

SCHOOL AS COMMUNITY IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP

Thomas J. Sergiovanni
Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas

Schools are "formal organizations." What people do in schools is organizational behavior." To understand how schools are structured and to understand life within them we must study "organizational theory." If we want to change schools we must change its "organizational culture." References to schools as "organizations" abound in the literature and in our minds.

The metaphor formal organization shapes the way we think and schools and leadership within them. It provides us with a unique conceptual system that creates its own standard for what is considered true. It brings to mind distinct understandings as to how school management and leadership are expressed, the nature of authority, how decisions are made, the roles of principals, teachers and students, the nature of the teacher's workplace, and how teacher supervision and evaluation are practiced. These understandings, in turn, shape the teaching and learning process and shape our conceptions of human nature whether intended or not.¹

The phrase "to organize" provides a good clue as to how the metaphor formal organization forces us to think about schools. To organize means to arrange things into a coherent whole. First there has to be a reason for organizing. Then a careful study needs to be made of each of the parts to be organized. This study involves grouping the parts mentally into some kind of logical order. Next, a plan needs to be developed that enables the elements to be arranged according to the desired scheme. Typically this is a linear process. As the plan is being followed it becomes important to monitor progress and make corrections as needed. And finally, when the work is completed, the organizational arrangements are evaluated in terms of original intentions. These principles seem to apply whether we are thinking about organizing our bureau drawers or a school.

Schools must be considered legitimate in the eyes of their relevant publics. Formal organizations seek legitimacy by appearing "rational." According to the sociologist John Meyer (1984) schools appear rational by having purposes that are clear and standardized and that can be easily counted and measured. Unclear, ambiguous purposes need to be converted into clear ones. This is done by breaking down

complicated learning goals into achievement test score targets and other measurable outcomes.

Meyer points out that schools as formal organizations must develop explicit management structures and procedures that give a convincing account that the proper means-end chains are in place to accomplish stated purposes. Organizing schools into departments and grade levels, developing job descriptions, constructing curriculum plans, and putting into place explicit instructional delivery systems of various kinds are all examples of attempts to communicate that the school knows what it's doing.

Key to maintaining legitimacy, according to Meyer, is convincing everyone that the school is in control. Developing and using rules and regulations, monitoring and supervising, providing for recordkeeping, and implementing evaluation systems are the means by which this hierarchy seeks and maintains control over teachers. Teachers, in turn, develop similar schemes in efforts to control students. In every case control must be linked to rational processes and processes must be linked to explicit goals.

The metaphor formal organization does not serve the school very well. Though initially organizations are creatures of people, they tend over time to become separated from people functioning independently in pursuit of their own goals and purposes. This separation has to be bridged somehow. Ties have to exist that connect people to their work. And ties have to exist that connect people to others with whom they work. In organizations the ties that connect us to others and to our work are contractual. Each person acts separately in negotiating a settlement with others and with the organization itself that meets her or his needs.

Self interest is assumed to be the prime motivation in these negotiations. Thus, in order for schools to get teachers to do what needs to be done, rewards and punishments must be traded for compliance. Teachers who teach the way they are supposed to get good evaluations. Good evaluations lead to better assignments and improved prospects for promotion. Bad evaluations lead to poor assignments and banishment. Teachers who cooperate get recognition, are in on the school's information system, and get picked to attend workshops and conferences. A similar pattern of rewards and punishments characterizes life within classrooms and the broader relationships that exist between students and schools.

Management and leadership are very important in schools understood as formal organizations. Since motivation comes from the outside, someone has to propose and monitor the various trades that are needed. In the classroom it is the teacher and in the school it is the principal who has this job. Both are overworked as a result. Leadership inevitably takes the form of bartering. "Leader and led strike a bargain within which the leader gives to led something they want in exchange for something the leader wants" (Sergiovanni, 1990, p. 30). Students and teachers become connected to their work for calculated reasons. Students study hard as long as they get desired rewards. Teachers go the extra mile for the same reason. When rewards are reduced or no longer desired both give less effort in return.

