of a tennis match:

> A serves. The way B returns the ball depends partly on the way it was served to him. A's next play will depend on his own original serve plus the return of B, and so on and so on. . . . A genuine interweaving and interpentrating by changing both sides creates new situations. (Follett, quoted in Kreisburg, 1992, p. 79)

In Follett's description of power, one can see its synergistic quality, a power that has potential for caring which frees and enables persons, affording them the capacity to implement (Baker Miller, 1976). Combined with caring, power has the potential to become a "blossoming experience" (Follett, 1942, p. 111). The story

of the math department, its chairperson and senior members, illustrates this well.

The math teachers appeared to have achieved a semblance of caring power within their department. They met regularly to discuss their classes; to help 'rookies' new to teaching and to the department; and to discuss, negotiate, and come to consensus about the curriculum and standards. Unlike most of the other departments, the math teachers met not only formally as a group, but informally each morning prior to school in order to chat and to discuss any issues that concerned them individually or as a whole. Mornings were also a time to just 'keep in touch' on a personal level. Fridays they met for drinks at a local pub to recap the week and unwind. A math teacher described the department as "our own little family. We're a close-knit and strong department. We have to be in order to survive" [SQ:5-18-92:2].

This "little family" did not just happen, but was consciously fostered by the chairperson and by the senior members of the department. There was an unspoken agreement that they would "talk back and forth to know what and how each other is teaching," [SQ:5-18-92:2] in order to maintain common and agreed-upon standards, and to support each other through the waves of criticism from other departments, staff members, and administrators who thought the standards were too high.

> I can't speak for other [departments], but I can for this one. If we come to a consensus, then we will abide by what we've decided. The whole department will work as a unit. We decided two years ago that it was time to hold these kids responsible for accomplishing something before we gave them a passing grade in

> mathematics. And though we have received a great deal of flak because our failure rate is so high, we've still held the line and said if they don't do it, they don't deserve to pass. [QM:1-29-92:2]

They shared the belief that math is sequential and, therefore, each of them must maintain the standards set so that the students are prepared for the next class. If a teacher received students who were not prepared for his/her class, s/he looked up the math teacher who had them the previous semester and demanded to know why the students were passed to the next level. Yet, that was not seen as misuse of power, but as a "set of checks and balances" [SQ:5-18-92:2] to maintain the integrity of the math department. The following conversation between a veteran math teacher and a less experienced, relative newcomer to Division illustrates that shared understanding and camaraderie.

> This is the way we keep tabs on ourselves and help each other if there are problems. Most of us are comfortable enough to talk about our problems, but sometimes the new people aren't. Take____, for instance. The first semester he was here he let the administration get to him. He passed kids he shouldn't have. And when some of us got his kids second semester and they couldn't pass the first test which was review, we were kinda tough on him. But, we straightened him out." (laughing) [SQ:5-18-92:2]

> They [the senior math teachers] were really rough on me my second semester. I had been told by the administration that I shouldn't hold kids to the standards the math department set up. I mean if a kid didn't cause any problems and came to class every day I should pass him. Well [the chairperson] sat me down and explained to me what the math department expected. I didn't lower my standards initially, but just gave more extra credit so they'd pass, even though they failed the tests. Well these guys [the senior math teachers] got my kids [second semester] and they couldn't do the work. [The chairperson] and _____really got on my case, but they helped me think through how to teach so students would pass the tests.

> And they also convinced me I wasn't doing a student a favor by letting him pass when he really couldn't do the work---even if the administration wanted me to do that. The people in this department stood behind me when I legitimately failed more students that next semester. [TE:5-18-92:3,4]

That teacher indicated he felt that people in his department cared about one another and would "stick their necks out" for each other. His perception was that he was initiated into the norms and values of the department and, like the rest of the members, agreed with them. Caring occurred through the support given and received by each other to maintain the consensus within the department. In Noddings' terms, the department worked at a reciprocal relationship among its members.

Department members looked to the chairperson to care for them, also. One teacher commented that the chairperson "tries to match courses and interests so we get at least some of the things we want to teach" [TE:5-18-92:3]. Asked to expand, he said the chair asked the math teachers their teaching preferences, which she seriously considered when making out the schedule for the deputy principal. In other words, teachers new to the staff were not 'stuck' with all the classes those with more seniority did not want. Another teacher said the chairperson would "really go to bat" [SQ:5-18-92:3] for the math faculty, doing all that was possible to support the individual teachers and the department as a whole. On several occasions I heard the chairperson sharing information informally with other math teachers; I saw senior teachers working with newer math teachers; and I observed one math teacher asking another for help with

particular students or with a new method or concept s/he was teaching. [fn:1-27-92; 1-30-92; 2-6-92; 3-30-92]

Caring occurred also through the expansion of the professional to the personal, that is, through social activities each person grew to know others as individual personalities. They made an effort to learn to work with each other as individuals and as part of a collective (department). No one person was solely the one-caring or the one-cared for, but the roles seemed to shift as needed. I believe reciprocity occurred because the teachers were willing to be care-givers and care-receivers.

On the other hand, the department members looked to the chairperson, because of the legitimacy of her authority through her position in the bureaucratic hierarchy, to care for them as members of a collective. They looked to her to do what was best for them as a whole, to put their interests as a department above those of the bureaucracy of the school and even of the math hierarchy within the district. Reciprocity occurred as they worked together to come to consensus regarding what they all could and would support; the staff supported the department head in the interactions and relationships in which she represented them.

Power was not absent from the act of caring. As the young teacher noted, the senior teachers gave him a "rough time" until he complied with the established norms of the department. He indicated that he agreed with the norms, but had a difficult time enacting them because of the "pressure some of the administrators put on me" [TE:5-18-92:2]. He explained that by "rough" he meant that the

senior teachers kept asking him to justify his reasons for passing students who could not do the work; they also helped him re-think how he taught. 'Power' in that instance supported him and brought him into the community of the department.

The chair also exerted power when she planned the schedule. She gave preference to senior faculty in terms of their having upper level classes. However, she ensured that the less experienced teachers had opportunities to teach classes they wanted by rotating some of the upper level classes.

