CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In her classic work, *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn*, Smith (1943) described the circumstances in which Francie Nolan, the protagonist, changes from a school where “Three thousand children crowded into this ugly brutalizing school” (p. 129) “made up of meanness . . . and heartbreak” to a “little old school” with “grass and not cement” (p. 141) where Francie “was given a seat to herself” (p. 146) and the principal would frequently go down to the janitor's “furnace room to sit and talk for a few moments” (p. 147). Smith concludes the chapter writing, “It was a good thing that she got herself into this other school. It showed her that there were other worlds beside the world she had been born into and that these worlds were not unattainable” (p. 149).

Writing for *The Washington Post*, Murphy (1997) reported on a heated debate at Georgetown University, a Catholic university in Washington, DC. A group of Georgetown University students known as the “Committee on Crucifixes in the Classrooms” had requested permission to hang crucifixes in the newly built classrooms. According to Murphy, “The university's administration . . . has not responded to the students' request” (p. B1). Father Leo O'Donovan, President of Georgetown, established a special review panel to investigate “the best way to promote . . . religious identity while remaining faithful to its [Georgetown University] mission of educating people of all faiths” (p. B1).

In an alternative Quaker high school in a mid-Atlantic state, students, teachers, principal, and headmaster gather twice a week for “Meeting for Worship,” which includes twenty minutes of silence followed by handshakes among the participants, personal sharing, and official announcements. Students and teachers are on a first-name basis, and a relaxed and casual atmosphere prevails. The belief that “there is that of God in everyone” promotes a significant emphasis on equality among school members, consensus-based decision making, personal authenticity, and silence.

Although seemingly divergent, the preceding three school portraits speak to the concept of culture: the assumptions, values, beliefs, rituals, history, religion, behaviors, relationships, language, symbols, and artifacts that define a people – what they do, how they do it, and why they do it. The familiar and frequently expressed statement, “We are products of our culture,” alludes
to the profound influence a culture has on its inhabitants. On a superficial level, culture impacts one's dress, dialect, daily rituals, affiliations, eating habits, and hygienic practices. On a deeper level, culture affects one's thinking, perceptions, values, beliefs, and behavior. The study of culture has been prevalent and ongoing, finding its roots in anthropology in the 1800s (White, 1973); extending into the corporate world in the early 1980s (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1981; Siehl & Martin, 1987; Schein, 1992); and, like other organizational theories, expanding its scope into the educational arena (Bates, 1992; Cook, 1998; Corbett, Firestone, & Rossman, 1987; Deal, 1987; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Furtwengler, 1988; Owens & Steinoff, 1989; Prosser, 1992; Stolp & Smith, 1995).

School culture, specifically its creation, is the focus of this study. As defined by Stolp and Smith (1995), school culture is “The historically transmitted patterns of meaning that include the norms, values, beliefs, traditions, and myths understood, maybe in varying degrees, by members of the school community” (p. 23). Accordingly, a school’s culture is worthy of serious study and analysis because it “tells people in the school what is truly important and how they are to act” (p. 24). In undertaking such a study, I seek to explore the various aspects of culture, as identified in the literature, and to develop, first-hand, an understanding of how it is actually created in a school setting. I will identify what fosters as well as what impedes the development of culture within a school.

**Need for the Study**

The literature on culture (a) indicates various components of culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Furtwengler & Micich, 1991; Ouchi, 1981; Schein, 1992; Siehl & Martin, 1987); (b) supports a relationship between school culture and recognized indicators of effective schools (Alloca & Muth, 1982; Deal & Kennedy, 1983; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1992; Rose & Muth, 1982); and (c) defines practices for developing strong cultures and the critical role of the principal in such development (Bates, 1992; Cook, 1998; Deal & Kennedy, 1983; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Siehl & Martin, 1987; Stolp & Smith, 1995). It sheds less light on the actual creation of culture within a new school. The deficiency of research in this specific area poses a worthwhile challenge. According to Pettigrew (1979):
New organizations . . . represent settings where it is possible to study transition processes from no beliefs to new beliefs, from no rules to new rules, from no culture to new culture, and in general terms, to observe the translation of ideas into structural and expressive forms. (p. 574)

Unless educational researchers and school practitioners advance their knowledge in this specific domain, the potential of culture as a means to positively impact and facilitate the development of effective schools will be minimized. How schools create culture, then, is worthy of significant attention (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Erickson, 1987; Prosser, 1992; Sashkin & Sashkin, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1996).

In conducting this study, I seek to expand the field of literature on school culture, particularly relating to its creation, and to contribute practical information for application in principal preparation programs. This information can be used to assist principals in gaining a deeper appreciation of the significance of culture and their essential role in creating it, as founding principals, or in strengthening it in an existing school. Advocating a cultural perspective, Greenfield (1986) stated, “The concept of principal as school culture-builder and reinforcer . . . encompasses and integrates the broad range of activities characterizing their work" (p. 145). Furthermore, Deal and Peterson (1990) argued, “The more principals understand about school culture and their roles in shaping it, the better equipped they will be to avoid the common pitfalls of life in schools" (p. 43).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of this study are to:

1. Conduct a descriptive case study of the creation of culture within a new school.
2. Explore culture through the following concepts: core principles, history, practices, problem solving, language, membership, and environment.

**Research Question**

The main research question is: How is culture created in a new school? In studying the creation of culture, I will employ a framework of cultural components based on the concepts and
understandings of culture of the following researchers:


Furtwengler & Micich (1991): cultural leadership, quality ethic, environmental support, student membership, collaborative problem-solving, personal and professional self-worth.


Schein (1992): artifacts, values, and basic underlying assumptions.


Synthesizing these conceptual models, I have identified seven broad components of culture from which to analyze the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School:

1. Core Principles
2. History
3. Practices
4. Problem Solving
5. Language
6. Membership
7. Environment

**Subsidiary Research Questions**

Each of these broad components of culture encompasses specific aspects relating to culture and are identified below along with corresponding subsidiary research questions:

1. **Core Principles (Values, Beliefs, Assumptions, Religion):** How are values and beliefs articulated by members of the community? What assumptions undergird these values and beliefs? What role does religion play in the school? What is the content of the curriculum and how is it taught?

2. **History (Myths, Stories, Traditions):** What personal and institutional history influences the creation of culture? What stories from the past are told? What historical impact do other
“parent” Quaker schools have on this school? How are traditions developed?

3. Practices (Rituals, Ceremonies, Celebrations, Heroes, Heroines): What are the acceptable norms of behavior and how are they encouraged? What are the formal ceremonies? What is celebrated and how? Who is recognized and why?

4. Problem Solving (Decision Making, Conflict Resolution, Critical Events): How are decisions made, and who is involved? How are conflicts resolved? How are issues raised and addressed? How are policies and rules created and implemented? How do people respond to critical events?

5. Language (Communication, Symbols, Metaphors): How do people communicate? What symbols are used within the school? What metaphors are used?

6. Membership (Members, Leaders, Subcultures): What criteria are used for selecting the principal, faculty, and students? How is authority delegated, and who has the greatest influence? What, if any, subcultures exist? What role do parents play? Who are the deviants?

7. Environment (Facility, Location): What impact do the facility and its location have on the school community?

These components of culture and their corresponding subsidiary research questions are displayed in Table 1.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study include:

1. The data are restricted to Chapman Friends High School, an alternative Quaker high school located in a mid-Atlantic state.

2. Thirty-one, on-site observations were conducted during the 1997 - 1998 school year. While the actual time spent at the site was limited, much data was gained.

3. Students and their parents were not randomly selected for interviews. They were
invited to be interviewed on a voluntary basis. From a school population of 38 students, nine parents and eight students participated. Interviewees did not always respond to every question, and time restrictions occasionally limited the number of questions asked.
CHAPTER II  
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE  

In Schein’s (1992) second edition of Organizational Culture and Leadership, he noted an earlier reservation on the part of some researchers regarding the legitimacy of the concept of organizational “culture.” Referring to the 1980s and the prevalence of research on culture, Schein remarked, “During the same time, many scholars and consultants wondered whether the use of culture as an explanation of various organizational phenomena was a fad that would wane” (p. xi). Clearly, the ubiquity of literature and the ongoing research on organizational culture testify to its credibility and validity as a legitimate organizational phenomenon. In this review of the literature, I have (a) analyzed the concept of culture from anthropological, organizational, and educational perspectives; (b) identified various definitions of the term; (c) described significant and pertinent studies; and (d) examined some of the relevant themes on culture.

Definition Dilemma  

A prevalent and explicitly documented theme in the review of the literature on the concept of culture is the absence of a clear and commonly accepted definition of the term: “Culture is . . . peculiarly complex” (Bates, 1992, p. 4); “Culture is a term that presents difficulties” (Erickson, 1987, p. 11); “Although definitions of culture are available, their shared attribute is vagueness” (Siehl & Martin, 1987, p. 433); “There are no universally accepted definitions of culture” (Deal & Peterson, 1990, p. 19); “There are a number of competing descriptions and definitions of organizational culture” (Owens & Steinhoff, 1989, p. 9); “In both the popular and the academic literature, I continue to see simplistic, cavalier statements about culture, which not only confuse matters but positively mislead the reader” (Schein, 1985, p. 5); “Given the inherently fuzzy nature of culture” (Trice, 1991, p. 298); “One begins to wonder about the utility of ‘culture,’ a term so broad and amorphous in character” (Taylor, 1984, p. 131); “Organizational culture researchers do not agree about what culture is” (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, & Martin, 1991, p. 7); “Culture has been likened to one of those ink blots in which we see what we want to see” (Hampden-Turner, 1992, p. 1). Even in the field of anthropology, where the term finds its genesis, culture is no less ambiguous, and White and Dillingham (1973) ask: “Culture, where art thou” (p. 31)?
While ambiguity shrouds the concept of culture, it has not precluded pervasive and significant research on the topic. Operational definitions of culture do exist in the literature and the similarities among them denote at least some consensus among researchers on the meaning of culture. While the focus of this study is school culture, an overview of the various definitions of culture is presented.

The Study of Culture

The Anthropological Perspective

In their historical perspective on the concept of culture, White and Dillingham (1973) claimed that Gustav Klemm (1802-1867) was “probably the first person to use this phrase” (p. 22) which was later introduced into the field of anthropology by Tylor (1871) in his work Primitive Culture. White and Dillingham noted that Tylor's definition of culture was more descriptive (a listing of cultural attributes) than it was definitional, and that this eventually resulted in a definition dilemma for researchers. Rejecting conceptions which defined culture as simply an “abstraction" or “behavior," White and Dillingham identified “three loci" of culture and argued: “Our answer is that culture has its existence within organisms (as ideas, sentiments, etc.), in interpersonal behavior, and in objects" (p. 12). Of particular interest is White and Dillingham's insightful recognition of culture's function to serve man’s “inner or spiritual needs. . . . to give man courage, confidence, morale, comfort, consolation" (p. 13).

Following, Thompson (1969) also noted the inadequacies of traditional interpretations of culture and the challenge of developing a contemporary definition. For Thompson, culture is, beyond all else, “a group problem-solving device instituted by a human community to cope with its basic practical problems" (p.6). Therefore, the importance of studying culture rested in the belief that such knowledge would allow “us to exercise a measure of control over our destiny" (p. 4).

Getting to the heart of why the study of culture is critical, anthropologist Margaret Mead (1964) defined culture as:

a process through which man creates his living environment and is able to improve it progressively by retaining and modifying advances made by previous generations, teaching the whole to subsequent generations, borrowing innovations made by other groups, and
making innovations which are capable of perpetuation. (p. 36)

In addressing the transmission of culture, Mead identified the role of teaching, learning, artifacts, and children's play, as well as the concept of “we – who do things this way – and they – who do things another way” (p. 48).

In summary, culture, as identified and discussed by anthropologists, encompasses the “why,” “how,” and “what” of human experience as well as the notion that culture has staying power. Accordingly, an understanding of culture empowers man to effect change. Whereas anthropologists have recognized the importance of studying culture to better understand human behavior, organizational and educational theorists and researchers have been advancing their knowledge and study of culture increasingly since the early 1980s.

**The Organizational Perspective**

According to Shafritz and Ott (1992), the organizational culture theorists attacked the popular organizational theories of the day – scientific management, bureaucracy, and general systems. Organizational culture researchers approached the study of organizations from the view that people's tacit agreement about what is expected and their patterns of behavior had more to do with what really happens in an organization or corporation than with “formal rules, authority, and . . . norms of rational behavior” (p. 483). While there existed debate as to the legitimacy of the study of “culture” as an organizational phenomenon, due in part to a lack of quantitative methodologies for analysis, a substantial number of highly-regarded studies and related books were published which countered such criticisms. The 1980s saw a swell of organizational and corporate culture literature – **Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life** (Deal & Kennedy, 1982); **Creating Corporate Culture** (Hampden-Turner, 1992); **Theory Z** (Ouchi, 1981); **In Search of Excellence** (Peters & Waterman, 1982); **Organizational Culture and Leadership** (Schein, 1985) – and CEOs and top-level management directed their attention to creating cultures of innovation and high performance or, in Ouchi’s words: “clans . . . of trust” (p. 87).
Simply put, organizational culture is what exists in an organization and is “comprised of many intangible things such as values, beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, behavioral norms, artifacts, and patterns of behavior” (Shafritz & Ott, 1992, p. 481). Conceptions of culture in organizational research are similar to those found in anthropology and are problematic to the extent that a list of cultural characteristics sometimes supplants authentic definition. An unquestionably robust definition of culture is offered by Schein (1992):

- a pattern of shared basic assumptions, that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 12)

Schein (1992) was ardent in distinguishing between the “essence” of culture and its “manifestations,” identifying three distinct levels of culture: (1) artifacts, (2) values, and (3) basic underlying assumptions (pp. 16-17). Schein’s tripartite concept resulted from his study of organizational behavior and his experience as a consultant working with two companies. While he made practical and well-received recommendations to his clients, in the end, behavior did not change because, as he later came to discover, the underlying assumptions of the employees remained unaltered.