THE COMMUNITY METAPHOR

Not all groupings of individuals, however, can be characterized as formal organizations. Families, communities, friendship networks, and social clubs are examples of organized collections of people that are different. And because of these differences the practices that make sense in schools understood as organizations just don't fit. In communities, for example, the connection of people to purpose and the connections among people are much more communal than contractual. Communities are socially organized around relationships and the felt interdependencies that nurture them (Blau and Scott, 1962). Instead of being tied together and tied to purposes by bartering arrangements, this social structure bonds people together in a oneness and binds them to an idea structure. The bonding together of people in special ways and the binding of them to shared values and ideas are the defining characteristics of schools as communities. Communities are defined by their centers of values, sentiments and beliefs that provide the needed conditions for creating a sense of "we" from "I."

Life in organizations and life in communities are different in both quality and kind. In communities we create our social lives with others who have intentions similar to ours. In organizations, relationships are constructed for us by others and become codified into a system of hierarchies, roles and role expectations. Communities too are confronted with issues of control. But instead of relying on external control measures in the forms of direct supervision, standardizing work processes and other managerial strategies, communities rely more on norms, purposes, values, professional socialization, collegiality, and natural interdependence. In communities, the emphasis in leadership is less on bartering and more on bonding and binding. As community builds, leadership itself becomes less important. The community ties that bond people together and bind them to shared ideas become substitutes for leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992).²

A THEORY OF COMMUNITY

There is no recipe for community building. Community must be created from the inside by schools one at a time. There are, however, theories of community that can help inform our work. These theories can provide ideas to help us reflect together. And, they can serve as a mental and emotional scaffold to help anchor our thoughts and transform them into a framework for community building.

One theory that can help is known as *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*. *Gemeinschaft* translates to community and *gesellschaft* translates to society. Though neither *gemeinschaft* or *gesellschaft* exist in pure form in the real world, both are metaphors that bring to mind two different ways of thinking and living--two different types of culture, two alternative visions of life.

The terms *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* are attributed to the German sociologist Ferdinand Tonnies. Writing in 1887, Tonnies (1957) used the terms to describe the shifting values and orientations that were taking place in life as we moved

first from a hunting and gathering society to an agricultural society, and then on to an industrial society. Each of the societal transformations resulted in a shift away from *gemeinschaft* towards *gesellschaft*; away from a vision of life as sacred community toward a more secular society. One wonders how Tonnies might react to the recent transformation from industrial to information society. *Gemeinschaft*

Gemeinschaft, according to Tonnies, exists in three forms: *gemeinschaft* by blood, of place, and of mind (p. 42). *Gemeinschaft* by blood comes from the unity of being in the sense of a "we" identity that families and extended families provide. *Gemeinschaft* of place emerges from the sharing of a common habitat or locale. This is my class, my school, my neighborhood, my town, my country. As a result of this common membership and this sense of belonging, my being is enlarged from "I" to "we." *Gemeinschaft* of mind refers to the bonding together of people that results from their mutual binding to a common goal, shared set of values, and shared conception of being. *Gemeinschaft* of mind further strengthens the "we" identity. Though all three are helpful, *gemeinschaft* of mind is essential to building community within schools. As Tonnies explains, "*Gemeinschaft* of mind expresses the community of mental life. In conjunction with the others, this last type of *gemeinschaft* represents the truly human and supreme form of community" (p. 42).

Community building in schools involves answering questions such as the following: What can be done to increase the sense of kinship, neighborliness and collegiality among the faculty? How can the school become more of a professional community where teachers care about each other and help each other to be and to learn, and to lead more productive work lives? What kind of relationships need to be cultivated with parents that will enable them to be included in our emerging community? How can we help each other? How can we redefine the web of relationships that exist among us and between us and students so that they embody community? How can we arrange our teaching and learning setting so that they are more familylike? How can the school itself, as a collection of families, become more like a neighborhood? What are the shared values and commitments that enable the school to become a community of the mind? How will these values and commitments become practical standards that can guide the lives we lead, what we learn and how, and how we treat each other? What are the patterns of mutual obligations and duties that emerge as community is achieved?

As these questions are answered the school begins the process of transformation from an organized collection of individuals to a community of the mind. Relationships within a community of mind are not based on contracts but on understandings about what is shared and on the emerging web of obligations to embody that which is shared. Relationships within a community of kinship are not based on contracts but on understandings similar to those found within the family. Relationships within communities of place are not based on contracts but on understandings about how members will live their lives together as neighbors. Though not cast in stone these understandings have enduring qualities. They are resilient enough to survive the

passage of members through the community over time. They are taught to new members, celebrated in customs and rituals, and embodied as standards that govern life in the community. Communities, in other words, replace contractual ties with communal ones.