She used her power as a chairperson as an entree to mentor new faculty members. She talked to them about their teaching, suggesting methods and ways of thinking that might help them improve. At the same time, she provided an opportunity for discussion in a non-threatening way. The chair was respected by the others in the department. Because of that, she was able to use her power as chair to diffuse disagreements among staff and to encourage them to 'talk it out.' The math department was not perfect, but it did seem to reflect not only an ethic of caring, but a power necessary to work within that ethic.

Power, on the other hand, has the capacity to use the reciprocal relationship to restrain and to maintain the advantage of one person or group over another. Mattie's relationship with her deputy principal and assistant principals was a maintenance of power over. Like Mattie's allegiance to her superiors in the central office, the deputy principal and the assistant principals checked with Mattie before they made virtually any decision. The assistant

principals looked to her for mentorship and guidance, seeing her power as helping them move up the hierarchical ladder.

Her relationship with the deputy principal, however, exhibited strong control and maintenance of her power position. Although she could offer concern for him on a personal level, as during the aftermath of a student's violent death, she was not as sensitive to him professionally. The relationship with him was such that, unlike the assistant principals, he was uncomfortable asking her for help; he did not see her as a mentor, but as his superior, one who had power over him. Among his biggest frustrations was Mattie's unavailability to him. He mentioned that he had questions he wanted to ask her, but she was so often in meetings and didn't want to be disturbed. By the time she was free, he was on cafeteria duty. When he was free to seek her out, "she's got her coat and hat on and is on her way out of the building. Then I have to wait 'til the next day and it's the same thing all over again" [KX:1-29-92].

She offered help in general, but failed to provide it when he specifically needed it, allowing him to struggle and, perhaps, even fail. As he agonized over--"I'm clawin' and stretchin,"--the master schedule, a task he had never done, she offered no help and he would not ask her for any. Asked if or who gave him help, he mentioned a counselor at another high school. He did say, "But, Mrs. Johnson told me she was available." I asked him what that meant. He gave a startled response, sat back in his chair, grinned at me, and was very quiet. Then, "I guess, available."

He discussed his frustration with the isolation he felt as he worked on the schedule with no guidance. He emphasized how stressful the time was. At one point, he puzzled about why Mrs. Johnson did not help him, for he was confident she saw his stress. He said he tried to see the positive, that she believed that if he learned on his own, he would really learn. He reiterated that she told him she was available, but never actually offered her assistance to him. Because he did make many mistakes on the master schedule, he lost credibility and trust among the teachers. Mattie's allowing him to flounder kept him strongly under her control.

Mattie's actions toward the deputy and assistant principals illustrate uses of power as reciprocal relations that were both oppressive and caring. The assistant principals went to her for help and received it. They felt nurtured and mentored; both indicated that Mattie was responsible for their being in their current positions and was assisting them to develop the skills to become higher level administrators. They trusted her, and she entrusted them with more responsibilities.

The deputy, however, had a difficult relationship with Mattie. He did not view her as his mentor, preferring to avoid asking her for help. The less time she made for him, the less he tried to confer with her. Their relationship became one of unspoken resistance and compliance. Mattie knew how much pressure she could exert--through silence or explicit requests--and the deputy knew how much he could resist in order to retain power over the degree of compliance he would give.

Caring and Power: Contextual

As we reflect on the concepts of caring and power, we see the complexity of the relationships. Neither caring nor power is unaffected by the other. Are the relationships care or power? oppressive or capacity building? The story of the ninth grade team provides a basis from which to further explore the connection.

Marty believed the ninth grade team concept had much to offer students: an orientation into high school life; an opportunity for bonding with a group of peers and with four teachers; an immediate sense of belonging to a smaller community within the larger school; a strong academic program where all four subject area teachers worked together; and the potential for retaining a higher percentage of students through graduation. She could not understand Mattie's standing in the way of a program that could have immediate effects for students. From Marty's perspective, Mattie did not care about teachers or students; she did not understand the important issues. Marty saw Mattie acting out of a desire to control teachers by not overtly supporting the ninth grade team. Marty, however, cared, for she understood what was important to students and teachers.

Mattie viewed the ninth grade team situation differently. She viewed herself as using her power to protect Division from outside sources who were attempting to influence, through the offers of money and other resources, the future goals of Division; Mattie believed the teachers and staff should decide without the pressures--and temptations--of money. If the outsiders could

support Division's staff's goals, then their help would be welcomed. Mattie believed she used her power to care for the school.

Caring and power are contextual; they are situated within the frameworks from which one works. Marty viewed the situation from the point of view of the merits of the program per se, and how it would benefit students. Mattie saw the program from a perspective that not only included students and teachers, but outsiders and future goals. In the instance of the ninth grade team, there is little doubt that Marty and Mattie would come to agreement whether Mattie's response was caring or controlling, for there was a basic conflict of interests between them. Marty saw the situation from the classroom perspective, Mattie, from a school-wide one. Rather than seeing the ways in which their interests intersected, the two individuals remained separate. Could they have reached a point of true intersection, where caring and power flowed together, there would have been the opportunity for cooperation and collaboration. The context, rather than being the "big" or "small" picture, would have been the intersection, creating, perhaps, something better than each had imagined. To paraphrase Mary Parker Follett, it could have been care-power as the blossoming of experience.

Bearing in mind the importance of a school's historical context is critical to an interpretation of care and power. Teachers who taught through the desegregation period view caring and power, in part, from the context of their experience. That context is fraught with multiple, often unresolved, feelings and tensions concerning racial attitudes and biases which affect not only those who were a

part of the desegregation process, but others who did not have those experiences. As much as people do not want to deal with those feelings--do not even want to believe they exist--they affect the caring and power--the webs of relations, the reciprocity, and the interpretations of caring/power--that occurs within the school. Other aspects of a school's history, such as a large proportion of senior teachers or the school's historical reputation affect the interpretation of caring and power. Clearly delineating caring from power is difficult, at best. Both are affected independently by reciprocal relationships and affect each other reciprocally; and are interpreted contextually as care, power, or care/power. However, there is, yet, another consideration: is there general agreement among educators or within the larger society concerning the understanding of what constitutes caring and power?