Ouchi (1981) explored similarities and differences in managerial practices within companies which had both an American and Japanese plant and determined that there was something “distinctively different” about the Japanese firms in the United States. Further research led to his discovery of “Type Z organizations” – uniquely American firms possessing characteristics similar to the Japanese firms. With a sincere focus on the individual worker and building trusting relationships among employees and management, these “Theory Z” cultures were rooted in a management philosophy that maintained “involved workers are the key to increased productivity” (p. 4). According to Ouchi, this unique culture was transmitted through “symbols, ceremonies, and myths that communicate underlying values and beliefs. These rituals put flesh . . . on . . . abstract ideas, bringing them to life in a way that has meaning and impact for a new employee” (p. 42). Achieving a “high state of consistency in their internal culture” (p. 83), Type Z companies were
successful as human and economic enterprises.

Providing corporate managers with a “primer” on building strong cultures, Deal and Kennedy (1982) synthesized their findings from a study of 80 American companies and concluded: “In culture there is strength” (p. 19). Deal and Kennedy defined organizational culture as “a system of informal rules that spells out how people are to behave most of the time” (p. 15) and identified five elements of culture: (a) business environment, (b) values, (c) heroes, (d) rites and rituals, and (e) the cultural network. Employing real, corporate-life examples, Deal and Kennedy rendered an exhaustive explanation and description of each cultural attribute and, while acknowledging the difficulty in shaping and reshaping a culture, challenged business leaders to become “bearers” and “promoters” of culture.

Peters and Waterman (1982) studied 62 companies in their search for corporate excellence and found eight attributes which distinguished the excellent innovative companies from the rest: (a) a bias for action, (b) close to the customer, (c) autonomy and entrepreneurship, (d) productivity through people, (e) hands-on, value-driven, (e) stick to the knitting – the business you know, (f) simple form, lean staff, and (g) simultaneous loose-tight properties (pp. 13-16). Peters and Waterman noted that they could “feel” the “intensity itself, stemming from strongly held beliefs,” (p. 16) which set these companies apart. In responding to the question of how these companies obtained such a status, Peters and Waterman credited “culture – guiding concepts and shared values” and noted two critical findings:

The excellent companies seem to have developed cultures that have incorporated the values and practices of the great leaders and thus those shared values can be seen to survive for decades after the passing of the original guru. Second. . . it appears that the real role of the chief executive is to manage the values of the organization. (p. 26)

Peters and Waterman concluded: “It's really about culture” (p. 319).

Peters and Waterman, aware of the potential for exploitation, stated: “The more worrisome part of a strong culture is the ever present possibility of abuse” (p. 78).

Accordingly, Bates (1992) took issue with the corporate culture rhetoric and noted the ethical difference between understanding a culture and manipulating it. Furthermore, Bates believed that corporate researchers simply made a theoretical “shift from traditional forms of bureaucratic
control, toward techniques of ideological control based upon the manipulation of company culture” (p. 83). Bates and, later, Sergiovanni (1996) argued for a different conceptional model of culture in analyzing schools, one not “synonymous with managerial culture.” The cultural studies perspective, which “allows for an analysis of the different ways in which schools intervene in the cultural politics of their society” (p. 93) was, for Bates, the only way to “begin to understand the complex features of the cultures of schools, the linkages that exist with various cultures in the wider society and the limits and possibilities of administration in the development and modification of such cultures” (p. 92). Echoing these sentiments, Harvey (1991) posited, “The culture of the school should not become a manipulative control device to make school staff and parents more manageable” (p. 30). According to Harvey, any managing or shaping of a school culture by the principal was justified to the extent it was inclusive of all interested parties and empowering.

While debate surrounds the study of corporate culture, the research evidences a link between culture and company morale, productivity, turnover, employee satisfaction, fiscal soundness, innovation, job security, and collaborative decision-making (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982). In their 1987 edition of Classics of Organizational Theory, Shafritz and Ott acknowledged a general consensus among researchers on the following points about organizational culture: (a) it exists, (b) it is unique, (c) it is socially constructed, (d) it creates meaning for cultural members, and (e) it guides behavior (p. 378). These findings were the very impetus for the expansion of the study of culture into the educational arena.

**The Educational Perspective**

As with other theories of organization, the concept of culture has found its way to the school house door, opening up a holistic, comprehensive, and value-driven approach to studying what happens in schools. Comments by Bates (1992) to the contrary, there has been a receptive welcome among educational researchers and leaders to embrace the “corporate culture” phenomenon and apply it to the study of schools. The educational literature is replete with findings that indicate a relationship between school culture and school effectiveness, teacher collaboration, teacher development, and student achievement (Alloc & Muth, 1982; Cook, 1998; Corbett, Firestone, & Rossman, 1987; Deal & Kennedy, 1983; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Leithwood,
In their study of the principal’s role in shaping school culture, Deal and Peterson (1990) defined culture as the “historically rooted, socially transmitted set of deep patterns of thinking and ways of acting that give meaning to human experience, that unconsciously dictate how experience is seen, assessed and acted on” (p. 19). Maintaining that culture is the key to school improvement and that its “shaping is indirect, intuitive, and largely unconscious” (p. 31), Deal and Peterson described five specific roles principals play in building strong school cultures and identified the following six strategies employed by the principals they studied: (a) developing a sense of mission, (b) selecting like-minded faculty, (c) addressing conflict and maximizing its potential for building unity, (d) telling meaningful and value-laden stories, and (e) nurturing the practices which express and reinforce school culture (p. 91). To the extent that school principals can become “symbolic leaders,” incorporating these five strategies, they will influence and shape the culture of their schools.

Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (1992) studied the development of collaborative cultures and reported, “Attention to school culture, as part of school reform, is driven by the evidence that traditional school cultures, based on norms of autonomy and isolation, create a work context in which realizing the central aspirations of school reform is highly unlikely” (p. 129). While Leithwood et al. questioned the actual degree of influence principals had on their school cultures and recommended further research, their findings included six strategies used by school leaders to create collaborative cultures. Strengthening the school culture and using symbols to express core values were among the six (pp. 143-44). According to Leithwood et al., “strengthening the school culture” referred to defining clearly the goals, reducing teacher isolation, and hiring teachers committed to the school’s mission. These actions strengthened a school's culture and, in turn, engendered collaborative cultures.

Similarly, Maehr (1992) argued, “It is the culture of the school that must change,” (p. 19) if there is to be any significant reform. Thus, Purkey and Smith (1983) claimed that studying schools
through the “culture perspective” provided a more comprehensive approach to understanding and creating better schools than other contemporary theoretical frameworks. Furthermore, they argued, “an academically effective school is distinguished by its culture: a structure, process, and climate of values and norms that emphasize successful teaching and learning” (p. 442). Consequently, if schools are to become more effective, educational leaders must pay attention to and seek to influence their schools' culture.

**Prominent Themes in the Study of Culture**

**The Creation of Culture**

While the term “creation” can evoke an image of starting from scratch, Deal (1987) contended, “Starting a school from scratch is impossible. Even innovators carry imprints in their heads” (p. 4). Yet, there is some basis and advocacy for the study of how organizations are created and evolve over time (Pettigrew, 1979; Sarason, 1972). In *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies*, Sarason (1972) studied the problems and challenges of creating new settings and acknowledged the absence of functional theories on this topic. Sarason’s experience as well as his study of new settings led him to conclude:

The fact of the matter is that agreement on values may be a necessary condition but it is far from being a sufficient condition. Beyond values the creation of settings involves . . . substantive knowledge, a historical stance, a realistic time perspective, vehicles of criticism, and the necessity for and the evils of leadership. The creation of settings is not an engineering or technological task. It is also not one that can be accomplished by simply having appropriate or strong motivation. (p. 6)

Sarason (1972) gained insight by examining the history of the creation of the Constitutional Convention and determined:

What is important is that these men began to create a setting guided not by what they hoped man could be but by what they thought he was; not by assuming that shared values were necessary and sufficient for success but by contriving and inventing ways which might protect these values against man’s tendencies to act rashly, selfishly, and corruptly; not by deluding themselves that the end product of their labors was adequate for all time but by
specifically providing for change and orderly change which in principle could undo all they had done. (p. 17)

In effect, those seeking to create settings – culture – must first examine their own basic assumptions about people and their social interactions and then draw upon past experiences and history to enlighten the process. To anticipate and plan for change, to invite scrutiny, and to continually nurture a shared sense of values are crucial components in the creation of settings and, as Sarason noted, not realized enough.

In her study of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee (LAOOC) in 1984, McDonald (1991) illustrated in detail the process by which the LAOOC created its unique, albeit, transitory culture. From frequently reminding employees that they were “playing a part in history,” to showing “inspirational Olympic newsreels,” to staging opportunities for speakers to affirm the workers, the LAOOC “management made the conscious decision that it would use all the available historical and ceremonial resources to provide its employees with a common sense of identity as rapidly as possible” (p. 38). While McDonald recognized that the LAOOC culture was limited in its scope and short-lived, she concluded that it was “an example of the creation of organizational culture in the short run – of how beliefs, stories, jokes, rituals, and ceremonies arose out of an unusual combination of circumstances, both orchestrated and spontaneous” (p. 38).

Prosser (1992) examined the creation of culture within a school setting in his study of three independent English schools merging into one comprehensive school. Prosser identified two kinds of culture within the new school: (a) generic culture, and (b) unique culture. Identifying those common features which distinguish a school from other institutions as (a) “generic culture” and those specific features which distinguish a school from other schools as (b) “unique culture,” Prosser found generic culture “to be the prime normative value of all participants. Secondary values only came to the fore when individual or group interpretations manifested themselves during the establishment of the school’s unique culture” (p. 6). Prosser cited an example in this newly developing comprehensive school. There was an expectation that it would celebrate “Speech Day” as tradition prescribed (generic culture); its format and design (unique culture), however, was not a normative value and, thus, needed to be discussed and decided upon by the key participants. Generic culture, according to Prosser, fulfilled the “basic need for security and stability” among
Participants (p. 5). Prosser also concluded that while both generic culture and unique culture were not easily changed, the headmaster played a pivotal role in creating the school's unique culture.

Identifying “purpose, commitment, and order” as components for the birth of an organization, Pettigrew (1979) utilized a longitudinal study of critical events within a private British boarding school to study the “birth” of organizations. According to Pettigrew, the school founder's actions, as well as his management of “symbols, ideologies, languages, beliefs, rituals, and myths,” defined the school’s purpose and garnered the commitment of school members (p. 572). In examining the role of commitment within a culture, Pettigrew claimed, “It may be possible for an organization to create a sense of institutional completeness, a set of beliefs reinforced by behaviors that practically all of life's needs can be at least partially satisfied within its bounds” (p. 579). He found this to be the case in the school and noted the school's practice of exposing its deviants publicly. In conclusion, Pettigrew argued that culture evolves through “symbols, language, ideologies, beliefs, rituals, and myths” because they “direct attention toward the mobilization of consciousness and purpose, the codification of meaning, the emergence of normative patterns, the rise and fall of systems of leadership and strategies of legitimization” (p. 576).

**Leadership and Culture**

The most prominent theme in the study of culture is leadership and the role of leaders in creating and building strong cultures. A number of researchers of both corporate and school cultures identify the leader as the most significant factor in how a particular culture develops and evolves over time (Bates, 1992; Bennis, 1984; Cook, 1998; Deal, 1987; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Hampden-Turner, 1992; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins 1992; Ouchi, 1981; Owens, 1987; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Pettigrew, 1979; Prosser, 1992; Schein, 1983, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1984, 1990, 1996; Siehl & Martin, 1987; Stolp & Smith, 1995; Taylor, 1984). Addressing this phenomenon, Schein (1983) stated, “An organization’s culture begins life in the head of its founder – springing from the founder's ideas about truth, reality, and the way the world works” (p. 13). Ouchi (1981) acknowledged this same occurrence and stated, “In the early years of a young company, the elements of the philosophy almost certainly exist in the values and
predisposition of the founder” (p. 159). While initially underestimating the significance of leaders in their study of successful companies, Peters and Waterman (1982) discovered, in the end, that the success of these companies was directly related to how they "incorporated the values and practices of great leaders” (p. 26). Perhaps most notable as it relates to school culture is Deal and Peterson's (1990) finding that “leadership shapes culture, and culture shapes leaders” (p. 24).

Recognizing the pivotal role of principals in building and transforming school cultures, Deal and Peterson (1990) studied school leaders and identified five distinguishable leadership styles – symbol, potter, poet, actor, and healer (p. 31) – that culture-building principals evidence. Who these principals hired; how they problem-solved and resolved conflict; how they interacted with others; what they paid attention to; how they articulated the school’s vision and their own values; and how they used ceremonies, rituals, and symbols were all intrinsically connected to principals' understanding of their own school culture and its values. As characterized by Sergiovanni (1987), “Leadership cannot exist separate from what people find significant and meaningful” (p. 116). Furthermore, “Cultural leadership – by accepting the realities of the human spirit, by emphasizing the importance of meaning and significance, and by acknowledging the concept of professional freedom linked to values and norms that make up a moral order – comes closer to the point of leadership” (p. 127).