The relationships among the three forms of community are mutually reinforcing. The connections that emerge among people from family like feelings and relationships and from sharing a common place contribute to the development of shared values and ideas. And this community of the mind that results provides the basis for solidifying the feelings and identities associated with being a community of kinship and a community of locale. "Whenever human beings are related through their wills in an organic manner and affirm each other we find one or another of the three types of *gemeinschaft*" (Tonnies, p. 42).

The need for community becomes urgent when we consider the consequences of loss of community. Students that are fortunate enough to experience belonging from family, extended family, friends and neighbors feel attached and loved, experience the warmth and safety of intimacy, and are more cooperative of and trusting of others. At an earlier time we took these values for granted. They were givens in what was a more traditional society. This traditional society still flourishes in pockets throughout the western world. The Native American experience, for example, still hangs on to these values. As Brendtro, Brokenleg and Van Bockern (1990) point out, "In traditional Native society, it was the duty of all adults to serve as teachers for younger persons. Child rearing was not just the province of biological parents but children were nurtured within a larger circle of significant others. From the earliest days of life, the child experienced a network of caring adults" (p. 37). And further, kinship "was not strictly a matter of biological relationships, but rather a learned way of viewing those who share a community of residence. The ultimate test of kinship was behavior, not blood: You belonged if you acted like you belonged" (p. 37). Citing the work of Karl Menninger, the authors observe "that today's children are desperately pursuing 'artificial belongings' because this need is not being fulfilled by families, schools, and neighborhoods" (p. 38). When students experience a loss of community they have two options. One option is to create substitutes for this loss and the other option is to live without community, with negative psychological consequences. Unfortunately, the substitutes that young people often create for the loss of community they experience are often dysfunctional or distorted. Using belonging as the value, Brendtro, Brokenleg and Van Bockern summarize some of the consequences of this loss below:

Belonging		
Normal	Distorted	Absent
Attached	Gang Loyalty	Unattached
Loving	Craves Affection	Guarded
Friendly	Craves Acceptance	Rejected
Intimate	Promiscuous	Lonely
Gregarious	Clinging	Aloof
Cooperative	Cult Vulnerable	Isolated
Trusting	Overly Dependent	Distrustful

Some youth who feel rejected are struggling to find artificial, distorted belongings through behavior such as attention seeking or running with gangs. Others have abandoned the pursuit and are reluctant to form human attachments. In either case, their unmet needs can be addressed by corrective relationships of trust and intimacy. (p. 47) Relationships in Communities

Values, beliefs, norms and other dimensions of community are visibly expressed in the kind and quality of relationships that exist among people. Relationships within communities are different than those found within organizations. The modern Western corporation, for example, is the metaphor for organization. It is, after all, the corporation and not the school that most organizational theorists have in mind. And it is the corporation that is, albeit often implicitly, the subject matter of much of their speculation and writings. In the corporation, relationships are formal and distant having been prescribed by roles and role expectations. Circumstances are evaluated by universal criteria as embodied in policies, rules and protocols. Acceptance is conditional. The more a person cooperates with the organization and achieves for the organization, the more likely will she or he be accepted. Relationships are competitive. Not all concerns of members are legitimate. Legitimate concerns are bounded by roles rather than needs. Subjectivity is frowned upon. Rationality is prized. Self interest prevails. These *gesellschaft* characteristics seem all too familiar in our schools.

Talcott Parsons uses Tonnies's concepts of *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* to describe the types of social relations found in different settings. He argued that any social relationship can be described as a pattern comprised of five pairs of variables that represent choices between alternative value orientations. A party to any relationship, for example, has to make decisions as to how she or he orients self to the other party. These decisions reflect the larger culture that circumscribes the relationship. As a

group, the decisions represent a pattern of relationships giving rise to Parsons's term "pattern variables."

affective -- affective neutrality
collective-orientation -- self orientation
particularism -- universalism
ascription -- achievement
diffuseness -- specificity

In schools, for example, principals, teachers and students have to make decisions as to how they will perform their respective roles in relationship to others. Teachers have to decide: Will relationships with students be more that of a professional expert who treats students as if they were clients (affective neutrality)? Or, will relationships be more that of a parent with students treated as if they were family members (affective)? Will students be given equal treatment in accordance with uniform standards, rules and regulations (universalism)? Or, will students be treated more preferentially and individually (particularism)? Will role relationships and job descriptions narrowly define specific topics for attention and discussion with students (specificity)? Or, will relationships be considered unbounded by roles and thus more inclusive and holistic (diffuseness)? Will students have to earn the right to be regarded as "good" and to maintain their standing in the school (achievement)? Or, will students be accepted completely, simply because they have enrolled in the school (ascription)? Will a certain distance be maintained in order for professional interests and concerns to remain uncompromised (self orientation)? Or, will they view themselves as part of a student-teacher "we" that compels them to work closely with students in identifying common interests, concerns and standards for decision-making (collective orientation)?