Caring and Power: Socially Constructed

Different cultures, different peoples, understand and construe caring and power in ways the hegemonic culture does not. Women of color, particularly, have noted that the discussion and debate about an ethic of caring have centered around the dichotomy of female/male issues and characteristics. Those women call to our attention that an ethic of caring, like feminist theory, generally, represents only one view, that of white middle class women. Eugene (1989) and Lykes (1989) detail differences in the interpretation of caring and power that are necessary in any discussion of an ethic of caring as a basis for schooling.

Much of the reform literature in recent years focuses on urban schools with large non-European populations and the necessity for policymakers, administrators, and teachers to better understand the students who attend them. To say that reformers imply the implementation of an ethic of caring would be, I believe, a reasonable assumption. However, there is an implicit understanding that the same interpretation of what caring and power is holds true for everyone. That is not true.

Part of the difficulty Mattie faced was a lack of understanding from the white teachers of the background and culture Mattie represented. White teachers criticized her for the effort she put forth with community members, for her continued referral to religion, and for the power she, at times, unabashedly used to further the school's interests.

To refer to Eugene's and Lykes' discussions, Mattie might be called a "Mother" in the black community of Newtown, for she was highly respected and influential. She gained her respect by being demanding of herself, students, and faculty; she expected one-hundred percent effort and dedication to education and to living a respectable life. For her, Division's improvement was dependent on community interest and support; and, in turn, the community would improve with the success of Division's students. Mattie believed the community was interested in Division and that she had to let

them know she was interested in them; the connection between school and community existed, but it was up to her to strengthen it.[6]

Several white teachers were critical of her for spending the time with parents, pastors, and other community members. They resented her taking time away from faculty in order to confer and visit with community members. Their understanding of caring focused on Division, **per se** and the community **within** Division.

Mattie's religion was her life. I used the word "ministering" in Chapter Five to partially describe Mattie's relationship to teachers and students. She saw her work as ministering, as shepherding students, faculty and community members not only in terms of schooling, but in terms of life. She believed it was her duty as a Christian to care for people because God gave her that ability as a "gift" and that she was "called" to her current position to lead her community.

Her position was misunderstood by many teachers, especially white teachers, at Division. One teacher talked about her being in the "black-Christian-Bible-toting" [BK:2-92] group of administrators who stuck together and pushed one another "up." Another referred to a conference which Mattie ended saying they needed to pray about the

---

[6]In the fall of her initial year as principal, Mattie invited me to a dinner given in her honor by friends and family to celebrate her appointment as the first female high school principal in Newtown. Former students and friends spoke briefly about her. With an exception, they all talked about the high expectations she held for them and for herself; her strong belief in God and how that governed her life; and her caring for them. One person specifically talked about the community's looking to Mattie for leadership to help her people work toward success. [fn:9-14-92]

matter. The teacher's response was that was not a viable answer. Those teachers appeared to interpret Mattie's reference to religion as using it as a powerful connection in the bureaucracy and as an excuse when she did not have answers to their problems.

Religion is a powerful influence on women in black culture. Eugene described the relation of black women to religions as one involving endurance, resistance, and resiliency in the face of attempts of personal and institutional domination. Mattie, in her many conversations with me, referred to the difficult times in her personal and professional lives where she has relied on her faith to move her forward. She approached the job of principal with that same attitude. Her faith would move her forward in her calling to minister to her people. And, she would use her power to make the move forward possible.

Caring and power are socially constructed. A culture's history influences the way its people understand and interpret those constructs. In the case of Division, black history--slavery, the strength of black women as household heads as a result of slavery (Davis, 1983) --influences Mattie and, in turn, the staff. For caring and power to be understood in full, a recognition of the impact of cultural differences is essential.

We now approach what I consider to be the critical question: who decides what is caring or power and whether it is in a person's or group's best interests?

AN ETHIC OF CARING--or--POWER THAT OPPRESSES?

In order to establish caring, can power be used to invoke compliance which is in the 'victim's' best interests? To address the question, we may ask: Do we accept at face value what the persons believe to be in their best interests and, therefore, care for them by accepting as best what they have identified, or do we attempt to ascertain independently what their interests are, whether they recognize them or not? Are those acts of power or of caring? Furthermore, how do we determine the best interests of the group or the whole collective, when, as in the case of Division, consensus is rare among the group members?

Although there is no one answer, there are ways by which to take responsible action. Burbules (1989) advocates the practice of Socratic dialogue, even if the dialogue is only with oneself. Such a dialogic would involve asking the others what they believe their interests are, questioning them about those interests, posing alternatives that we see, and indicating inconsistencies or ambiguities in their versions. Noddings (1984) and Grimshaw (1986) would call that exercise being reflective. By following such a "contextual process" (Burbules, 1989, p. 99), one would more likely avoid decisions that are authoritarian and would guard against those based on "credulous subjectivism and presumptuous objectivism" (p. 99).

Noddings (1984; 1992) suggests another contextual process to enact caring: modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation. At Division, when persons did model caring, it often went unnoticed for

there was virtually no dialogue to discuss caring, a lack of recognition regarding what one should practice, and no confirmation that what one did was acceptable and linked to a caring intent.

We also need to think differently about power. Power for itself is oppression. But as we've seen, power connected with an ethic of caring provides a "capacity to implement" (Baker Miller, 1976) or a "blossoming experience (Parker Follett, 1942). Care-power can be more than either caring or power. Noblit (1993) noted in his study of an elementary classroom that power can be used to confirm others. Such confirmation moves one toward a better vision of him/herself (Noddings, 1984, 1992). It is recognizing a person's potentialities in more than the abstract; it is seeking out and valuing their accomplishments (Hawkins, 1974).

To return to the questions at the beginning of this section, I believe it is evident that for one person to determine what is best for another without thoughtful dialogue, preferably with the other or a third person, is irresponsible. Recognizing that caring and power are intertwined underscores the critical responsibility one has to address all aspects of the interest before coming to a decision that potentially could oppress another.