While particular leadership styles are significant, what determines a leader's effectiveness is his or her ability to extract meaning from the culture's daily activities, accomplishments, struggles, and failures and to explicate this meaning publicly in order to build intimacy among a culture's members. As noted by Sergiovanni (1984), “The object of leadership is the stirring of human consciousness, the interpretation and enhancement of meaning, the articulation of key cultural strands, and the linking of organizational members to them” (p.8). Seeking to answer the question of how organizations “translate intention into reality and sustain it,” Bennis (1984, p. 64) acknowledged “transformative power” as the key, defining it as “the ability of the leader to reach the souls of others in a fashion which raises human consciousness, builds meanings, and inspires human intent that is the source of power” (p. 70). As Depree (1992) succinctly stated, “At the core of becoming a leader is the need always to connect one's voice and one's touch” (p. 3). Employing the term “learning organization,” Senge (1990) also recognized the requisite connection
between employees and meaningful work and noted that successful companies in the future will be able to “tap people's commitment and capacity to learn” (p. 4). This “commitment,” however, goes beyond mere acceptance on the part of an organization's members. The commitment is directly related to a guiding vision which is “a force in people's hearts, a force of impressive power” (p. 206).

For Senge (1990), what distinguishes outstanding leaders is “the clarity and persuasiveness of their ideas, the depth of their commitment, and their openness to continually learning more” (p. 359). Senge identified five disciplines which effective leaders seek to develop in themselves and integrate into the daily events and operations of their organizations in ways that foster “learning organizations.” These five disciplines include (a) systems thinking, (b) personal mastery, (c) mental models, (d) building shared vision, and (e) team learning (pp. 6-11). In his interviews with three prominent business leaders, Senge found that in addition to their conscientious efforts to integrate the five disciplines, these exceptional leaders possessed a purpose story – “the overarching explanation of why they do what they do, how their organization needs to evolve, and how that evolution is part of something larger” (p. 346). That “part of something larger” is humankind, itself, according to Senge. The practice of these disciplines among leaders and their followers creates strong cultures in which “people follow people who believe in something and have the abilities to achieve results in the service of those beliefs” (p. 360).

Critical to a leader's success is the trust and unity found among the organization's members. For Schein (1992), the creation of a new culture is a process wherein the founder, who initiates an enterprise, seeks to attract individuals with like-minded values and assumptions or, as noted by Pettigrew (1979), a “homogeneity of background” (p. 579). This convention among leaders serves to build strong cultures (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Pettigrew, 1979; Sashkin & Sashkin, 1990; Stolp & Smith, 1995). Sashkin and Sashkin cautioned, however, that in selecting staff, “the real difficulty is in (a) knowing how to identify the underlying educational values and beliefs of potential staff members, and (b) having the skill to apply that knowledge” (p. 19). What is important, then, is what Ouchi (1981) discovered among the employees of Type Z companies, “That you and I share fundamentally compatible goals in the long run, and thus we have reason to trust one another” (p. 100).
While Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) acknowledged a less-than-direct relationship between school leaders’ practices and the development of collaborative cultures, they identified six leader strategies which influence culture. The six strategies include: (a) strengthening the culture, (b) using bureaucratic mechanisms, (c) fostering staff development, (d) frequent and direct communications, (e) sharing power and responsibility, (f) and using symbols and rituals to express cultural values (pp. 24-25). Leithwood and Jantzi also found that to strengthen a school’s culture, principals sought to hire teachers who willingly committed themselves to the school’s goals and purposes.

Using both quantitative and qualitative research methods, Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) examined the relationship between leadership and culture and identified certain visionary leadership behavior which was directly related to building a school culture. Sashkin and Sashkin found that communicating effectively, demonstrating trust, showing respect, and creating opportunities for growth had the strongest impact on cultural methods (p. 10). Using symbols and articulating a long-term vision were two other practices used by leaders which positively impacted the culture.

Employing and expanding the five culture-building strategies of principals as identified by Deal and Peterson (1990), Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) examined each of these strategies from two perspectives, one obvious and bureaucratic, the other subtle and cultural. They noted that it was not sufficient for principals to tell an interesting, thought-provoking story (bureaucratic); they also had to connect that story to a deeply held cultural value for the story to have significant impact (cultural). Sashkin and Sashkin concluded that the five strategies – staffing based on values, using conflict constructively, modeling values, telling stories, and creating traditions, ceremonies, and rituals – when used “consistently and fully . . . are major tools of school leaders” for strengthening and building culture (p. 34). Accordingly, Sashkin and Sashkin advocated for a “level three” leadership wherein the principal uses “actions to express and embed in the school’s culture the values and vision that define and guide such actions” (p. 33). Metaphorically, these principals help “people to perceive not a crazy quilt but a complete and coherent tapestry” (p. 34). Clearly, the role that leaders play in creating and building strong cultures is paramount, and the ubiquity of research on the subject speaks to this. As asserted by Schein (1992), “In young organizations one must focus primarily on leadership behavior to understand cultural growth” (p. 252).
synthesizing the research on leadership and the creation of culture, consistent themes arise relating to leaders' abilities and include: (a) to critically compare the practices and events taking place within their organizations against the stated vision, (b) to foster a sense among the members that what they do has meaning as it relates to the organization's mission and vision, and (c) to use the “artifacts” of the culture to embed values and endorse the taken for granted assumptions. Schein's (1992) words are potent here, “Culture and leadership are two sides of the same coin,” (p. 1). In the end, however, one finds profound wisdom in the simple, yet potent, words of Senge (1990) who identified culture building leaders as learners, “The core leadership strategy is simple: be a model" (p. 173).

**Assumptions: The Basis of Culture**

According to Schein, while one can glean an organization's culture from a variety of components – language, symbols, values, mission, environment, stories, heroes, rituals, norms of behavior, problem-solving strategies – one should not mistake these “artifacts of culture" for the culture itself. At root, culture is “the assumptions that underlie the values and determine not only behavior patterns, but also . . . visible artifacts” (p. 14). These tacit assumptions, not easily or readily identifiable, exist in the minds of not only leaders and founders but all the members of a particular culture. Hampden-Turner (1992) described this phenomenon as the “automatic compass” of the culture, while Deal and Peterson (1990) identified the “cultural imprints" which individuals bring to a school culture. Most profound, then, as they relate to the creation of culture, are the basic “assumptions the members of the organization share about their identity and ultimate mission" (Schein, 1992, p. 56) and which “tend to be those we neither confront nor debate" (p. 22).

In his research on corporate cultures, Schein discovered that these basic assumptions are rooted in the “deeper dimensions" individuals have about “the nature of reality and truth, time, space, human nature, and human activity" (pp. 95-96). Similar to Senge's (1990) “mental models," these deep assumptions are unconscious, taken for granted, and not easily changed. Senge claimed that these assumptions define how an organization works and are the essence of any significant and meaningful change within a culture. Harvey (1991) spoke to the significance of cultural assumptions and noted that “the new principal should give special attention to identifying the key
values, beliefs, and assumptions that underpin the shared meanings that influence the actions of school participants" (p. 10).

In examining the concept of culture as it relates to reading practices among school teachers, Erickson (1987) distinguished culture from observable behavior and identified culture as "essentially ideational . . . a set of interpretive frames for making sense of behavior" (p. 13). According to Erickson, the prevalence of the “skills approach" to reading instruction, in spite of heated debate over reading practices, is an apt example of the cultural knowledge and “conceptual structures" which influence teaching methods. Furthermore, he maintained, “Much of our cultural knowledge is implicit, consisting of over-learned ways of thinking and acting that, once mastered, are held outside conscious awareness" (p. 14). It was this “intuitive sense" that Erickson recognized as culture.

Relying heavily on Schein’s tripartite theory of culture, particularly that one must uncover the basic assumptions of a culture to understand it, Steinhoff and Owens (1989) developed the Organizational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI) which relied on descriptive metaphors to illuminate these taken-for-granted cultural assumptions. Steinhoff and Owens found that “a preliminary analysis of the OCAI yielded four root metaphors which identified the types of culture found in public schools" (p. 22). These metaphors related to the dimensions of culture as revealed in the literature: (a) history, (b) values and beliefs, (c) myths and stories, (d) cultural norms, (e) tradition, rituals and ceremonies, and (f) heroes and heroines (p.18). While Steinhoff and Owens acknowledged the need for further testing of the OCAI as a valid means of uncovering a culture's hidden assumptions, their research and development in this area clearly underscored the significance of cultural assumptions.

The existence of shared cultural assumptions raises an important question: What is their origin? According to Schein (1992), shared cultural assumptions evolve over time:

The learning process for the group starts with one or more members taking a leadership role in proposing courses of action and as these continue to be successful in solving the group's internal and external problems, they come to be taken for granted and the assumptions underlying them cease to be questioned or debated. A group has a culture when it has had enough of a shared history to have formed such a set of shared
Building upon Schein's explanation of cultural assumptions, Sathe (1985) found that the “strength" of any given culture is directly related to the pervasiveness of shared assumptions throughout the culture and the degree to which these assumptions were “clearly ordered," ensuring that the most important assumptions would “prevail in cases of conflicting interests" (p. 15). In his research at the Cummins Engine Company in the early 70s, Sathe (1985) described culture as both an “asset" and a “liability." To the extent that the culture aided in the efficiency of accomplishing the organization's mission, it was an asset; where a strong culture precluded necessary change, it was a liability.

Smircich (1992), in her study of an insurance company experiencing a merger and transition in leadership, discovered a similar asset/liability phenomenon. The shared meanings, which developed over time, among management resulted in behavior which frequently led to inaction, complacency, and the concealment of problems. This behavior was further ritualized by “polite, calm, restrained" weekly meetings at which the company president used symbols reinforcing the idea of harmony, albeit superficial, within the company. As discovered by Smircich, these shared meanings, which are influenced by time, place, people's interactions, and a leader's behavior, are “necessary for continuing organized activity so that interaction can take place without constant interpretation and re-interpretation of meanings" (p. 525).

Clearly, the significance of underlying assumptions which give rise to a particular culture cannot be underestimated; the role that a founder or leader initially plays in developing these shared assumptions is critical. As noted by Schein (1983), most leaders come equipped with a strong set of assumptions about the world and how things should operate and, in a sense, impose their assumptions on the culture. As a culture successfully solves problems and overcomes challenges, the assumptions which led to these successes become shared, taken for granted, and provide for a certain degree of meaningful consistency – the way we do things around here – within a culture. While these tacit assumptions serve to strengthen a culture, they can also become a force for stagnation in that “new insights fail to get put into practice because they conflict with deeply held internal images of how the world works, images that limit us to familiar ways of thinking and acting" (Senge, 1990, p. 174).
Change and Culture

In examining the process of change within an organization, particularly the degree to which changes are adopted or resisted, researchers have recognized the significant influence of culture on the process of change (Corbett, Firestone, and Rossman, 1987; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Hampden-Turner, 1992; Harvey, 1991; Sarason, 1972; Sathe, 1983; Schein, 1992; Stolp & Smith, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1996; Wilkins & Ouchi, 1983). Change within organizations is often adamantly resisted because it threatens “who we are around here” (Corbett et al. p. 57). It is for this reason that Schein argued:

If any part of the core structure is to change in more than minor incremental ways, the system must first experience enough disequilibrium to force a coping process that goes beyond just reinforcing the assumptions that are already in place. (p. 298)

Identifying the various stages in a culture's growth as creation, midlife, and maturity, Schein (1992) espoused a different leadership approach for each phase and argued that the leader's departure may be the necessary strategic move to advance the culture. In the creation stage, leaders should “make no apologies" for their assumptions and realize their essential role of “not only creating the culture but also their responsibility in embedding and developing culture" (p. 376). During a culture's midlife, subcultures form. Schein cautioned, “Because culture serves an important anxiety-reducing function, members cling to it even if it becomes dysfunctional” (pp. 377-78). Thus, the work of the leader at this stage is two-fold: (a) to critically examine the culture's assumptions, and (b) to effectively negotiate change (p. 378). In the mature or “potentially declining” organization, the leader faces a strong and unified culture which has most likely redefined leadership. To the extent that a culture's survival is contingent upon change, the leader must be able to “break the tyranny of the old culture" (p. 379) and introduce new assumptions by which the culture will prosper and re-create itself.

Studying the effects of three high school cultures on school improvement initiatives, Corbett, Firestone, and Rossman (1987) found that the degree of resistance to proposed changes related directly to the “sacred" and “profane" norms of the culture. Sacred norms “lend meaning to organizational activity” and are “more powerful the more widely they are held" (p. 38). Sacred
norms within a school relate to teachers' sense of professionalism and the meaning of teaching. Profane norms include the daily operations and activities within an organization but “cannot establish broad meanings as do the sacred” (p. 38). Whereas profane norms can be changed, sacred norms are not easily changed because they relate to “who we are around here” (p. 56). Corbett et al. noted:

Stronger resistance arose as initiatives challenged underlying assumptions about the instructional process. Resistance took on a different character as normative aspects of life came under fire; it became not a matter of the mind but of the heart. In one circumstance, culture encouraged systematic progress, in another, thrashing resistance. (p. 48)

Because “change redefines what is and ought to be in a school” (p. 57), Corbet et al. maintained that effective change within a school required educational leaders to know the culture, its sacred and profane norms, and the extent to which proposed changes affirmed or challenged the deep underlying assumptions of the sacred norms.