The five pairs of pattern variables, when viewed as polar opposites on a continuum, can be used to evaluate the extent to which social relationships in an enterprise resemble those found in community or organization; *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*. For example, though no school can be described as emphasizing affective relationships all of the time or never emphasizing affective relationships, schools can be fixed on this continuum based on the relative emphasis given to each of the polar opposites. This fixing across several pairs of variables can provide us with a kind of cultural "DNA" (a pattern of variables in Parsons's language) that can be used to place the school on the *gemeinschaft-gesellschaft* continuum.

A fifth differentiating characteristic is the relationship between means and ends (substantive vs. instrumental). In organizations, a clear distinction is made between the two, communicating an instrumental view of human nature and society. In communities, the distinctions are blurred. Ends are ends but means too are viewed as ends. In schools as communities, for example, teachers care about the subjects they teach. They communicate to students that what is being taught is valuable in its own right and not a mere means to some end such as test scores, grade promotion, or enhanced admission

to a university. Reverence for what is being taught is modeled by a spirit of inquiry and a commitment by the teacher to being a learner. This stance pays dividends in increased student learning. Many of the relationship dimensions of *gemeinschaft* speak to the principle: "You need to know students well to teach them well." This one adds the principle: "You need to be passionate about what you teach if students are to value what is taught."

Community and organization provide different ties for connecting people to each other and for connecting them to their work. In the school as community, relationships are both close and informal. Individual circumstances count. Acceptance is unconditional. Relationships are cooperative. Concerns of members are unbounded thus considered legitimate as long as they reflect needs. Subjectivity is okay. Emotions are legitimate. Sacrificing one's self interest for the sake of other community members is common. Members associate with each other because doing so is valuable as an end in itself. Knowledge is valued and learned for its own sake, not just as a means to get something or get somewhere. Children are accepted and loved because that's the way one treats community members. These community characteristics emerge in part because of the ties of kinship and in part because of the sense of identity that is created by sharing a common place such as a classroom or a school. But the ties that bond and bind the most, are those that emerge from a concept of mutual shared obligations and commitments, a common purpose. These are the ingredients needed to create a community of the mind.

AUTHENTIC COMMUNITY

Philosopher Mary Rousseau (1991) believes that it is the motives that bring people together that are key in determining whether community will be authentically achieved or will be counterfeit. To her it is altruistic love which differentiates the former from the latter.

Altruistic love does not mean that I want to spend my summer vacation with my neighbor or that I want to become her or his telephone companion. It certainly does not mean falling in love in the romantic sense, or having other unusual feelings of affection, warmth, tenderness, or lust. These examples are more descriptive of egocentric love than altruistic love. The two provide still another dimension for determining the extent to which relationships in a school tilt toward *gemeinschaft* or *gesellschaft*.

Egocentric love is emotionally and physically self gratifying. When egocentric love is the motive, each of the parties to the relationship enter into an implicit contract with the other for the exchange of needs and satisfactions that benefit both. As Mary Rousseau points out, "contracts, inherently egocentric in their motivation, can only link people in their external aspects. Contracts can bring people together in the same place at the same time, to share a common activity or project. But since those who love contractually are seeking their own fulfillment as their end, looking to other people as

the means to their own pleasure or utility, they forge no existential bonds with each other" (p. 49).

Webster's American dictionary defines altruism as benevolent concern for the welfare of others, as selflessness. Love is defined as deep devotion and good will that comes from and contributes to feelings of brotherhood and sisterhood. Altruistic love is an expression of selfless concern for others that stems from devotion or obligation. At its heart, altruistic love is more cultural than psychological. It can exist even if community by blood and community of place are absent. Community of the mind is enough to sustain altruistic love.