Noddings suggestions of modeling, dialogue, practice and confirmation have merit to help determine what is best for all. However, as with any process, there is the danger that it will become a "recipe," steps that people perform with little or no thought. The outcome, the decision, is justified because the process was followed.

The focus of caring/power requires the thoughtful and collaborative efforts of all persons involved. It is not a process to be hurried, nor one to be duplicated for masses of people to follow verbatim. To use care/power responsibly will take time and cultivation.

In the final chapter, I discuss my thoughts about the implications of care/power for education--organization, leadership, teaching, and research.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CARE/POWER: QUAGMIRE?

> You will say that to fight against somebody may be terrible, but to fight for something is noble and beautiful. . . . The fight for is always connected with the fight against, and the preposition "for" is always forgotten in the course of the fight in favor of the preposition "against."
>
> Milan Kundera
> Immortality

In a world fraught with violence, anguish, hatred, and disregard for human life, to pursue an ethic of caring seems almost mandatory. Schools, traditionally looked upon as change agents of society, would, then, be logical places in which to develop an ethic of caring. Teachers and administrators would dialogue with each other to determine their respective needs; they would model and practice caring; and they would confirm each other as valued and worthwhile human beings. Knowing how to care and be cared for, teachers and administrators would have the skill and expertise to care for students who, in turn, would learn to dialogue with them and other students, and would model caring and confirm one another. Educators and students, then, would become the change agents for society, transforming their families and others so that the whole of

. our society would live with an ethic of caring as the core of our beings. Would that reform would be so straightforward!

As so many past and current school reforms, the ideal, development, and goals of an ethic of caring are reasonable and laudatory. The reality, however, involves a much more complex scenario. An ethic of caring would be embedded within a power structure that depends on rules, regulations, hierarchy, justice, and ultimately control. It would not be conceived and carried out in virgin territory. In many school settings, it would be embedded in individual and group historical contexts that are often filled with pain, distrust, disillusionment, and even fear. It would not be embraced without reservation, skepticism, or cynicism; it might well be seen as another means of an individual or group manipulating the power structure to maintain or gain more control over others. An ethic of caring as posited by white middle-class women only partially speaks to the interpretation of caring as understood by persons of other cultures and races. Subsequently, such an ethic might stand to alienate more than connect, for those cultures other than European might choose to resist yet another attempt of 'power over' to mold them into the 'white' image of the 'good' citizen. In all cases, caring is viewed within the context of power. The question becomes: how do we understand caring in relation to power? And further, how can we experience power in ways that result in caring?

This study persuades me that to discuss an ethic of caring without considering the influence of power relations is impossible.

I believe caring and power intertwine, intersect, and influence the ways in which each is interpreted and carried out. But simply acknowledging a relationship is not enough. The next step is to think about the ways in which caring and power relate, that is, why do some intersections result in positive relations and other in negative ones? In order to address that question, four areas of caring need further exploration: individual and collective caring; caring as a female ethic; who will care and to what degree; and caring as multiply interpreted.

RESEARCH ISSUES

INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE CARING

Virtually all discussions and examinations of caring are from the perspective of caring at an individual level, that is, one person caring for another. If schools are to be viewed as caring places, is caring among individuals enough, or would a caring school necessitate caring in a larger sense, as a collective? From the current study, I would suggest that for a school to be a caring place would require trust among individuals and groups, constructing and sharing knowledge within and among groups, recognizing the personal and institutional histories that affect people's ability to care, and accepting the notion of multiple understandings and interpretations of caring. Further research needs to be based on these questions: what degree of trust can realistically be established in a large institution? what unites people? can

multiple groups and/or individuals have conflicting or contradictory goals, yet build trust and, ultimately, a caring place?

Depending on one's history, experiences, gender, relationships, and/or culture, caring is interpreted and experienced differently. In a caring relationship, one person takes into consideration the unique make up of the other in order to determine how to care. The other, in turn, acknowledges the unique qualities of the one-caring in order to receive her care. Yet, within an individual caring relationship--one-caring and one-receiving--understanding what is in the best interests of the other may be difficult; there may be misapprehensions about what each understands as caring.

How, then, can an ethic of caring function at a group or collective level, where caring must be broad-based, encompassing the histories, experiences, gender, relationships, and cultures of many people? The dissertation suggests this question is paramount to further research on the implementation of an ethic of caring in schools, for within the collective reside multiple power relations, each having the potential to strengthen or limit the development of caring. Following are questions pertaining to the notion of collective caring that come out of this study.

What is 'collective caring'? Must all people within the collective approach one another in a relational, connected manner, working only for the good of the group/school? Of what importance is individual growth? How can the current power structure be altered to better serve the needs of both individual and collective? If educators think of 'experiencing' power rather than 'having'

power, might the relationship between caring and power become clearer? Finally, how can educators think about nurturing in terms of broad educational policy?

In order to address those questions, I believe that research efforts must entail a more thorough investigation of current thinking about the theory of power--power as knowledge, as control, as oppression, as the capacity to become or to do, and as something to experience rather than have. Furthermore, research needs more in-depth study of school organizational structure and culture in light of the theories and practices of power that enable and/or deter acts of caring to/from happening. Through the study of theory and practice, I suggest researchers seek connections between caring and power--where is power used to limit or support acts of caring; where is the rhetoric of caring used to alter power to allow for more caring. I suggest the need to look for the possibilities of caring and power acting synergistically to create a way of organization that may be outside our present vision and that we be open to seeing that which is yet unknown to us.

CARING AS A FEMALE ETHIC

Women discuss the need for caring. The call for reforms in education to include an ethic of caring, or to reconceptualize organizational theory to include caring have come primarily, although not solely, from women. A louder cry, that of empowerment, has emanated throughout educational reform and organizational reform. If we examine the characteristics of empowerment, we will

find that many of them mirror those of an ethic of caring--sharing, collaboration, allowing one to do. Much has been written about power and empowerment by men--and less, by women.