In his significant research on schools in the 60s, Sarason (1972) claimed that “any attempt to introduce an important change in the school culture requires changing existing regularities to produce new intended outcomes” (p. 86). According to Sarason,

Because our values and assumptions are usually implicit and "second nature," we proceed as if the way things are is the way things should or could be. We do not act but we react, and then not with the aim of changing our conceptions – or, heaven forbid, our theories from which our conceptions presumably derive – but to change what is most easy to change. (p. 109)

Similarly, Stolp and Smith (1995) highlighted the “self-perpetuating nature of schools” and noted that while significant growth in schools is possible, it requires a concerted and determined effort on the part of the principal (p. 59). Accordingly, they claimed, “Principals alone cannot bring about change in the norms of a school because, by definition, cultural transformation is a collaborative activity” (p. 76). Sergiovanni’s (1996) research led him to conclude, “Efforts to change school cultures inevitably involve changing theories of schooling and school life” (p. 3). The self-perpetuating nature of schools is due in large part to the existing self-perpetuating theories about school or “mindscapes,” as Sergiovanni defined them. Furthermore, substantive change in schools
is dependent upon “both shared values and collegiality” (p. 169).

Casting a slightly different and insightful point of view, Wilkins and Ouchi (1983) observed that contemporary cultures are more malleable than their anthropological counterparts and, thus, are adaptive to change when the basic underlying assumptions of the culture are not violated (p. 479). As Sathe (1983) noted, behavioral change within a culture is sometimes sufficient enough and does not necessitate a corresponding cultural change – a change in values and beliefs. The latter change, then, is what is most resisted because underlying assumptions and beliefs come into question. Historically and experientially, the assumptions and beliefs of a culture have guided the culture through its problem solving and, unless shown to be no longer effective, will withstand change.

Values, Vision, Mission and Culture

At the heart of any culture is a set of values. The more broadly held and well-articulated, the stronger the culture. Effective leaders not only seek to reinforce these values by what they pay attention to, what they do, and what they say, but they also actively engage others in sharing them (Deal & Peterson, 1990; DePree, 1989; Greenfield, 1986; Harvey, 1991; Johnston, 1987; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1990; Sheive & Schoenheit, 1987; Siehl & Martin, 1987; Stolp & Smith, 1995; Ouchi, 1981; Owens, 1987). Defining the shared values and expectations of a school community as a “covenant,” Sergiovanni, (1990) stated:

A covenant is a binding and solemn agreement by principals, teachers, parents, and students to honor values, goals, and beliefs; to make certain commitments to each other; and to do or keep from doing specific things. It is the compact that provides the school with a sense of direction, on the one hand, and an opportunity to find meaning in school life, on the other. (p. 20)

Out of this covenant, a mission – the purposeful goal of the school – is then realized.

Noting the significant relationship between effective leadership and vision, Sheive and Schoenheit (1987) studied 12 educational leaders in light of the concept of vision and found that these leaders sought to consciously realize their visions for their schools. Similar to Senge's findings of effective leaders' use of a purpose story, Sheive and Schoenheit noted
that “these leaders are pulling all of us toward a future that we would all prefer” (p. 98) and that future, that vision, is deeply rooted in their values. In seeking to “pull” the Johnson City Central School District in New York to a model of educational excellence, Champlin (1987) clearly and boldly articulated his vision and then modeled his “beliefs and dedication in every way possible” (p. 58). Champlin credited the successful turn-around of the Johnson City schools to “a vision carefully conceived, thoughtfully managed, and doggedly sustained” (p. 62). The vision, however, must resonate with the members if there is to be any success in realizing it (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Johnston, 1987; Owens, 1987; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1996).

Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, and Smith (1979) studied 12 secondary schools in London and the effect of culture on student performance. They concluded that there was an impact on student performance resulting from the ethos of the school as a social institution (p. 205). They defined this ethos as a school-wide set of values and norms of behavior (p. 192). Rutter et al. cautioned that for there to be consistency and ubiquity of values and norms within a school, both teachers and students must be able to identify with those values and norms. In his research on new principals and school culture, Harvey (1991) acknowledged this critical balance and stated that principals must be able to read the competing sets of cognitions of school participants. . . . legitimize meanings and reaffirm the key values of the culture (p. 33). Johnston (1987) identified the following values as critical to an organization’s success regardless of its mission: (a) striving for personal and organizational excellence, (b) respecting and appreciating the individual, (c) promoting an innovative spirit, (d) providing outstanding service, and (e) communicating openly and frankly (p. 82).

While a school’s values and vision may be stated explicitly in policy manuals, handbooks, and other school literature, it is through everyday, often indirect, yet purposeful means that these values are communicated and transmitted. Primarily, through the use of symbols, rituals, rites, ceremonies, heroes, and celebrations, values are imparted. As detailed by Schein (1992), the prevailing and strongly-held cultural values are transformed over time into underlying assumptions as the culture successfully solves problems and adapts to changes both within and without its environment.
Symbols, Language, Rituals, Ceremonies, Heroes and Culture

What one “sees, hears, and feels” upon encountering a culture are the artifacts of that culture and, according to Schein (1992), ambiguous in nature. At the same time, these artifacts can have a profound influence on people and serve to strengthen a culture because of their inherent symbolic meaning and potential to inspire and motivate. Through symbols, language, rituals, slogans, traditions, ceremonies, heroes, and stories, organizational leaders and members can manifest, affirm, and reinforce their culture's values (Cook, 1998; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Deal & Peterson, 1990; March, 1984; Owens, 1987; Pondy, Frost, Morgan, & Dandridge, 1983; Sashkin & Sashkin, 1990; Schein, 1992; Shafritz & Ott, 1987; Siehl & Martin, 1987; Smircich, 1992; Stolp & Smith, 1995). As Owens (1987) concluded in his ethnographic study of a senior high school principal:

Those principals who would be powerful leaders . . . must be prepared to engage in symbolic leadership and to develop organizational cultures of a new and higher order. Such leaders attend to the creation of new legends and fresh organizational stories; they extol emerging heroes and develop new social norms in the organization (pp. 23-24).

In their study of a high-technology firm, Siehl and Martin (1987) stated that leaders can create and foster a culture of shared values through the intentional implementation of organizational stories and rituals which transmit the organization's core values. Furthermore, Siehl and Martin maintained that formal training programs, which included these expressions of culture, could “be a powerful means of reinforcing the value system” (p. 443). Supporting this finding, Smircich (1992) concluded that a culture's shared sense of meaning can be developed through “rituals, slogans and specialized vocabularies” (p. 64).

In their review of five case studies of successful principals, Deal and Peterson (1990) attributed their success to symbolic leadership – “Using one's own behavior to exemplify core values and beliefs, and reinforcing those values consistently in daily routines; telling stories that illustrate shared values; and nurturing the tradition, ceremonies, rituals, and symbols that express and reinforce the school culture” (p. 91). In describing one principal and his use of story to shape the culture, Deal and Peterson (1990) remarked, “Boyden used the story of Tom Ashley to communicate core values of the institution, to demonstrate the ways the school had shaped others,
and to motivate slackers to greater effort" (p. 89). In their research on organizational stories, Martin and Powers (1983) found similar results and concluded, "Stories caused more commitment than other means of communicating information, such as statistics" (p. 103). Telling stories and recognizing heroes in order to inspire organizational members and strengthen the culture is a frequent and well-documented practice among leaders of successful companies and schools (Deal, 1985; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Johnston, 1987; Ouchi, 1981; Stolp & Smith, 1995).

While stories, symbols, and rituals can be employed to inspire organizational members and strengthen the culture, they are also a means of control (Shafritz, & Ott, 1987). In their study of the relationship between the dominant culture of General Motors (GM) and the "counterculture" of John DeLorean, Martin and Siehl (1983) described the core values and various rituals practiced in the GM culture and the extent to which DeLorean challenged some of these values and did not engage in certain traditional practices which reinforced those values. DeLorean's contradictory response and behavior was, in itself, symbolic and eventually led to his departure. Herein lies the crux, according to Johnston (1987). Johnston asserted, "If individuals are able to choose which values they will support... and which they will reject, it is difficult to develop a coherent consensus on values. What this means is that your rituals and rules should be connected directly to core values, the central ones that no one is free to reject" (p. 87).

**Subcultures and Culture**

When members within an organization form a group based on parochial or opposing values and, in turn, develop their own artifacts and demonstrate counter behavioral norms, they are identified as a subculture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, 1983; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Erickson, 1987; Martin & Siehl, 1983; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1996). While some subcultures foster deviant behavior, they are frequently developed around the special interests, specific jobs, gender, race, or unmet needs of members and are a natural part of any culture's growth (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1996). Martin and Siehl distinguished the various subcultures which emerge within a “dominant culture” and defined them as (a) enhancing, (b) orthogonal, and (c) counterculture (p. 53). Whereas the first two subcultures serve to promote the dominant culture's core values, with the orthogonal subculture maintaining separate, but compatible, values, the
counterculture subculture thwarts the core values (p. 54).

In schools, subcultures are frequently created around functional roles – teachers, students, parents, staff, and administrators. Sergiovanni (1996) noted that “subcultures have always been alive and well in schools, dictating patterns of dress, speech habits, and fairly harmless rites and rituals” (p. 60). More recently, in the absence of a “strong moral voice” in schools, he claimed:

Students are particularly vulnerable. . . . In the absence of this voice, they can respond to the norms of a separate – and often dysfunctional – student subculture. But respond they must, for it is part of our human nature to be norm-referenced. This is the way we know we belong. This is the way we secure our personal identities. And this is the way we find sense and meaning in our lives. (p. 60)

Maintaining that students will form select groups, Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, and Ouston (1979) found that the degree to which student subcultures support the vision of the school relates directly to the overall condition of the school, the rapport and interaction between students and teachers, opportunities for students to assume responsibility, and student academic success (p. 194).

According to Schein (1992), it is during an organization's mid-life that subcultures naturally come into existence in response to the organization's growth, internally and externally. Schein noted the challenge leaders have in building relations among these various subcultures within an organization and the critical task of ultimately advancing them in the direction of the vision. Bennis (1984) defined this advancement as “organizational integrity” (p. 68) and Sergiovanni (1984) as “domestication of 'wild' centers” (p. 9). Where radical subcultures arise, such as unions with opposing ideology, leaders may need to seek professional assistance to “create a climate of negotiation and conflict resolution” (Schein, 1992, p. 273). Focusing on John DeLorean’s counterculture practices at GM, Martin and Siehl (1983) concluded, “A counterculture can serve some useful functions for a dominant culture, articulating the boundaries between appropriate and inappropriate behavior and providing a safe haven for the development of innovative ideas” (p. 63). Clearly, the relationship between the dominant culture and counter subcultures is a delicate one, “symbiotic” in Martin and Siehl's words, but one which can prove worthwhile in that its very challenge can provide the dominant culture an occasion to boldly declare its core values.
Summary

In reviewing the literature on culture, I noted the ambiguity surrounding its meaning; provided anthropological, organizational, and educational perspectives on culture; and highlighted prominent themes, most specifically those which relate to school cultures. While a “definition dilemma” may still exist, there appears to be substantive agreement within the literature on the following: (a) culture encompasses the tacit assumptions which guide, direct, and give meaning to normative behavior; (b) leaders play the most critical role in creating and developing culture; (c) leaders, through symbolic action – using symbols, telling stories, recognizing heroes, articulating values, speaking metaphorically – can strengthen culture; (d) culture is resistant to change to the extent that the change conflicts with the shared basic assumptions and sacred norms; (e) symbols, traditions, rituals, language, stories, ceremonies, artifacts, and heroes manifest a culture's values and beliefs; (f) culture develops over time and within the context of problem solving; and (g) culture gives meaning to life.
CHAPTER III
METHODODOLOGY

I conducted a descriptive case study of Chapman Friends School, an alternative Quaker high school which opened in August 1997. In explaining the methodology and justification for a descriptive case study of Chapman Friends School, I have relied on the work of Yin (1994) and Miles and Huberman (1994). Following is: (a) a summary of the case study design, (b) a description of the site, (c) sources of evidence, (d) a rationale for data collection procedures, (e) discussion of the significance of creating a database, and (f) an explanation of the format for data analysis.

Research Design

According to Yin (1994), a case study is preferred when the researcher seeks to answer a "how or why question . . ., has little control over events . . ., and the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context" (p. 1). Yin emphasized the significant advantage of this kind of research, "A major strength of case study data collection is the opportunity to use many different sources of evidence" and develop "converging lines of inquiry . . . triangulation" (p. 91-92). Further strengths of qualitative methods identified by Miles and Huberman (1994) include: local groundedness, richness and holism, sustained period of data collection, discovery of meanings, assessment of causality, flexibility, and development and testing of hypotheses (p. 10).

In conducting this study, I sought neither to prove nor confirm a particular hypothesis, but rather, to discover how culture is created; for, as Mintzberg (1983) declared, "It is discovery that attracts me to this business, not the checking out of what we think we already know" (p. 108).