The seven pairs of characteristics described above are illustrated in Table 1 in the schedule "Profiles of Community." This schedule can be used to evaluate whether relationships in a school are primarily *gemeinschaft* or *gesellschaft*--whether the school is more like a community or a formal organization. Implications for Leadership

What are the implications for leadership when community replaces formal organization as the metaphor for school? What, for example, are the sources of authority for leadership in schools understood as formal organizations?³ How do these sources compare with the sources of authority for leadership in schools understood as learning communities? What are the consequences of both for how leadership is expressed?

In formal organizations bureaucratic and personal authority are virtually exclusive sources for seeking compliance. When bureaucratic authority is at the center of leadership one presumes that principals and teachers are subordinates in a hierarchically arranged system. School leaders are trustworthy but you can't trust subordinates very much. The goals and interests of teachers and administrators are not the same and thus administrators must be watchful. Hierarchy equals expertise thus administrators know more about everything than do teachers. Each hierarchical level is responsible for evaluating those immediately below. Those below must submit to control of those higher. External accountability works best.⁴

It is pretty much accepted that excessive bureaucratic leadership is not a good idea. Few administrators, for example, believe that teachers are not trustworthy and do not share the same goals and interests as they do. Even fewer accept the idea that hierarchy equals expertise. Less contested, perhaps, would be the assumption that teachers are subordinates in a hierarchically arranged system and that external monitoring works best. After all, school leadership practice still relies heavily on "expect and inspect," predetermined standards, inservicing teachers and providing direct supervision. These enduring practices force leaders to spend a great deal of time trying to figure out how to motivate teachers and trying to develop change strategies that can get them to do things differently. As a result leadership becomes a direct, intense and often exhausting activity.

Personal authority is based on the leader's ability to provide human relations leadership. Key to practicing personal leadership is knowing how to motivate people and how to demonstrate other interpersonal skills.

When personal authority is at the center of leadership it is assumed that the goals and interests of administrators and teachers are not the same. Teachers have needs and if these needs are met at work the work gets done as required in exchange. Leaders must become experts at identifying the needs of teachers and experts in people handling skills in order to barter for compliance and for performance increases. Congenial relationships and harmonious interpersonal climates make teachers content, easier to work with, and more apt to cooperate.

Suggesting that leadership practice that relies on personality, on knowledge of psychological principles, and on the leader's skills in using this knowledge may have negative consequences can make some administrators uncomfortable. After all, they have worked hard to develop skill in how to motivate teachers, how to apply the correct leadership style, how to boost morale, and how to develop the right interpersonal climate. In most North American universities, for example, these insights comprise the core technology of educational administration preparation curricula.

But personal authority is not powerful enough to tap the full range and depth of human capacity and will. And, personal authority is not able to elicit the kind of motivated and spirited response from teachers that allows schools to work in extraordinary ways. Most teachers respond to this kind of leadership by doing what is required of them when rewards are available or when administrators are pleasant, but not otherwise. They become involved in their work for calculated reasons, quickly reducing both performance and commitment when the exchange of compliance for satisfaction is not perceived to be fair. Further, their performance becomes increasingly narrowed as they emphasize only that which is rewarded. Sadly, what gets rewarded can replace what needs to be done.

Overemphasizing personal leadership raises moral as well as practical questions (Haller and Strike, 1986). For example, what should be the reasons why teachers should follow their principals and principals should follow their directors or superintendents? Is it because leaders know how to manipulate others effectively? Is it because leaders can meet the needs of others and provide them with psychological payoffs? Is it because leaders are charming and fun to be with? Or is it because leaders have something to say that makes sense; have thoughts that point others in a direction that captures their imagination; and, stand on a set of ideals, values and conceptions that they believe are good for teachers, for students and for the school? A yes vote for the first series of questions is a vote for a vacuous leadership practice that separates process from substance. A yes vote for the second series of questions is a vote for a leadership practice based on substance in the form of ideas, values, and compelling arguments.

Since communities are defined by their shared purposes and values, and since in the ideal, schools should be both learning and professional communities, leadership

within them becomes norm based. Norms, for example, bind teachers together in special ways, and bond them to a set of shared conceptions. In schools, community norms are intermingled with the norms that define teaching as a profession. And together the two sets of norms can provide the basis for what should be done and how. Teachers, for example, would not only be responsive to shared values, conceptions and ideals within the school but also to the shared values, conceptions and ideals that define them as professionals. The first set of norms provides the foundation for basing leadership on moral authority and the second set for basing leadership on professional authority. Moral authority is derived from obligations and duties that teachers feel as a result of their connections to widely shared community values, ideas and ideals. When moral authority is in place, teachers respond to shared commitments and felt interdependence by becoming self-managing thus alleviating the need for direct leadership.