Empowerment continues to carry the notion of power, albeit, sharing control or authority in a collaborative way, or by providing opportunities for others to develop or to do. Empowerment, however, does not reach the depth of relationship that caring does. It presumes one has power and becomes the benefactor of another or others by 'giving' power to those with less or without. It presumes power is a commodity to be given away while implicitly assuming that the agent of power is better or absolved from the dialectics of power if s/he has the ability to bestow power.

An ethic of caring presumes relationship, that one sees situations in relation to others and makes decisions based on one's positions within relationships. Contrary to empowerment, caring not only allows for sharing or collaboration in decision making, caring encourages cognizance of one's position in relationship to others and consideration of how any decision will affect the relationship. That is, empowerment emphasizes the act of sharing in decision making--having power to participate and sharing control--and caring emphasizes decision making within a framework of maintenance of relationships.

Caring is as implicitly and explicitly 'female' as power is 'male. To develop schools with an ethic of caring as their basis would require that caring and power be separated from the concern with gender. That is, school personnel need to see caring and power

as gender-neutral concepts that both females and males employ to establish and maintain caring within schools; females and males will have to learn to feel comfortable working within the contexts of both caring and power.

The notion of establishing caring within schools must include the awareness that it would be embedded in a deeply rooted power structure. Certainly the problems at Division illustrate this. Questions that need our attention for continued research might include the following: Is it possible to be both caring and empowered? what would that look like? How must the present power structure change in order for power to become empowerment? How might an ethic of caring influence the dynamics of empowerment? Would empowerment be an integral part of caring?

Critical to this research would be a study of females' and males' attitudes toward power and caring. How do women and men interpret both concepts? Do they see a relationship between caring and power? Do they associate more with one than the other? Do females fear power, and males caring? If so, how can that change? What is the dialogue between males and females regarding their perceptions of power and caring? To what degree, if any, do women and men believe a relationship between caring and power is necessary to social change?

WHO WILL CARE AND HOW MUCH

Who cares and how much are important considerations for further research on caring and power. 'Who' is important as it relates to

hierarchy. Caring will be embedded in an existent school hierarchy both within the school and within the district. What will leadership entail in a school committed to functioning within an ethic of caring? Reflection on Mattie's experiences with attempts to care within a bureaucratic hierarchy give rise to the following questions necessary for researchers interested in an ethic of caring as a school reform measure to consider: What will the role of principal be, especially in the transition period to an organizational structure that is more supportive of nurturing and collaboration? Will the principal 'lead,' 'facilitate,' or do both? How will a principal learn to work within a role that is ambiguous at the school level, yet carefully delineated at the district level? How will a leader learn to balance power and caring so that s/he is able to work with the district organization, yet move/lead the individual school to develop a different type of organizational structure?

A most important consideration concerning caring and power in leadership is that of who decides what is in the best interests of the group. This became a source of conflict at Division. What responsibility does the principal have to 'lead' the group to her/his vision of what is best for the school as one entity? to 'lead'--to use the power of the position--the group to discover its collective vision? Is the latter possible in a large school with competing interests and visions?

Finally, how much caring is possible? Within an ethic of caring I believe it is necessary to care for oneself as well as for

others. Caring for oneself presumes interpretations of selfishness by other; neglecting to honestly care for oneself may lead to power struggles. That was evident between Mattie and Division's staff who saw her efforts to maintain balance in her life as being neglectful of them; and among various staff members who worked hard to implement SBM or new programs, only to leave feeling ineffectual and defeated. How do educators know when they have cared enough or too much?

Research on leadership requires addressing the question, is it possible to have leadership without power? If not, what does power mean in the context of caring?

CARING AS MULTIPLY INTERPRETED

Writings in recent years about caring and an ethic of caring are mainly those of white middle class women. Although those writings and discussions provide important thinking about the topic, educators contemplating the establishment of an ethic of caring within their schools must recognize that those writings represent only a dialogue embedded in the perspective of one culture. Caring in schools with non-European staff and students requires the latitude to reconceptualize and define caring from the perspectives of those from other cultures and/or races.

Central to the consideration is the understanding of power within caring. As discussed earlier, some African American women view caring as a liberational ethic of caring in which there is no dichotomy between power and caring. Power is a part of caring,

enabling the strong to care for those who are weaker or who have no power. The strong, the Mothers, are acknowledged, if not chosen outright, by their community members. The Mothers seek power not for self-aggrandizement, but to better nurture and care for those depending on them. In many respects, Mattie was seen as a "Mother" by the African American community. Her efforts to involve the neighborhood community and her reliance on her faith were not fully understood by white staff members who saw her only as using power in the guise of caring.

Research on caring and power from the perspective on non-European cultures would enhance thinking about caring and power. What are the differences between Europeans' and non-Europeans' conceptions of caring and power? How will those differences influence the ways in which educators consider establishing an ethic of caring in schools? the ways in which they assess the 'success' of an ethic of caring? How might the concept of leadership be affected by a 'liberational ethic of caring' as opposed to Noddings' or Gilligans' interpretation of an ethic of caring? Can white middle class males or females understand power and caring in the way traditionally oppressed people can? That is, are white males, especially, and white females, secondarily, capable of using power to liberate rather than constrain? Will they have the incentive to make changes? Will they see the gains to be made using power to tear down the current barriers to free those who have been oppressed?

Research would entail studies of school leaders of non-European cultures to observe how they lead; to listen to their thinking about caring and power and how they view themselves in relation to people of their culture. Researchers must begin reading about theories of caring and power from the perspective of non-European cultures and comparing them to the works dominant educators currently cite. Through such studies, there is an exciting possibility of moving toward pluralistic understandings of care and power which might lead to a more accepting attitude of diverse cultures.

LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

Educators who decide to incorporate an ethic of caring into school systems need to consider the organizational structure and leadership required to support that ethic. Mandating such an ethic is simply continuing the current bureaucratic tradition; finding a program, such as site-based management, with elements of an ethic of caring is not much better. I believe that as educators we must begin with the premise that an ethic of caring is not just implementing another program, but is re-thinking values and the ways in which we make moral judgments. It is a continuous process.