Based on his belief that culture is to be discovered in the assumptions, Schein (1984) recommended four interdependent approaches to the study of culture within an organization. Primarily through interviews, observations, and artifact analysis, the researcher must (a) examine the socialization process of new members, (b) examine how the group responds to critical events, (c) develop biographical data on the “culture creators,” and (d) explore with an “insider” the contradictions which have surfaced in the culture (p. 13). In conducting my study of the culture of Chapman Friends School, I employed these approaches.
Site Selection and Description

Site Selection

Desiring to study the creation of culture within a school, I selected a new school. I considered the school's proximity, accessibility, and the administration's openness to participating in the study. My first encounter with Chapman Friends School was in the spring of 1997 when John Smith, the headmaster, and Joan Anderson, the principal, visited the elementary school where I am principal. They introduced themselves and acquainted me with their school, which was scheduled to open in the fall of 1997. Since graduates from my school would be entering high school that same fall, John asked me if some school marketing literature could be forwarded to students and parents who might be interested. In considering a site for my case study, I recalled this previous meeting and contacted John in July 1997.

From the start, John expressed great interest in my proposal and remarked, “I think it is a wonderful idea! We're an open book here.” Joan, too, was supportive of my request and stated that she would discuss it with the teachers, who later agreed. Located just three miles from my school, Chapman Friends School's proximity allowed me to make frequent visits and not lose time in transit. School factors such as student enrollment, religious affiliation, governance, curriculum, ethnic make-up, grade levels, and physical setting had no relevance in the selection process. To ensure anonymity, the school's name and the names of all its members were changed. The individuals involved in my study were asked to sign an informed consent letter (see Appendix A).

Site Description

Chapman Friends School is a private, alternative Quaker high school located in a mid-Atlantic state. The school is housed in a Jewish temple situated in an upper-middle class and well-established neighborhood. Student enrollment the first year was 38 and there was no senior class. There was some cultural diversity within the student population – four African-American, one from India, and one from Samoa – and nearly twice as many males as females. Regarding faith affiliation, there were only three Quakers: John, a teacher, and one student. Most of the faculty members and Joan, however, had previous experience with other Quaker schools or were attending Quaker Meetings in the area.
A total of eight teachers, five full-time and three part-time, and an office manager made up the school's faculty and staff. Both John and Joan taught on a regular basis. Of the eight teachers, three had been involved with the Chapman Friends Schools in a neighboring state, one as a former student and the other two as teachers. The faculty vitae brochure included in the registration packet portrays a well-educated group of teachers with highly diverse and enterprising accomplishments.

A ten-member Board of Directors, comprised of faculty members and Quakers, governs the school along with John. No parent is on the Board and, at her own request, Joan chose to waive her right to be on it during the first year. Tuition the first year was $10,995, and financial assistance was available for families in need. While the school is a member of the Association of Independent Schools, the Friends Council on Education, and the Small Schools Association, it is not accredited. According to John, accreditation is a future goal.

**Sources of Evidence**

Sources of evidence include (a) artifacts, primarily school documents and literature, (b) observations as recorded in the researcher's log; and (c) interviews. Data collection began in August 1997 and continued through September 1998.

**Artifacts**

Schein (1992) defined artifacts as "the visible products," "all the phenomena that one sees, hears, and feels when one encounters a new group" (p. 17). For the purposes of my study, I have employed the term artifacts to describe the documents, literature, correspondence, and video of Chapman Friends School which I collected during my study. As noted by Yin (1994), document collection and analyzation allow the researcher to substantiate and validate evidence gathered from observations, interviews, and archival records. In order to ensure a comprehensive collection of school documents, I requested an on-site mail box for correspondence and other items distributed by the school. While I initially planned to procure policy manuals, curriculum guidelines, and parent and student handbooks, none were to be found. The absence of such typical school materials was not accidental. It was purposeful and related to the school's "unwillingness to write
down all the rules and 'regs'" (Researcher's log, June 14, 1998).

I collected and examined 108 documents, which included: (a) school advertising brochures; (b) publishing pamphlet – *What Makes a School "Quaker"?*; (c) personnel interview form; (d) student application and registration materials; (e) school information packet; (f) alumni newsletters (from the parent school); (g) formal, school-wide correspondence to parents, students, and teachers; (h) publicly-displayed communiques and notices; (i) school board meeting minutes; (j) faculty meetings agenda; (k) news articles about the school; (l) school calendar; (m) school video; (n) school yearbook; (o) school newspaper; (p) city council docket items; (q) invitations and flyers to school events; (r) the school's commitments list; and (s) personal letters from John to me.

**Observations**

In addressing the challenge of field observations for the novice researcher, Ely, Annull, Feldman, Garner, and Steinmetz (1991) asserted, "an attitude of curiosity and a heightened attention" are essential, lest the researcher fall victim to the typical human behavior of conditioned filtering of one's environment (p. 42). Furthermore, Ely encouraged researchers to begin with a wide-angle, panoramic observational lens, erring on the side of gathering the seemingly trivial, at least initially. I followed this latter advice and, eventually, discovered the challenge that comes from collecting a staggering amount of data. I visited the school on 31 separate occasions throughout the year. These visits included attendance at faculty meetings, classroom observations, parent workshops, participation in weekly Meeting for Worship, and interviews with John, Joan, and the teachers. I also attended related events which occurred off-site, including (a) a school auction, (b) a board meeting, (c) a talent show, (d) a workshop at the parent school, (e) the retirement celebration for John and his wife who taught at the parent school, (f) a city planning commission meeting, (g) a city council meeting, (h) a local neighborhood association meeting, (i) the graduation ceremony for students of the parent school, (j) a softball game, and (k) the deli where some students ate lunch most days. On the recommendation of one of the teachers, I attended a local Quaker Meeting for Worship on two separate occasions.

During the on-site visits, I sought to be as inconspicuous as possible and did not take notes in public. Generally, I left the immediate setting and, in private, made "rapid jottings or
whisperings into a tape recorder of details and dialogues that serve as guideposts for fuller description" (Ely et al., 1991, p. 69). Following my on-site observations, I recorded on tape all the observations I could recall as well as any impressions and questions I had as a result of those observations. I later transcribed these tapes, along with any notes I had written, and included them in my researcher's log.

In order to gain an appreciation and understanding of the Chapman Friends culture, I visited the parent school in a neighboring state in the fall of 1998. During this visit I observed classroom instruction, attended a Meeting for Worship, spoke with teachers, and informally interviewed the teacher who would later become the parent school's principal.

**Researcher's Log**

Ely et al. (1991) refer to the log as “the data” – an extension of field notes where “the researcher faces the self as instrument through a personal dialogue about moments of victory and disheartenment, hunches, feelings, insights, assumptions, biases, and ongoing ideas about method” (p. 69). Following my observations, I described the situation, the people involved, the actions which occurred, and any other pertinent information relating to the event and recorded it in my log. I employed the following guidelines regarding format: (a) wide margins to accommodate additional comments; (b) line numbering for easy reference; (c) inclusion of comments as well as analytic information and thematic codes in the margins; (d) prompt and comprehensive writing in the log following observations and interviews; (e) incorporation of analytical memos – reflections on previous journal entries (Ely et al., 1991, pp. 73-74, 79-80).

**Interviews**

Throughout the period of the study, I conducted informal (spontaneous and not taped) interviews and focused (scheduled and taped) interviews with (a) John, (b) Joan, (c) all faculty and staff, (d) students, and (e) parents. I interviewed all eight teachers, the office manager, eight students, nine parents, as well as John three times, Joan twice, and Fran for a total of 32 interviews. George, the interim principal during Joan's absence, chose not to be formally interviewed. All the faculty and staff interviews were completed prior to the end of the school year. While my interviews with John, Joan, and the teachers were on-site and in person, the student and parent interviews
were off-site, some by phone. Interviews lasted about an hour.

I experienced some difficulty in scheduling interviews with the students. Initially, I made a brief presentation to the students and requested their “critical” involvement. While there appeared to be some enthusiasm on their part, the majority of students did not return the required form. I then changed my strategy and made personal phone calls to students, asking if they would consent to an interview. I contacted eleven students in all, and interviewed eight. A few students who agreed to be interviewed simply forgot their appointments. In selecting the parents to be interviewed, I made sure to interview parents of students who were returning to Chapman Friends School the following year as well as parents of students who would not be returning.

**Interview Questions**

According to Ely et al. (1991), questions should be consistent “with or arise from the ongoing data as the qualitative researcher contemplates them” (p. 67). Interview questions were of an open-ended nature, designed to enhance my understanding of events, actions, and behavior within the school setting as well as to answer those questions which I had noted in my log following an observation. Formal interview questions related directly to the research questions and were analyzed for content validity. Four individuals, not related to this study, were asked to analyze the interview questions and evaluate them based on how well they correlated with the research questions. Questions were revised based on recommendations by these individuals. The interview questions are shown in Tables 2 - 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Component: Core Principles</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values/Beliefs: How are values and beliefs articulated by members of the community?</td>
<td>What kind of school community are you hoping to create? What would you like the parents, faculty, and students to say about CFS at the end of the year? (Chapman Friends School = CFS)</td>
<td>What kind of school community are you hoping to create? Upon graduation, what are the qualities you hope your students will have developed? What kind of orientation did you receive at the start of the year?</td>
<td>What kind of school community are you hoping to create? Upon graduation, what are the qualities you hope your students will have developed? What kind of orientation did you receive at the start of the year?</td>
<td>What do you enjoy most about this school? What would John say is the most important thing to learn at CFS? What would you say? What kind of orientation did you receive at the start of the year?</td>
<td>Why did you choose to enroll your child at CFS? What kind of orientation did you receive at the start of the year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions: What assumptions undergird these values and beliefs?</td>
<td>Why did you decide to open CFS in this area?</td>
<td>What led you to accept the principalship here?</td>
<td>What led you to accept a teaching position here?</td>
<td>What did you believe about the Quakers prior to coming here?</td>
<td>What did you believe about CFS or Quaker schools that influenced your decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: What role does religion play in the school?</td>
<td>What is the significance of Meeting for Worship? What makes this school Quaker?</td>
<td>What is the significance of Meeting for Worship? What makes this school Quaker?</td>
<td>What is the significance of Meeting for Worship? What makes this school Quaker?</td>
<td>What is your understanding of Meeting for Worship? What makes this school Quaker?</td>
<td>What is your understanding of Meeting for Worship? What makes this school Quaker?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the content of the curriculum, and how is it taught?</td>
<td>What is unique about your curriculum and instruction?</td>
<td>What is unique about CFS curriculum and the kind of instruction that occurs here?</td>
<td>How is the curriculum and instruction at CFS different from other schools?</td>
<td>How is CFS different from other schools you have attended?</td>
<td>How do CFS curriculum and instruction compare to that of other schools?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Data Collection: Interview Questions – History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Component: History</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What personal and institutional history influences the creation of culture?</td>
<td>What has led you to the position of director at CFS?</td>
<td>What has led you to the position of principal at CFS?</td>
<td>Have you had any previous teaching experience? At a Quaker School?</td>
<td>What do you know about Quakerism or other Quaker schools?</td>
<td>What is your knowledge of Quakerism or Quaker schools in general? Have you ever attended a Quaker school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories: What stories from the past are told?</td>
<td>What stories from your past CFS experience have you told?</td>
<td>What stories from your past CFS experience have you told?</td>
<td>What stories from their past experience have John and Joan told?</td>
<td>Do the teachers, John, or Joan ever share stories about the other Quaker schools?</td>
<td>What affirms your decision to send your child here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What historical impact do other “parent” Quaker schools have on this school?</td>
<td>Why did you decide to open CFS? In what ways is this school similar to its parent school?</td>
<td>In what ways is this school similar to its parent school?</td>
<td>Are comparisons made between this school and the parent school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are traditions developed?</td>
<td>What activities would one find occurring at the parent school and here?</td>
<td>What traditions have you borrowed from the parent school? What symbolic practices are you initiating?</td>
<td>What symbolic practices are you initiating in your classroom or the school at large?</td>
<td>Are there any traditions here at CFS?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

**Data Collection: Interview Questions – Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Component: Practices</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norms:</strong> What are the expected behavioral norms of students, and how are they articulated and reinforced?</td>
<td>What are the expected behavioral norms of students, and how are they articulated and reinforced?</td>
<td>What are the expected behavioral norms of students, and how are they articulated and reinforced?</td>
<td>What are the rules for student behavior at CFS, and how did you learn about them?</td>
<td>What are the rules for student behavior at CFS, and how did you learn about them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceremonies:</strong> Have there been any formal ceremonies this year?</td>
<td>Have there been any formal ceremonies this year?</td>
<td>Have there been any formal ceremonies this year?</td>
<td>Have there been any formal ceremonies this year?</td>
<td>Have there been any formal ceremonies this year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Celebrations:</strong> In what ways have you celebrated here?</td>
<td>In what ways have you celebrated here?</td>
<td>In what ways have you celebrated here?</td>
<td>Have there been any celebrations this year?</td>
<td>Have there been any celebrations this year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heroes and Heroines:</strong> Whom have you publicly recognized as exemplary and why?</td>
<td>Whom have you publicly recognized as exemplary and why?</td>
<td>Whom have you publicly recognized as exemplary and why?</td>
<td>Have any students been recognized publicly. If so, why and how?</td>
<td>Are you aware of any individuals being publicly recognized?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