The norms of professionalism can also be powerful. When first thinking about professionalism attention tends to be drawn to issues of competence. Professionals are experts, it is argued, and this expertise entitles them to be autonomous. But expertise is not enough to earn one the mantle of professional. Though society often refers to safecrackers, hairdressers, gamblers and football players as being professionals, the reference is colloquial. Being a professional has to do with something else besides being competent. Society, for example, demands not only that physicians, physicists, teachers and other professionals be skilled but also that their skills be used for good intentions. Professionals enjoy privileges because they are trusted. But it takes more than competence to earn trust. We might refer to this "something else" as professional virtue.

What are the dimensions of professional virtue? At least four are related to this discussion.⁵

A commitment to practice in an exemplary way;

A commitment toward valued social ends;

A commitment to not only one's own practice but to the practice itself;

A commitment to the ethic of caring.

The four dimensions of professional virtue provide the roots for developing a powerful norm system that when combined with the norm system that defines the school as community can greatly diminish if not replace leadership as it is now practiced. A commitment to exemplary practice, for example, means practicing on the cutting edge of teaching, staying abreast of the latest research in practice, researching one's own practice, experimenting with new approaches, and sharing one's craft insights with others. Once established, this dimension can result in teachers accepting responsibility for their own professional growth, thus greatly reducing the need for someone else to provide staff development programs for them. The focus of professional development shifts from "training" to providing opportunities for self renewal, for interacting with others, for learning and sharing. Much of what happens

in this kind of professional development would be informal and built into the everyday life of the schools.

The second dimension of professional virtue, commitment to practice toward valued social ends, represents a commitment to place oneself in service to students and parents and to agreed upon school values and purposes. Such a commitment raises the issue of purpose to a prime position in ongoing conversations about the school and its work and in planning, doing and evaluating teaching and learning.

When relying on purposes an idea structure emerges in the school that can greatly reduce the need for hierarchical based controls or for leaders working hard to provide interpersonal leadership. Teachers, for example, would do things not because they are forced to by controls or coaxed by personality but because they are persuaded by merit defined by purposes. Compliance comes from school purposes rather than from rules or from the leader's personality. Professional and moral become the sources of authority for leadership. These sources of authority have the capacity to transform the work of the school from something technical and secular to something sacred.

The third dimension of professional virtue, a commitment not only to one's own practice but to the practice of teaching itself, forces teachers to broaden their outlook. Such a commitment requires that teaching be transformed from individual to collective practice. When teaching is conceived as collective practice then collegiality emerges as an expression of professional virtue. Teachers feel compelled to work together not so much because interpersonally they enjoy relief from isolation and not so much because administrative arrangements force them together but because of internally felt obligations. With professional virtue intact, collegiality becomes a reciprocal form of meeting obligations in a collective practice.

A commitment to the ethic of caring, the fourth dimension of professional virtue, shifts the emphasis from viewing teaching as a technical activity involving the execution of validated teaching moves, toward viewing teaching as a professional activity involving concern for the whole person. The word "person" is key. Too often technical conceptions of teaching provide language systems of labels and categories that encourage us to think of students as cases to be treated rather than persons to be served. The caring ethic speaks not only to how students should be regarded but to the quality of relationships that teachers share among themselves. Teachers, as Nell Noddings (1986) observes, act as models of caring when they model "meticulous preparation, lively presentation, critical thinking, appreciative listening, constructive evaluation, general curiosity" (p. 503). The ethic of caring, in sum, provides still another substitute for leadership. As this ethic is internalized, teachers are motivated more from within thus requiring less external supervision.

SUMMARY

The ideas and ideals about teaching and learning and about how lives should be lived in schools associated with community will be difficult to realize as long as

formal organization remains as the dominant metaphor for schools. Within communities social relations are the fundamental type of action. Social relations require actors (principals to teachers, teachers among teachers, teachers to students, students among students) to orient themselves to others as if they were the others (bonding) and to share with others common commitments to a set of values and ideals (binding). By contrast, within organizations the emphasis is on behavior (as opposed to action) in the form of bureaucratic relationships. Bureaucratic relationships separate individuals from the organizational systems they create and casts them into roles as "managers" and "functionaries." Bureaucratic relationships inevitably script conceptions of teaching and learning and narrow views of the nature of human nature. This scripting and narrowing then requires that strong and direct leadership, in the form of leadership behavior, be provided by those in managerial roles and that those in functionary roles submit to this leadership.