Our current school organization is designed to function with programs--we have a new idea about teaching and we design a program for all to use. An ethic of caring is not that. It is responsive to the people within that school, adapting and changing with the population. How can we think about designing organizational structures that function with continuous idea processing and

assessment? That do not look for the answer, but acknowledge and use multiple solutions? that see themselves always in process and their mission as awareness of change as relations change?

An ethic of caring will occur within established and to-be-established programs. It will be the thread running through that determines how people live their lives in community and how they develop as individuals. An ethic of caring will require organizational structure and leadership that support thinking as well as doing. It will demand time which, in turn, will demand resources, skills, and knowledge. Will a school organization--students, teachers, administrators, boards of education, and , ultimately, the citizenry--be willing to give time to change decades based on thinking only in terms of competition, autonomy control, and independence, in order to cultivate thinking in terms of interdependence, connection, and community? Will time and support be available to allow interdependence and community to develop along with the individual the competitive?

I ask the above questions in relation to Division's experiences with reform. The staff was emotionally exhausted as a result of past personal and professional histories, including participation in multiple reform efforts at Division. Faculty wanted immediate results, but realistically knew that could not happen. They feared involvement in yet another reform for they believed that, based on past experiences, they would not be given the time and resources with which to carry it out. Those experiences and attitudes, however, are precisely the evidence that should persuade reformers

of the necessity to allow time, for developing trust, connection, and community does not occur within prescribed time periods. Caring is personal, emotional, affective; it cannot be mandated, but must be nurtured. As Mattie, recognized, change takes time.

Creation and implementation of an ethic of caring in school will require leaders who do not have all the answers, who are willing to struggle with ambiguity, who are willing to make hard decisions--to use their power--knowing that at some point, they, albeit unintentionally, may make a decision that is not in the best interest of a; they will need to know how to re-group. These leaders will worry more about the collective than about themselves, thus modeling a tenet of caring. They will dialogue, having a good sense of when to show their weaknesses and when that would be damaging to themselves or to the group. They will have a vision clear enough to guide others, while simultaneously working with others to create the collective vision.

The organizational structure will have to be such that it can support the leaders in the process of continuous change, from the first tentative, never-before-taken steps away from the comfortable structure of bureaucratic hierarchy to the never-ending path of personal and collective discovery.

I believe that an ethic of caring in schools is not changing programs; it is changing the way we think about valuing and moral judgments, and the ways in which we relate to others. Programmatic changes evolve to accommodate our thinking. Organizational structure and leaders will need to recognize and accommodate that.

CONCLUSION

The conundrum of caring and power remains just that: an intricate puzzle. The intricacy and complexity of the puzzle, however, rests on one's choice of solutions. There will always be conflicting interests The task is bringing about that which is in the best interests of the person or group. Functioning within an ethic of caring involves the use of power. Those who are in a position to decide for others must always be prepared for their mistakes, for "there is no possibility of ever eliminating all conflict between human needs and desires; the problem is rather how to identify and eliminate its most damaging and destructive forms" (Grimshaw, 1986, p. 186).

Caring is not pristine, devoid of all power relations. Particularly as we consider caring in the context of a collective--of a school--relationships will involve both caring and power. There will be mistakes; some people may be hurt. But change--and freedom--does not come without a price.

> Life is trouble. Only death is not. Life is to undo your belt and look for trouble. . . . A man needs a little madness or he doesn't cut the rope to be free.
>
> Zorba
> "Zorba the Greek"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abel, E. & Nelson, M. (Eds.) (1990). Circles of care: Work and identity in women's lives. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Abbott, M. G. & Caracheo, F. (1988). Power, authority, and bureaucracy. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 239-257). New York: Longman.

Acker, J. (1991). Hierarchies, jobs, and bodies: A theory of gendered organizations: Gender and Society, 4(2), 139-158.

Anderson, J. G. (1966). Bureaucratic rules: Bearers of organizational authority. Educational Administration Quarterly, 2 7-34.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry, 11, 3-42.

Anyon, J. (1983). Intersections of gender and class: Accommodations and resistance by working-class and affluent females to contradictory sex-role ideologies. In S. Walker & L. Barton (Eds.), Gender, class, and education, (). London: Falmer Press.

Arendt, H. (1958). The human condition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Auerback, J., Blum, L., Smith, V. & Williamson, C. (1985). Commentary on Gilligan's In a Different Voice. Feminist Studies, 11(1), 149-161).

Baker, A. J. (1982). The problem of authority in radical movement groups: A case study of lesbian-feminist organization. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18(3), 323-341.

Beck, L. (1992). Meeting the challenge of the future: The place of a caring ethic in educational administration. American Journal of Education, 100(4), 454-496.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Bellah, M. F., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life. New York: Harper & Row.

Blackmore J. (1991a). Changing from within: Feminist educators and administrative leadership. Peabody Journal of Education, 19 40.

Blackmore, J. (1991b, April). Policy as dialogue: feminist administrators working for educational change. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Association, San Francisco, CA.

Brabeck, M. (Ed.) (1989). Who cares: Theory, research, and educational implications of the ethic of care. New York: Praeger.

Brown, C. (1982). Home production for use in a market economy. In B. Thorne, with M. Yalom (Eds.), Rethinking the family: Some feminist questions (pp. 151-167). New York: Longman.

Burbules, N.C. (1986). A theory of power in education. Educational Theory, 36(2), 95-114.

Calas, M. B. & Smircich, L. (1988). Using the F word: Feminist theories and social consequences of organizational research. Paper presented at the Academy of Management meetings, Anaheim. California.

Cameron, B. (1983). Gee, you don't seem like an Indian from the reservation. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua (Eds.), This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color (pp. 46-52). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Cantor, D. W. & Bernay, T. (1992). Women in power: the secrets of leadership. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, C. M. (1991, May). Educating the good teacher. Paper presented to the Norwegian Council on Teacher Education Conference, Tjome, Norway.

Clark, C. M. & Jensen, K. (1991, September). Studying the ways of care. Paper presented to the International Study Association on Teacher Thinking, Surrey, England.