**Data Collection: Interview Questions – Problem Solving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Component: Problem Solving</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Making:</strong> How are decisions made, and who is involved?</td>
<td>How are decisions made, and who is involved?</td>
<td>How are decisions made, and who is involved?</td>
<td>How are decisions made, and who is involved?</td>
<td>How are decisions made, and who is involved?</td>
<td>How are decisions made, and who is involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Resolution:</strong> How are conflicts resolved?</td>
<td>How are conflicts resolved? What happens when there is disagreement between students and teachers? Teachers and parents? Teachers and the administration?</td>
<td>How are conflicts resolved? What happens when there is disagreement between students and teachers? Teachers and parents? Teachers and the administration?</td>
<td>How are conflicts resolved? What happens when there is disagreement between students and teachers? Teachers and parents? Teachers and the administration?</td>
<td>What happens when there is disagreement between the students and the teachers? Between students and the principal?</td>
<td>What happens when there is disagreement between the parents and teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are issues raised and addressed?</td>
<td>How are issues raised and addressed?</td>
<td>How are issues raised and addressed?</td>
<td>How are issues raised and addressed? If you could change something at CFS, what would that be?</td>
<td>What issues have the students raised, and how have they raised them? If you could change something about CFS, what would that be?</td>
<td>How do parents raise issues of concern? How are issues addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are policies and rules created and implemented?</td>
<td>How are policies and rules created and implemented?</td>
<td>How are policies and rules created and implemented?</td>
<td>How are policies and rules created and implemented?</td>
<td>How are rules created and implemented?</td>
<td>How are you made aware of school rules and policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Events:</strong> How do people respond to critical events?</td>
<td>What has been the most critical event this year?</td>
<td>What has been the most critical event this year?</td>
<td>What has been the most critical event this year?</td>
<td>What has been the most critical event this year?</td>
<td>What has been the most critical event this year?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Collection: Interview Questions – Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Component: Language</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication:</strong> How do people communicate?</td>
<td>What do you do when you want to articulate a policy or deliver a message to the CFS community?</td>
<td>What do you do when you want to articulate a policy or deliver a message to the CFS community?</td>
<td>What do you do when you want to articulate a classroom policy or deliver a message to the students?</td>
<td>In what ways do you communicate with your teachers, John, and Joan?</td>
<td>By what means do parents communicate with the faculty, principal, and director?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbols:</strong> What symbols are used within the school?</td>
<td>What symbols are used within your school?</td>
<td>What symbols are used within your school?</td>
<td>What symbols are used within your school?</td>
<td>What symbols are used within your school?</td>
<td>What symbols are used within your school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metaphors:</strong> What metaphors are used?</td>
<td>How would you describe CFS?</td>
<td>How would you describe CFS?</td>
<td>How would you describe CFS?</td>
<td>How would you describe CFS?</td>
<td>How would you describe CFS?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

**Data Collection: Interview Questions – Membership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Component: Membership</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members:</strong> What criteria are used for selecting the principal, faculty, and students?</td>
<td>What criteria are used for selecting the principal, faculty, and students?</td>
<td>What criteria are used for selecting the principal, faculty, and students?</td>
<td>What kind of student would do well at CFS?</td>
<td>What kind of student would do well at CFS?</td>
<td>What kind of student would do well at CFS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaders:</strong> How is authority delegated, and who has the greatest influence?</td>
<td>How is authority delegated? Who has the greatest influence at CFS?</td>
<td>How is authority delegated? Who has the greatest influence at CFS?</td>
<td>How is authority delegated? Who has the greatest influence at CFS?</td>
<td>Who has the greatest influence at CFS?</td>
<td>Who has the greatest influence at CFS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcultures:</strong> What, if any, subcultures exist?</td>
<td>Do you think all the students here “buy into” CFS?</td>
<td>Do you think all the students here “buy into” CFS?</td>
<td>Do you think all the students here “buy into” CFS?</td>
<td>Do you think all the students here “buy into” CFS?</td>
<td>Do you think all the students here “buy into” CFS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role do parents play?</td>
<td>What role do you see the parents playing at CFS?</td>
<td>What role do you see the parents playing at CFS?</td>
<td>What role do you see the parents playing at CFS?</td>
<td>Are parents involved here at CFS?</td>
<td>To what extent are parents involved here at CFS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are the deviants?</td>
<td>Were any students suspended or their contracts not renewed?</td>
<td>Were any students suspended or their contracts not renewed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Data Collection Plan: Interview Questions – Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Component: Environment</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility &amp; Location: What impact do the facility and its location have on the school community?</td>
<td>In what ways does this facility impact CFS? What about the location in the community?</td>
<td>In what ways does this facility impact CFS? What about the location in the community?</td>
<td>In what ways does this facility impact CFS? What about the location in the community?</td>
<td>What do you think about this facility and its location?</td>
<td>What do you think about this facility and its location?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phone Conversations

To address what Miles and Huberman (1994) defined as “noncontinuous presence” (p. 264), I contacted John and Joan on a bi-weekly basis by phone. Our conversations involved discussions regarding the previous week as well as follow-up questions from my visit. Notes from these phone conversations were recorded in my researcher's log.

Principles of Data Collection

To ensure construct validity and reliability, Yin (1994) identified and strongly advised the use of three guiding principles: (a) use multiple sources of evidence, (b) create a database, and (c) maintain a chain of evidence (pp. 90-99). In using multiple sources of evidence, “multiple measures of the same phenomenon” (p. 91) are obtained and construct validity is established. A database, containing field notes, typed transcriptions, documents, tapes, videos, and any other sources of evidence, is recommended as a way of ensuring reliability, allowing for any other researcher to exam the data separate from the written report. Finally, reliability is also established to the degree that the researcher can “move from one portion of the case study to another, with clear cross-referencing to methodological procedures and to the resulting evidence” (p.99).

Database

I created a database which included: (a) tapes, (b) researcher's log – transcription of field notes, (c) documents and correspondence, (d) a video, and (f) phone log. On each tape, I listed the date and activity (observation, interview) and assigned a number to the tape. I kept a typed inventory of tape numbers with corresponding details for easy reference. Transcriptions of field notes were contained in a three-ring binder identified as the “researcher's log.” I also numbered each document and correspondence collected and kept a typed inventory of them.

Data Analysis and Coding

Qualitative researchers are in agreement on the challenging task of analyzing, categorizing, and synthesizing the mounds of data collected by the novice researcher (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Ely et al., 1991; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 1994). I utilized the researcher's log and coding to
Coding is the process by which the researcher creates meaning from the data gathered (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Most of the research literature recommends a progressive coding system, moving from simple descriptive to increasingly more inferential or conceptual codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Marshall & Rossman, 1995). Mintzberg (1983) cautions, however, against a too-structured approach, contending: “As soon as the researcher insists on forcing the organization into abstract categories – into his terms instead of its own – he is reduced to using perceptual measures which often distort reality” (p. 111). In this regard, I initially used a thematic coding system based on the cultural components outlined in chapter one, fully aware that my experience in the field might require a change or modification to allow for what Miles and Huberman (1994) called the “emerging code.” In order to identify the components of culture and note themes, I used a color coding system and color coded passages in my researcher's log, interview transcripts, and documents which were thematically similar. Coding categories included: (a) history, (b) core principles, (c) leadership, (d) membership, (e) practices, (f) decision making, (g) environment, and (h) critical events.

**Findings and Conclusions**

The findings and conclusions are presented in a narrative report and include passages from my researcher's log, statements made during formal interviews, and text from artifacts (documents and correspondence). Miles and Huberman recommended data displays, stating, “Displays . . . are focused enough to permit a viewing of a full data set (p. 91), and allow for “careful comparisons, detection of differences, noting of patterns and themes” (p. 92). Where the amount of data proved substantial, I created thematic data matrix displays and have placed them in the Appendix. Some tables also appear in the context of the narrative report.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

I have reported the findings in the context of the research literature to identify relationships and distinctions between past research studies and my findings at Chapman Friends School. Chapter four is organized into eight main sections based on the components of culture which were most significant in the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School. The components include: (a) history, (b) core principles, (c) leadership, (d) membership, (e) practices, (f) decision making, (g) environment, and (h) critical events. Each section consists of a narrative report and, where the volume of information necessitates, tables, with detailed data gained from interviews, observations, and artifacts.

A Brief History of Chapman Friends School

Chapman Friends School was established in 1997; its roots, however, go back to 1973 when the first Chapman Friends School was founded in a neighboring state. According to John Smith, the headmaster, the first Chapman Friends School was the “brain child” of two outstanding, charismatic educators who had an innovative philosophy and powerful vision about educating bright, underachieving students they believed were ready to think for themselves. These two educators – a husband and wife – asked Chapman Green, the headmaster of Windy Trails Friends School, where they had been teaching, if they could begin another school for those students who were not succeeding at Windy Trails. According to John, they asked Chapman for “the kids that you won't take, the ones that would be too difficult to handle” and promised to “excite kids to learning by taking them seriously and encouraging them to speak their mind.” With Chapman's consent, they founded the Interlocking Curriculum School wherein “the individual talents and worth of each student, the creation of an environment in which people can think for themselves, the emphasis on making a better world, and the encouragement to lead and express individual power and influence” were the focus, along with an integrated curriculum (“Alumni Notes,” 1997, 2). The name of the school was subsequently changed from Interlocking Curriculum School to Chapman Friends School to recognize and honor Chapman Green as well as to distinguish it as a Friends school.
In addition to the parent high school, or “upper school" as it is known, a middle school was founded in 1994 in the same vicinity. The success of these two schools and an expressed interest from parents, teachers, and counselors in a neighboring state prompted John to begin yet another new school and, thus, the third Chapman Friends School was founded. As noted in an advertising brochure for the new school:

We see a unique opportunity to build another high school the Chapman Way – a school of true diversity, in which there are no artificial boundaries between people from different cultural or racial backgrounds. A school where compassion, a sense of community, and mutual support and trust can replace cliques, mistrust and fear. Chapman Friends is a safe place to grow! (“A New Chapman Friends School?” [Brochure])

Through published news articles in local journals and John and Joan's visits to the “feeder" schools in the area, the school began to make a name for itself and attract the attention of parents and students seeking an alternative approach to education. The school's mission has been constant from the outset:

Our mission is to serve young people for whom life has become too precious to waste on dull and repetitive pedagogy. Our students are those whose very creativity and intelligence make a ‘standard' school seem pallid, pro forma, dull, not enough. Our teachers are committed to the liberation of the best intelligences lurking within our students, the most far-reaching thoughts, the most energetic inquiry, the most exciting speculation. We empower young people to dare to believe in themselves, and in the possibility of improvement in the world. (“A New Chapman Friends School?” [Brochure])

This mission was not lost on the students nor their parents. As the only Quaker student stated:

It's a community with the intention of learning. They focus more on the individual side of learning. Their main goal [is] to create a strong sense of community throughout the group. They also hope for you to build educationally, spiritually, mentally, physically, in all possible ways. They want you to grow into your highest potential. They do that by focusing on trust. (Interview, September 4, 1998)

Another student noted, “Chapman Friends School is a very small high school for those who are
looking for an educational alternative to a large, bureaucratic public high school” (Interview, July 30, 1998). Reflecting the views of a number of parents, one parent described Chapman Friends School as “a school that is trying to help teenagers who have not been successful in regular schools to find their ‘inner rudder’ and be successful both in school and non-school activities” (Interview, July 15, 1998). Another parent claimed, “This school has put everything I think about education on its heels.” Acknowledging that the “Kids tend to love it,” yet another parent expressed serious concerns about the academic caliber and the behavior of some of the students.

Chapman Friends School had an eventful and challenging first year. In late October, Joan Anderson, the principal, took a leave of absence due to the discovery of a malignant tumor, and John appointed an interim principal who, after a few weeks, fell ill with pneumonia. John then assumed most of Joan's daily responsibilities and asked one of the teachers to become “acting dean” and take on some of the administrative tasks. In interviews, students, teachers, and parents defined Joan's illness and subsequent two-month leave of absence as one of “the most critical events” of the year. One teacher described this critical event as follows:

The toughest time that we had was when Joan was sick and was gone for those few months. The school was in such a fledgling stage. We were trying to maneuver things and then to go through a lot of changes with Joan leaving and another principal coming and with John being here. It sort of threw everybody out of whack a little bit. “Wow what is this? How is this working?” [There was] a lot of concern for Joan. We all really took on a little bit of extra during that time. (Interview, June 1, 1998).

Joan, too, acknowledged the critical impact of her long absence and, in summing up the year, remarked candidly:

I think it was a tough year for all of us, especially for the two months that I was away because of my illness. . . . I think we did a lot of things right. The few things that didn't go so well, we tried to correct. I just continue to be impressed by the quality of students that we have overall and how much so many of them grew. (Interview, July 10, 1998)

Furthermore, Joan recognized the role parents played in the school's success this year and stated an appreciation for:

Parents who were willing to take a chance on us. This was a whole new venture. I think it
took a lot of faith to say, “This is where I want my child to be, and this is what we're committed to.” Because, obviously, that was very important to establishing the school itself. (Interview, July 10, 1998)

**Core Principles and the Creation of Culture at Chapman Friends School**

To truly discover the nature of a culture, one must go deeper than the surface level of artifacts and publicly stated values and seek to expose the underlying assumptions which guide the members' behavior and actions. Schein (1992) conceded that such knowledge is not easily discovered and noted:

> Even if we begin to have an intuitive understanding of an organization's culture, we may find it extraordinarily difficult to write down that understanding in such a way that the essence of the culture can be communicated to someone else. (p. 207)

The challenge of discovering underlying assumptions within a new organization is that the members have not been together long enough. They have only begun to encounter problems of internal and external integration. They have not successfully worked through them, with the result of a set of assumptions which will guide members' behavior in the future. Thus, in the case of Chapman Friends School, I examined its religious dimension, its formal commitments, and its curriculum as a way of discovering the school's core values, beliefs, and, to a lesser degree, its underlying assumptions. Recognizing the intimate relationship between curriculum and instruction, I selected to include data on the teachers and their instructional approaches in this section.