Whether it is the principal who assumes the managerial role with respect to teachers as functionaries or the teacher who assumes the managerial role with respect to students as functionaries, the result is the same. Leadership behavior is behavior on the surface that results from some stimulus rather than from preference, value or belief. By contrast, leadership expressed as social action suggests that what principal or teacher actor does is intentional; emphasizes the subjective meanings attached to situations by the individual actor; and requires that behavior be examined within the context of the actor's culturally defined situation and network of social relationships. To account for action, according to Weber (1947), one must understand it (Verstehen) by putting oneself in the position of the actor thus inferring her or his definition of the situation. The actor's definition of a situation is a reflection of the situation's perceived characteristics and a reflection of the actor's intentions defined a priori by values and beliefs. Values, purposes, beliefs, connections, obligations, commitments, reflection, inquiry, understanding, meaning and significance are the subject matter of good pedagogy and the subject matter of fruitful human relationships. They are also the subject matter of community.

NOTES

1. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, for example, state, "Truth is relative to understanding, which means that there is no absolute standpoint from which to obtain absolute objective truths about the world. This does not mean that there are no truths; it means that truth is relative to our conceptual system, which is grounded in, and constantly tested by, our experiences and those of other members of our culture in our daily interactions with other people and with our physical and cultural environments" (p. 193). And similarly Thomas B. Greenfield remarks, "Language is power. It literally makes reality appear and disappear. Those who control language control thought--and thereby themselves and others" (p. 8).

2. Many schools already function more in line with the metaphor "community" than they do organization. Some well known examples include the Koln-Holweide School in Cologne, Germany; the Diana School in Reggio Emilia, Italy; and Central Park East Secondary School in New York City. The core of teaching and life in Koln-Holweide is the "table group": six students of varied abilities who stay together and work together for at least a year and often longer. Cooperative learning and peer tutoring are the preferred teaching strategies. Each member of the table group is responsible for the success of every other member. Each table of six is part of a larger grouping of students numbering 80 to 90. The larger group is taught by a six to eight member teaching team (Team-Small-Group-Plan") that stays with the same group of students from grades 5 to 10. The result is the development of a closely-knit learning community. Koln-Holweide is networked with approximately 20 other schools who operate similarly. Ann Ratzki, the principal, comments, "Our teachers are responsible not merely for teaching their subjects but for the total education of their students, for making sure that their students succeed, personally and academically. This requires us to cast our net broadly and involve ourselves in many things: We eat with the students, counsel them on personal and academic issues, determine their class schedules, tailor their curricula, help to broaden their interests by offering special lunch time activities, talk with their parents" ("Creating a School Community...An Interview with Ann Ratzki," 1988, *American Education*, Spring, p. 13). The Koln-Holweide School population is multicultural with students of Turkish origin dominating. One percent of the students drop out compared to the 1988 West German average of 14 percent and 60 percent of the students do well enough on exit exams to be admitted to a four year college.

The Diana School is for children from infancy to age six. Prior to age three the children attend the *asilo nido* ("the nest") and from age three to six the *scuola materna* ("maternal school"). Master teachers work side by side with parent-volunteers to design the curriculum and provide learning experiences. Studies are organized around themes that are developmentally suitable to young children. In the *scuola materna* children are assigned to teachers who stay with them for the entire three years. When Deborah Meier and her colleagues began to plan Central Park East Secondary School in 1984 they naturally fell upon the concept of community. This stemmed from their belief that good high school practice should resemble good nursery school and kindergarten practice (Meier, 1991). The school is divided into divisions of about 150 students and divisions are further subdivided into houses numbering 75 to 80 students. Each house has its own faculty of four or five staff members. Most teachers teach more than a single discipline allowing for courses such as math and science to be combined. The academic schedule is simple, being comprised of two hours each day for studies in the humanities (art, history, literature, social studies) and two hours each day for studies in math science. An additional hour is scheduled for the Advisory. The Advisory provides a time for students to deal with problems and issues that are important to themselves, to get counseling, and to participate as well in the governance

of the school. Believing that what to teach and how to teach should flow naturally from a clear articulation of purpose the core values of Central Park East Secondary School are summarized in a statement of purpose and mission called The Promise. The statement reads as follows:

At CPESS we make an important promise to every student--one we know we can keep. We promise our students that when they graduate from CPESS, they will have learned to use their minds--and to use their minds well. In every class, in every subject, students will learn to ask and to answer these questions:

1. From whose viewpoint are we seeing or reading or hearing? From what angle or perspective?
2. How do we know what we know? What's the evidence, and how reliable is it?
3. How are things, events or people connected to each other? What is the cause and what is the effect? How do they "fit" together?
4. So what? Why does it matter? What does it all mean? Who cares?

We are committed to the idea that a diploma is a meaningful piece of paper, not one that says only that the student has "stuck it out" through high school. A CPESS diploma tells the student--and the world--that the student has not only mastered specific fields of study but is curious and thoughtful, above all, has learned "how to learn" and to use his/her learning to deal with new issues and problems (Central Park East Secondary School, 1988).

3. The discussion of sources of authority for leadership is drawn from T.J. Sergiovanni (1992), *Moral Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
4. This description fits as well the relationships and assumptions that exist between teacher and students when teachers rely primarily on bureaucratic and personal authority in seeking compliance.
5. The first two dimensions are from Alasdair MacIntyre (1981), *After Virtue*, Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University. The third is from Albert Flores (1988), "What Kind of Person Should a Professional Be?" in Albert Flores (ed.), *Professional Ideals*, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing. The fourth is from Nell Noddings (1984), *Caring, A Feminine Approach to Ethics in Moral Education*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

REFERENCES

- Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott (1962). *Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.
- Brendtro, L. K., M. Brokenleg and S. Van Bockern (1990). *Reclaiming Youth at Risk Our Hope for the Future*. Bloomington, Ind.: National Education Service.
- Central Park East Secondary School (1988). *The Promise*. School publication, New York.
- Flores, Albert (1988). "What Kind of Person Should a Professional Be?" in A. Flores (ed.), *Professional Ideals*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Greenfield (1982). "Against Group Mind: An Anarchistic Theory of Education." *McGill Journal of Education*, Vol. 17, Winter.
- Haller, Emil J. and Kenneth A. Strike (1986). *An Introduction to Educational Administration: Social, Legal and Ethical Perspectives*. New York: Longman.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1980). *The Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair (1981). *After Virtue*. Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University.
- Meier, Deborah (1991). "The Kindergarten Tradition in the High School." In Kathie Jervis and Carol Montag (eds.), *Progressive Education for the 1990s Transforming Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Meyer, John (1984). "Organizations as Ideological Systems." In T.J. Sergiovanni and J.E. Corbally (eds.), *Leadership and Organizational Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Noddings, Nell (1984). *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics in Moral Education*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Parsons, Talcott (1951). *The Social System*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Rousseau, M. F. (1991). *Community the Tie that Binds*. New York: University Press of America.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990) *Value-Added Leadership*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tonnies, F. ([1887] 1957). *Community and Society (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)*. (Trans. and edited C. P. Loomis.) New York: Harper & Row.
- Weber, M. (1949). *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. (Trans. E. A. Shils and H. A. Finch.) Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

ANEXO

Table 1
Profiles of Community

School as Community
(Gemeinschaft)

School as Formal Organization
(Gesellschaft)

		Teachers' relationship with students											
		5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	affective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	affective-neutrality
2.	collective-orientation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	individual-orientation
3.	particularism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	universalism
4.	ascription	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	achievement
5.	diffuseness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	specificity
6.	substantive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	instrumental
7.	altruistic love	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ego-centered love
		Relationships among teachers											
		5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	affective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	affective-neutrality
2.	collective-orientation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	individual-orientation
3.	particularism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	universalism
4.	ascription	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	achievement
5.	diffuseness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	specificity
6.	substantive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	instrumental
7.	altruistic love	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ego-centered love
		Administrators' relationships with teachers											
		5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	affective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	affective-neutrality
2.	collective-orientation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	individual-orientation
3.	particularism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	universalism
4.	ascription	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	achievement
5.	diffuseness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	specificity
6.	substantive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	instrumental
7.	altruistic love	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ego-centered love