Cocks, J. (1985). Suspicious pleasures: On teaching feminist theory. In M. Culley & C. Portuges (Eds.), Gendered subjects, The dynamics of feminist teaching (pp. 171-182). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Pub.

Cohen, E. G. (1986). Designing group work: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Culley, M. et al. (1985). The politics of nurturance. In M. Culley & C. Portuges (Eds.), Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching, (pp. 11-20). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Pub.

Cusick, P. (1992). The educational system: Its nature and logic. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Cusick, P. (1983). The egalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Daly, M. (1973). Beyond god the father: Toward a philosophy of women's liberation. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, M. (1979). Gyn/Ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism. Boston: Beacon Press.

Davis, A. Y. (1983). Women, race, and class. New York: Vintage Books.

Dunlop, D. M. (1991). Rethinking power in schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27(1), 5-29.

Edelman, M. W. (1987). Families in peril: An agenda for social change. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Edwards, R. C. (1984). Forms of control in the labor process: An historical analysis. In F. Fischer & C. Sirianni (Eds.), Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy, (pp. 109-142). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Eisenstein, H. (1984). Contemporary feminist thought. London: Allen & Unwin.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review, 59(3), 297-324.

Ellsworth, E. (1990). Correspondence: Empowering or not empowering? Continuing debate over non-repressive pedagogies. Harvard Educational Review, 60(3), 399-405.

Elshtain, J. B. (1990). Power trips and other journeys: Essays in feminism as civic discourse. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Elshtain, J. B. (1981). Public man, private woman: Women in social and political thought. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Eugene, T. M. (1989. Sometimes I feel like a motherless child: The call and response for a liberational ethic of care by black feminists. In M. Brabeck, (Ed.), Who cares?: Theory, research, and implications of the ethic of care (pp. 45-62). New York: Praeger.

Ferguson, K. E. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Finch, J. & Groves, D. (Eds.). (1983). A labour of love: Women, work and caring. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Fine, M. (1987). Silencing in public schools. Language Arts, 64(2), 157-174.

Fine, M. (1986). Why urban adolescents drop into and out of public high school. Teachers College Record, 87(3), 392-409.

Fischer, F. (1984). Ideology and organization theory. In F. Fischer & C. Sirianni (Eds.), Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy, (pp. 172-190). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fischer, F. & Sirianni, C. (1984). Organization theory and bureaucracy: A critical introduction. In F. Fischer & C. Sirianni (Eds.), Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy, (pp. 3-20). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fisher, B. (1990). Alice in the human services: A feminist analysis of women in the caring professions. In E. Abel & M. Nelson (Eds.), Circle of care: Work and identity in women's lives (pp. 108-131). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Fisher, B. & Tronto, J. (1990). Toward a feminist theory of caring. In E. Abel & M. Nelson (Eds.), Circle of care: Work and identity in women's lives (pp. 35-62). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Flanagan, J. Jr. I Adler, J. E. (1983). Impartiality and particularity. Social Research, 50(3), 576-596.

Flax, J. (1981). The conflict between nurturance and autonomy in mother-daughter relationships and within feminism. In E. Howell & M. Bayes (Eds.), Women and mental health, New York: Basic Books.

Follett, M. P. (1942). Dynamic administration. New York: Longmans, Green.

Foucault, M. (1979). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. (A. Sheridan, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1975)

Foucault, M. (1980). Power and knowledge. In C. Gordon (Ed.), Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977. Michel Foucault (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1972).

Fox-Genovese, E. (1991). Feminism without illusions: A critique of individualism. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Freire, P. (1989). Pedagogy of the oppressed. (M. B. Ramos, Trans) New York: Continuum.

French, M. (1985). Beyond power: On women, men, and morals. New York: Summit Books.

Frye, M. (1983). The politics of reality. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.

Ghiloni. B. W. (1987). The velvet ghetto: Women, power, and the corporation. In B. W. Domhoff & T. R. Dye, (Eds.). Power elites and organizations (pp. 21-36). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Gilligan, C. (1983). Do the social sciences have an adequate theory of moral development? In N. Haan, R. Bellah, P. Robinson, & W. Sullivan (Eds.), Social science as moral inquiry. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N. P., & Hamner, T. J. (Eds.) (1990). Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H. A. (Ed.) (1991). Postmodernism, feminism, and cultural politics: Redrawing educational boundaries. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Moral dimensions of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988). School university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gordon, C. (Ed.) (1980). Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977. Michel Foucault. (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1972)

Graham, H. (1983). Caring: A labour of love. In J. Finch & D. Groves (Eds.), A labour of love: Women, work and caring (pp. 13-30). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grimshaw, J. (1986). Philosophy and feminist thinking. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Grumet, M. (1988). Bitter Milk. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. London: Routledge.

Harding, S. (Ed.) (1987). Feminism and methodology. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S. (1986). The science question in feminism. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge?: Thinking from women's lives. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hartsock, N. C. M. (1984). Money, sex, and power. Boston: Northwestern University Press.

Havel, V. (1992). The power of the powerless. In P. Wilson (Ed.), Open letters: selected writings 1965-1990 by Vaclav Havel (pp. 125-214). (P. Wilson, Trans) New York: Vintage Books (Original work published 1985.)

Hawkins, D. (1974). The informed vision: Essays on learning and human nature. New York Agathon Press.

Hearn, J., Sheppard, D. L., Tancred-Sheriff, P., & Burrell, G. (Eds.) (1989). The sexuality of organization. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Helgesen, S. (1990). The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership. New York: Doubleday Currency.

Hodgkinson, H. (1986). The schools we need for the kids we've got. Paper presented at the 1987 annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.

The Holmes Group (1988). Tomorrow's Schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

hooks, b. (1989). Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1990). Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics. Boston: South End Press.

Howe, F. (Ed.) & the Carnegie Commission on High Education (1975). Women and the power to change: A volume of essays. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Jackson, P. (1986). The practice of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jagger, A. (1983). Feminist politics and human nature. Brighton, CN: Harvester.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1974). Instructional goal structure: Cooperative, competitive, or individualistic. Review of Educational Research, 44 (2), 213-240.