**Religion**

The guiding principles of Chapman Friends School are rooted in the teachings of George Fox, the founder of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), and are outlined in a booklet titled *What Makes a School “Quaker”?* (Price, 1994). In brief summary, the following beliefs impact the “methods, content, aims, and purposes” (p. 2) of Chapman Friends School:

> “Truth is available."

> “Progress is possible."

> “Humans are not born in original sin."
Humans have an infinite capacity for good.
Learning is a natural process.
Education is an opening up, not a filling up.
A child is an exciting bundle of potentialities.
We are all connected.
Meeting for Worship is one of the most powerful tools in the pursuit of truth.
Truth is continually revealed.
To check personal revelations against those of the group is important.
The revelatory process is available to all and there is ‘That of God' in everyone.
Divine Light is a constant in the universe. (pp. 3-5).

During my first meeting with John and Joan, John gave me this booklet as well as a school brochure – A New Chapman Friends School? – wherein the following is written: “Our core belief is that there is ‘that of God’ in every person, no matter their age, experience, social status, creed, color or religious preference.” The belief that there is “that of God” in each person precludes the need for an intermediary. As John remarked:

You can talk directly to God. Which you do by being silent. . . . We come together . . . twice a week for twenty minutes to give us an opportunity to ‘travel in,' as Douglas Steere calls it, . . . to the place where we are all connected and where God also resides.

(Interview, December 18, 1997)

Meeting for Worship

“Being silent” is no mere practice in the Quaker faith but, rather, intentional participation in Meeting for Worship. As John Punshon (1987) asserted:

The practice of Quaker worship has a strength which goes far beyond the simple act of sitting in a . . . meeting. It defines a community of believers and the way they understand the bond that exists between them. It gives expression to their sense of the indescribable holiness of God. (p. 10)

Furthermore, he noted, “In the Society of Friends . . . the silent meeting stands alone and bears the full symbolic weight of the values, faith and practice of the Quakers” (p. 67).

While there is some mention of the twice-weekly silent Meeting for Worship in the school's
promotional materials, students learned about Meeting for Worship from John during orientation the first week of school. One teacher stated that John spends a considerable amount of time discussing Meeting for Worship, “what it’s for, the reasons behind it, the history of it, and the expectations [for student participation]” (Interview, June 1, 1998). During a classroom observation, one student was quite emphatic in his explanation of that orientation, remarking, “Oh, we know what a Meeting for Worship is! At the beginning of the year, for three days in a row, John talked about that and truth, truth, truth, and looking into yourself for the truth!” (Researcher’s log, January 15, 1998) Another student stated:

They told me a little bit. . . . They told me that it's a time for you to reflect on your thoughts and to get yourself together and think about how you want to do things and, if not that, time to pray to whatever you believe in or time to figure out if you want something, how you are going to get it. So that was your time to figure it out. (Interview, August 14, 1998)

Beginning meetings in silence was the common practice at Chapman Friends School. My initial experience with Meeting for Worship was during an early visit when I attended a faculty meeting. After everyone had gathered in the main room, Joan turned off the lights and we sat in silence for about 20 minutes. After this period of time, we were invited to share “goods and news.” Generally, each person shared something personal that was either good or news. While I had no intention of sharing, because of my status as researcher, I was invited to do so and did. Much later in the year I expressed to John that I believed this particular experience had the unanticipated but very welcome outcome of establishing a level of intimacy and trust between the teachers and myself. By our fourth Meeting for Worship together, the teachers were enthusiastically asking me to come and spend a day and meet the students.

The students’ Meeting for Worship differed slightly from the teachers’ meetings. Following the silence, the students shook hands with one another (a traditional part of the Quaker ritual) but did not always share goods and news. This was done during study period as a general rule. Instead, either the teachers, John, or Joan, or the students made formal announcements relating to after-school sporting activities, community service, and other administrative issues. The atmosphere of the students’ Meetings for Worship was not always still and calm. At times students
would whisper, talk, giggle, make noises, communicate through facial expressions or hand signs, and fall sleep. On occasion, Joan or one of the teachers addressed the students on their behavior during Meeting for Worship and asked for improved comportment. For the most part, the majority of students settled in and became quiet for the 20-minute period. In asking the students, teachers, administrators, and parents about their understanding of Meeting for Worship, they revealed a variety of views (see Appendix B).

Their views included:

- Time for silence and reflection.
- Mystery, spiritual experience, find “Inner Light.”
- Community experience.
- “Meaningless worship.”
- Quaker tradition, instruction.
- Unique experience.
- Time to sleep.
- Forced practice.

Although responses varied and some respondents provided more than one understanding, the majority view reflects a sense of meaningful purpose to Meeting for Worship. Even Punshon acknowledged the various stances one can take in Meeting for Worship and remarked, “Certainly I pray and meditate, but I also do many other things. I daydream. . . . On occasion I have gone to sleep” (p. 60). When I asked the question, “What makes this school Quaker?” most respondents included Meeting for Worship in their reply. John maintained that Meeting for Worship is not just what makes the school Quaker, it is the “sine qua non” of Chapman Friends School and is absolutely essential to creating the kind of community they desire. In a letter to me, John wrote, “How can we claim to be following the leadings of God if we don't set aside time – as a corporate body – to seek what leadings may be ‘out there’ for us.” The only other people who expressed equal conviction of this belief were two students, one of whom was Quaker; this student's mother; and the newly appointed principal at the parent school.

One of the stories I heard frequently related to Meeting for Worship. Joan referred to it during one of my interviews with her:
I don't think it's [Meeting for Worship] something we necessarily define. I think it's something they have to figure out for themselves. What we've done is provide a brief explanation. . . . And it may take years for them to get it. [John tells the story of an alumnus who exclaimed] "I finally got it! I finally got what Meeting for Worship was all about!" (Interview, March 16, 1998)

Such a story reinforces John's sentiment that “You cannot ‘ef’ the ineffable.” You cannot define Meeting for Worship in an absolute, succinct way understood by all because of the very nature of it. As Punshon (1987) eloquently expressed:

At the same time, the ways to God are many, and we have to discover most of them on our own. They appear when we are ready for them and when our faithfulness has shown we can live with the consequences of further growth. . . . The whole point of Quaker Worship is that we find our own way. (pp. 58-59)

**What Makes This School Quaker?**

To uncover an individual's understanding of what it means to be Quaker, I asked the question, “What makes this school Quaker?” Responses revealed similar notions and included: (a) Meeting for Worship, silence; (b) the Quaker value of “that of God” in everyone; (c) the Quaker values of peace, non-violence, authenticity, respect, tolerance, equality, trust, care for the environment; (d) the Quaker way of decision-making through consensus; (e) addressing one another on a first-name basis; (f) town meetings; (g) community service; (h) style of teaching – teaching “how to learn” as opposed to what to learn; (i) its title; (j) John, the headmaster, is Quaker; and (k) the school's commitments. In addition to these qualities, Joan added, “That’s another difficult question because I know I've heard on many occasions that we are a different Quaker school than many [others]. It's even difficult defining Quaker right in a Quaker school" (Interview, March 16, 1998).

Two teachers mentioned a desire for a greater Quaker influence, one remarked, “It would be nice to have more of those roots here already in terms of those teachers and students who were Quaker, who could pass that [Meeting for Worship] along" (Interview, June 1, 1998). The one Quaker teacher in the school maintained:

But I think that's one of the problems. I think it's difficult to have it be very “Quakerly," in
fact and not just in name, with so few Quakers on the staff and in the school. And there is a difference, when the . . . Quaker [student] came. He came late in the year. There is a difference in him that I particularly notice and pick up. (Interview, May 27, 1998)

Interestingly, the parent of this Quaker student remarked in like manner:

It's a philosophical question that comes up in lots of Quaker circles because there are lots of Friends schools that are not run by Friends. What makes them a Friends school? Is it because they have a particular philosophy? That makes it a friendly school, but it doesn't necessarily make it a “Friends” school. At Chapman, the fact that the head of the school is a Friend is important. So there's kind of that guiding force. . . . I don't think that you can have a Friends school without Friends in it! (Interview, September 4, 1998)

In my last interview with John, I asked him if he had concern with there being so few Quaker teachers in the school. He responded:

A little. Tom [teacher] attends Quaker Meetings regularly. And Kevin [newly appointed headmaster] will be there two days a week, as I have been. Kevin is a Quaker. So I'm not concerned, but apprehensive. I think it's something that bears watching. I think we should. . . . My successors should be on the lookout for Quaker people they can hire. But no Quaker school has a majority of Quaker teachers. . . . It's a problem for all. . . . Nolan is going to be the principal in the [parent] school. He wasn't raised Quaker. He didn't go to a Quaker school. But he's thoroughly Quaker. He may not call himself that. But his spiritual depth makes him a Quaker. (Interview, June 23, 1998)

Schein (1992) addressed the significance of hiring and appointing leaders in his review of mature organizations and asserted, “It is within the powers of leaders. . . . through selection and promotion, to reduce diversity and thus manipulate the direction in which a given organization evolves culturally” (p. 333) . John's apprehensiveness was not unfounded, as one student claimed, “What makes this school Quaker? The title. I highly doubt that it's very Quaker. There are barely any Quaker kids in it” (Interview, September 4, 1998). Clearly, there is an assumption among some, that in addition to the aforementioned Quaker values and rituals, the presence of Quakers – whether they are teachers, administrators, or students – is fundamental to being a Quaker school.
Chapman Friends School Commitments

Emanating from the core belief that there is “that of God” in everyone is the “Chapman way” of education which emphasizes personal authenticity or honesty; the development of a healthy, confident self-esteem within each student; and the building of a community of respect and trust. Fundamental to the Chapman way is letting go of control. As stated by John's wife Fran:

We foster amazing changes in people during their time at Chapman, but it is not because we control them. People new to Chapman – teachers, parents, students – are often frustrated by our unwillingness to write down all the rules and regs. But this reluctance is at the heart of Quakerism and has stood the test of time. . . . Controlling blocks God's will. . . . Each of us has a center, a place which knows, and it is not in the heart or in our thoughts; it is in the soul. Only in that still place can we find that part of ourself that is pure and holy. . . . At Chapman, we utterly believe that young people have in them this center, and that there is in them a will toward wholeness and health that is not under our direction, except as we keep them safe and loved. (Graduation remarks, June 14, 1998)

This letting go of control is most apparent in the noticeable absence of typical school manuals – parent and student handbook, faculty handbook, school policy manual, curriculum guidelines – the “rules and 'regs'” so to speak. What exists are the “Chapman Friends School Commitments,” seven promises which students are required to make upon entering the school and to which they sign their names. The brevity of the commitments epitomizes a belief among the teachers and administration that “Responsible people don't need rules.” The commitments, posted on one of the main bulletin boards in the hallway, are written in frank language on a plain piece of 8 x 11" paper and include:

- Attending school and classes.
- Doing assigned work.
- Participation in Meeting for Worship.
- Doing no drugs, including smoking cigarettes, during school hours.
- Being supportive of other students, the faculty, the school program.
- Being protective of school property.
- Telling the truth.
While individual students and teachers could not always identify all seven of the commitments off the top of their head, they were very much aware of them and their general content. One student described them accordingly, “There were under ten. . . . They were like simple rules, like ‘Don't put anyone down.’ They were just basically like the Ten Commandments. . . . Treat others as you would treat yourself” (Interview, August 4, 1998).

On the first day of school there was a general discussion of the commitments with all the students. A student recalled:

At the beginning of the year the teachers went over the . . . goals. There are seven of them. I mean basically it all comes down to trust and respect. That kind of sums up the whole Chapman philosophy right there. They know that rules are meant to be broken and commitments aren't. Commitments are something you commit to do. By agreeing to the Seven Commitments, you are agreeing to be a part of the community at Chapman. . . . They don't want to control students. They don't want to say like, “Do this. Do this. Do this. And don't do this.” They brought students into this school to . . . be themselves, to do what they needed to do to learn better. (Interview, September 4, 1998)

Parents appeared uninformed or vaguely aware of the Seven Commitments. One parent remarked, “I don't remember what they were, but I saw them, maybe” (Interview, July 28, 1998). In responding to my question regarding an absence of a lot of rules, one parent summed up the Chapman Friends philosophy well, remarking, “What they're trying to foster here is to use your own moral compass to tell you what's appropriate and not appropriate” (Interview, July 15, 1998).

The Chapman Friends School Seven Commitments affected the creation of culture in that students were asked to commit to a set of behavior norms which were rooted in the values the school sought to foster. As Sergiovanni (1990) claimed:

The key to successful schooling is building a covenant comprising purposes and beliefs that bonds people together around common themes and provides them with a sense of what is important, a signal of what is of value. A covenant is a solemn and binding agreement . . . to make certain commitments to each other and to do or keep from doing specific things. (p. 20)
Underscoring this theme, a teacher maintained, “The essence of doing what is right is what it comes down to and that's what matters. The essence of being guided by your spiritual truth, and that's a lot more important than what is the exact punishment” (Interview, May 19, 1998).