Johnson, R. T. & Johnson, D. W. (1987). How can we put cooperative learning into practice? Science Teacher, 54(6), 46-48, 50.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Kotlowitz, A. (1991). There are no children here: The story of two boys growing up in the other America. New York: Anchor.

Kreisberg, S. (1992). Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Krieger, S. (1991). Social science and the self: Personal essays on an art form. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kundera, M. (1978). The book of laughter and forgetting. (M. N. Heim, Trans.). New York: Penguin Books.

Kundera, M. (1990). Immortality. (P. Kussi, Trans.). New York: Grove & Weidenfeld.

Kundera, M. (1984). The unbearable lightness of being. (M. N. Neim, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.

Lewis, M. & Simon, R. (1986). A discourse not made for her: Learning and teaching within patriarchy. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 457-472.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lykes, M. B. (1989). The caring self: social experiences of power and powerlessness. In M. Brabeck (Ed.), Who cares?: Theory, research and implications of the ethic of care (164-180). New York: Praeger.

March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1979). Ambiguity and choice in organizations. (2nd ed.). Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.

Marx, K. (1967). The spirit of bureaucracy. In L. Easton & Guddat (Eds.), Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society (185-187). Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

McDonald, M. (1991, September). First woman high school principal brings background of striving. The Flint Journal, pp. A1, A11.

McIntosh, P. (1992). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In M. L. Andersen & P. H. Collins (Eds.), Race, class and gender: An anthology (pp. 70-81). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

McLeod, J. (1987). Ain't no makin it: Leveled aspirations in a low-income neighborhood. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

McPhee, C. & FitzGerald, A. (Compilers). (1979). Feminist quotations: Voices of rebels, reformers, and visionaries. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Publishers.

Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1978). The structure of educational organizations. In Marshall Meyer & Associates (Eds.), Environments and organizations (pp. 78-109). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.

Neumann, A. (1992, October-November). On experience, memory, and knowing: A post-holocaust (auto)biography. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Minneapolis, MN.

Noblit, G. W. (1993, Spring). Power and caring. American Educational Journal, 30(1), 23-38.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1991). Caring and continuity in education. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 35(1), 3-12.

Noddings, N. (1992). The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. American Journal of Education, 96(2), 215-230.

Noddings, N. (1989). Women and evil. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (1988). Class stratification, racial stratification, and schooling. In L. Weiss (Ed.), Class, race, and gender in American education (pp. 163-182), Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Olsen, L. (1988). Crossing the schoolhouse border: Immigrant students and the California Public Schools. San Francisco, CA: California Tomorrow.

Peshkin, A. & White, C. (1990). Four black American students: Coming of age in a multiethnic high school. Teachers College Record, 92(1), 21-37.

Puka, B. (1989). The liberation of caring: A different voice for Gilligan's "Different Voice". In M. Brabeck (Ed.), Who cares?: Theory, research, and implications of the ethic of care (pp. 1944). New York: Praeger.

Putnam, H. (1975). Mind, language and reality: Philosophical papers, Volume 2. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Putnam, J. & Burke, B. (1992). Organizing and managing classroom learning communities. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Regan, H. B. (1990). Not for women only: School administration as a feminist activity. Teachers College Record, 91(4), 565-677.

Rich, A. (1986). Blood, bread, and poetry: Selected prose, 1979-1985. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Ruether, R. R. (1975). New women new earth: Sexist ideologies and human liberation. New York: Seabury Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change (2nd ed.). Boston: Allen & Bacon, Inc.

Sarton, M (1978) A Reckoning. New York: w. W. Norton & Co.

Sarton, M. (1981). The house by the sea. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Schaef, A. W. (1985). Women's reality: An emerging female system in a white male society. San Francisco: Harper & Row, Pub.

Schorr, L. B. (1988). Within our reach: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage. New York: Doubleday.

Sedlak, M., Wheeler, C., Pullin, D. & Cusick, P. ((1986). Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sizer, T. R. (1985). Horace's compromise, the dilemma of the American high school: The first report from a study of American high schools, co-sponsored by the National Association of Secondary Schools and the National Association of Independent Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co.

Sizer, T. R. (1992). Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co.

Slavin, R. (1984). Component building: A strategy for research-based instructional improvement. Elementary School Journal, 84(3), 255-269.

Slavin, R. (1987). Cooperative learning: Can students help students learn? Instructor, 96(7), 74-76, 78.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28(3), 339-358.

Smircich, L. (1985, August). Toward a woman centered organization theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the Women in Management and Social Issues in Management Divisions of the Academy of Management, San Diego, CA.

Smircich, L. & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 18(3), 257-273.

Stahl, L. (1993, May). Sixty minutes (Television broadcast) Central Broadcasting System.

Starratt, R. J. (1991). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27(2), 185-202.

Suter, R. (1989). Interpreting Wittgenstein: A cloud of philosophy, a drop of grammar. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Traver, R. (1987). Autobiography, feminism, and the study of teaching. Teachers College Record, 88(3), 443-452.

Tronto, J. C. (1987). Beyond gender difference to a theory of care. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 12(4), 644-663.

Ungerson, C. (1983). Why do women care? In J. Finch & D. Groves (Eds.), A labour of love: Women, work and caring (pp. 31-50). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Weatherley, R. & Lipsky, M (1977). Street-level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special-education reform. Harvard Educational Review, 47(2), 171-197.

Weber, M. (1958). Bureaucracy. In H. H. Garth & C. W. Mills (Eds.& Trans.), From Max Weber: Essays in sociology (pp. 196-244). New York: Galaxy Books.

Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Weiler, K. (1988). Women teaching for change: Gender, class & power. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Pub., Inc.

White, D. G. (1985). Ar'n't I a woman?: Female slaves in the plantation South. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Willis, P. (1981). Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1989) Philosophical investigations (3rd ed.). (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). New York: Macmillan Pub. Co. (Original work published 1958).

Yamada, M. (1983). Invisibility is an unnatural disaster: Reflections of an Asian American woman. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua (Eds.), This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color (2nd ed.) (pp. 41-45). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293010192353