On one occasion following Meeting for Worship, John took the opportunity to reinforce the importance of adhering to the commitments by informing students of the negative consequences for not doing so:

John stood before the students and said that a member of the temple administration had made a comment to him regarding students smoking during their morning break. John told the students that there was to be no smoking on campus or in the vicinity, and that was one sure way of getting a couple of weeks off from school. John also spoke about the letter he sent to the parents on homework. He told the students that homework “is your responsibility.” He mentioned that it was time for the students to take responsibility and to start giving. He also added that any student who was disruptive in class would be sent to him or George [the acting principal], as a student would not be allowed to interfere with the education of others. “We have lost students as early as Christmas. I hope that is not the case here.” Continuing, John also stated that the students were not to have any electronic devices in the school, no Walkmans, etc. Such devices were “distracting and blocked out other people and that is not what we are about here.” (Researcher's log, December 11, 1997)

When students chose to break a commitment, the teachers and administration did impose consequences. In some cases, a student and teacher met, and the teacher made suggestions regarding the student’s behavior. One student shared how she had been identified as “starting a clique” and that some of the teachers talked to her about it, recommending that she try to be friendly toward everyone. Students who were caught smoking were suspended. Those who did not put forth effort or complete assignments earned unsatisfactory grades and a letter mid-year stating that changes were in order if the student wanted to be invited back the following year. Students who showed up late for school or a class had to forfeit some of their break time or lunch period and attend “Break/Lunch Bunch.” When the faculty sensed a lack of respect in the community at large, they convened a “town meeting” at which students and teachers discussed the
issue. Students who acted up in class or were verbally abusive were sent to speak to Joan. Most significant, when students continually or blatantly defied the commitments, they were not invited back the following year.

Such responses to undesirable student behavior was a critical factor in the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School. As Schein (1992) found:

To function, every group must develop a system of sanctions for obeying or disobeying the rules. There must evolve some consensus on what symbolically and actually is defined as a reward or punishment and on the manner in which they are administered. The shared assumptions concerning this issue constitute some of the most important elements of an emerging culture in a new organization. (p. 86)

At the same time, teachers, students, and parents noted some uncertainty regarding the consequences and seeming inconsistency in implementing them for specific behavior. One teacher remarked that she did “not know the consequences for cussing” (Interview, May 27, 1998), and a student recommended, “Have a set of . . . expectations and rules at the beginning of the year and stick with them” (Interview, July 11, 1998).

**Curriculum**

To discover Chapman Friends School’s core values and beliefs, I examined its curriculum, classroom instruction and learning, and individuals’ perceptions of the academic program. To provide a comprehensive description of the curriculum, I included data on the teachers, their practices, and the formal orientation they received at the beginning of the year. The inclusion of this data assists the reader in understanding more clearly the many factors which affected the implementation of the curriculum at Chapman Friends School.

Bates (1992) defined curriculum as a “mechanism or message which carries the culture of the school” (p. 17). According to Joan, the school has a dual objective when it comes to its program:

We try to have a two-pronged approach in terms of their self-esteem and academics. Their feeling good about themselves is probably the most important thing. Most of these kids are bright, and if they can feel good about themselves, the grades will come. (Interview, June
23, 1998)

In marketing literature, the curriculum is described accordingly:

Our curriculum is college preparatory, yet cooperative. Each student is encouraged to develop five talents and a self-perception. The talents are 1) reading with penetration and active criticism, 2) writing with power and conviction, 3) listening with focused attention, 4) speaking with clarity and persuasion, 5) thinking logically and lyrically. The self-perception: “I am worthy of whatever good things cross my path, and powerful and clear enough to take advantage of them.” (Chapman Friends School marketing materials, 1997)

The description also includes references to after-school sports, field trips, camping trips, campfire circles, town meetings, and Meetings for Worship. In addition, every student is required to complete 40 hours of community service each year. Students complete their service hours during the winter quarter (December - March) on Wednesdays, when regular classes are suspended in the afternoon. As noted in a letter sent to the school parents at the beginning of the year, community service is rooted in the Quaker belief, “That there is the light of God in everyone and that each individual has worth and deserves respect.”

Following is a description of classes written by a student:

Classes at Chapman are unique and especially interactive. . . . Teachers use videos, field trips, visuals, and hands-on activities. . . . Students have more freedom at Chapman as opposed to most schools. They also carry a greater responsibility to do the work assigned. This allows students to work more at their own pace and be in control. . . . Furthermore, the classes are personal, and everyone gets the help that's needed. (Chapman Friends School 1997-1998 [Yearbook])

Similarly, a teacher explained the difference between Chapman Friends School and public schools:

Theoretically, it is the way we think about it. In public schools you have a system and you set up standards. “Students should know ‘ABCD’ by the end of the year.” That's not all that bad. I don't think we work curriculum first and the students meet the curriculum. We start at the other end, with the students, and find out where we can help them. Because of our size, we work hard at being close to the students and their needs. (Interview, May 19, 1998)
Students had a 15-minute study group each morning and five 50-minute periods a day, including four core academic classes and one elective. In study group, teachers invited students to share goods and news. One teacher commented that this “ritual” helped to build community and remind the students that there was always something either good or new in their lives. Between the third and fourth period, students had a 60-minute lunch break, and a number of students left campus and headed to a local strip-mall a mile away. During fifth period, teachers offered electives ranging from stained glass to the study of dreams. Students were permitted to select courses in a somewhat random fashion and were not locked into a pre-determined sequence of classes over four years.

Regarding the actual academic course offerings, John's remarks in the school video – *As Way Opens at Chapman Friends School* – are apt, “On a piece of paper, it looks quite similar to other schools’ curriculum. It's within each classroom that the dynamic is different.” My classroom observations along with interviews with teachers, students, and parents proved this to be the case.

**Classroom Instruction and Learning**

Classes ranged in size from five to nine, and this alone affected the dynamics of the instruction and learning in that it allowed for much individualized attention. Class discussions were a frequent teaching method and to be expected when one considers John's own educational experience and philosophy on learning. John advocated “education in the realm of ideas” and believed that giving students frequent opportunities to express themselves and their ideas promoted graduates who were articulate and could “speak truth to power.” As John noted, “Quakers are known for the courage of their beliefs and their speaking truth to power. We teach students to speak truth to power, which is a very, very powerful concept” (Interview, December 19, 1997). The classroom discussions I observed were intellectually stimulating at times and, at other times, intellectually wanting. In the latter case, students either had not read the assignment and, thus, could not add meaningful comments to the discussion, or they simply engaged in discussing topics which were completely unrelated to the one at hand. As noted by one teacher:

We are heavily engaged in classroom discussion, and from day one, one of the qualities or criteria or rules has been to listen to other people. But 90 per cent of the time there's a sidebar discussion going on when someone else is talking. (Interview, May 19, 1998)
Important to note, however, is that discussions which involved the students sharing about themselves personally and their life experiences were fostered as a way of assisting students in their growth in authenticity. One student described the curriculum as, “Life lessons, not necessarily fabulous academics or anything like that or good sports skills. Things that you can't see. . . . I think they teach us how to think, basically. It's basically learning about yourself” (Interview, July 11, 1998).

**Classroom observations.** On twelve separate occasions I observed instruction within classrooms. The following observations and comments provide a detailed, albeit limited, perspective on classroom instruction and learning:

Katie began by asking everyone to relax and be silent for a few minutes. She said that she had noticed some tension in the morning Meeting for Worship and invited them to relax whatever muscles were tense. After a few minutes, she began the algebra lesson by reviewing homework problems. She gave an excellent, real-life example of an algebraic problem and used the chalkboard for explication. As students answered her questions, she praised them. I couldn't help but notice the student next to me who was busy drawing the entire time. He did not participate in the lesson at all. After completing some problems together, Katie assigned homework and told the students they could begin working on it so they wouldn't have to worry about it that night. (Researcher's log, October 13, 1997)

I went into Lisa's journalism class. There were four students. It was very informal. Lisa sat at a student's desk in a semi-circle of desks. The students were working on their articles for the soon-to-be published school newspaper. Lisa suggested to one student that she go and ask Joan if she was available for an interview. She reminded the student to introduce herself to Joan. One of the other students remarked how he thought that was “stupid” since everyone knows everyone else. Lisa stated that when they came into her journalism class, they were “journalists.” A male student began interviewing a female student about driving safely on campus. Lisa interjected every now and then, “Are you putting words in her mouth? Are you stating your opinion or the facts? How will your reader know what that is?” Another student asked Lisa some questions about the new computers. Lisa responded that she “felt good” about them, at which point a student boldly
proclaimed, “That's a feeling! He asked you what you think about the computers!” Lisa asked a student who had arrived late (due to an extended weekend trip) if he had done his homework. He stated that he didn't have any time over the weekend. He said that he was going to do a story on what the temple administration thought about having the school there. Lisa reminded the students that “comments” were being sent home that week, subtly hinting, perhaps, that students should complete their assignments. Throughout my time in the class, extraneous discussions between students occurred. (Researcher’s log, October 13, 1997)

At a later point Lisa spoke candidly about the difficulty – “like pulling teeth” – in getting students to complete assignments. She stated:

Most of them are very capable and have very mature ideas and thought processes. It's the transference of that into a product that becomes stressful or too much pressure or just a pain in the butt that they don't want to go through the effort to do. (Interview, June 15, 1998)

She went on to say that she, along with her colleagues, probably were not strict enough with the students, and “gave in a little too easily to their apathy of ‘I am not going to do this,’” and, thus, assigned less. Similar views were expressed by teachers at faculty meetings and during my interviews with them. Experience taught Lisa, however, that when the students had a “tangible product of their work,” such as the school newspaper, and had some peer pressure from being a member of a team, they did excel. As Senge (1990) stated, “People learn more rapidly when they have a genuine sense of responsibility for their actions. If we know our fate is in our own hands, our learning matters” (p. 287).

I entered Tom's civics class, and he introduced me to the students. Tom decided to change his lesson plan since there were only four students. The lesson involved reading a number of scenarios from the book and discussing them in light of relevant laws. Throughout the lesson students interrupted and made comments which had nothing to do with the topic. Tom took most of it in stride but did gently reprimand a few students. One student was preoccupied with peeling an affixed strip of the Hebrew alphabet off the top of the desk. The student next to her, seeing this, hit her on the shoulder and said, “Hey, don't do that.
They need that." Before long, three of the four students were peeling the strips on their desks, including the one who said not to. Tom asked a student to give his report on a current news topic. The student reported on the situation in Iraq and the U.N. inspectors. Tom congratulated the student on his “fine job.” During the class two boys were kidding around and using the terms "pothead" and “crackhead.” Twice Tom informed the students that “those words are like the other words we talked about and are not appropriate words to be using.” Overall, I perceived that the students were not fully participating in the lesson and showed a lack of interest. (Researcher's log, January 15, 1998)

During my interview with Tom, who taught a class in civics and current events part time, he noted:

It's clear that students can easily get away with a lack of academic activity in this school, at least in my class. A large number are so resistant to reading and writing that for a parent who wants their child to get externally imposed academic instruction and success, this is not likely to be the place. The climate does not allow for a lot of heavy academic instruction. (Interview, May 19, 1998)

I visited Katie's class. She and the students were engaged in a board game. The game had to do with diplomatic relations and nuclear war. Some students were actively involved in the game while others were engaged in sidebar discussions unrelated to the game. Katie was explaining various moves the students could make and the consequences of such moves. After the class ended, I mentioned to Katie that it looked highly motivational. With a sigh of slight frustration, she said, “Yes, I have to do something to get them interested and motivated and thinking.” (Researcher's log, February 5, 1998).

Katie's views on teaching and learning evidenced her past experience at the parent school. According to Katie, her curriculum differed from the public school's in that she could generally cover a lot more within the course of a school year. “I teach them how to analyze, how to figure out something on their own rather than just lecturing to them” (Interview, May 13, 1998). From students creating energy-efficient model homes to separating small animal bones into groups and sketching a food web, Katie employed a hands-on approach to teaching, exemplifying well the kind of teacher described in the school's marketing literature.
In the chorus class there were four boys and five girls. One of the boys was playing the notes to “O Danny Boy” on the piano while other students sat or reclined fully on the couches. Theresa, who was teaching the class for the day, sat on the floor. One student was eating her lunch as another began painting her nails. At one point she asked, “Is this color too dark?” Another student then grabbed a bottle of nail polish from the bag and began to paint the nails of a male student. Theresa did not comment on any of this but rather asked the students to sing their parts. The boys did not sing much at all. For the most part, four girls carried the tune. At one point, Theresa moved over to where two boys were sitting and asked them not to talk while the girls were singing and to begin singing. (Researcher’s log, March 6, 1998)

When I asked Theresa, an experienced teacher, about the curriculum and where Chapman Friends School placed emphasis, she stated:

Community. . . trying to work together as a group. . . to get them excited about learning. . . basically, just to like to learn. . . . Students are allowed to really blossom here, let their curiosity go. I think that they really benefit from that, and I think they end up enjoying school. I think that's the main thing. If we can get a student who before didn't really enjoy . . . school to do that, that's a huge battle won. (Interview, June 1, 1998)

Theresa also described what she considered “Chapmanesque”: “When students are challenging an issue . . . and good discussions” are taking place (Interview, June 1, 1998).

I walked into Carol's depth psychology class. Depth psychology was “for those who want to understand themselves better and to wrestle with the meaning of life” (Chapman Friends School Course Descriptions, 1997-1998). According to the course description, students studied Jung, Scott Peck, and Krishnamurti. Four boys and one girl were sitting around a table. They were discussing The Autobiography of a Schizophrenic Girl and their own experience with prescribed drugs. A couple students told of taking medication when they were younger because they had been diagnosed with ADD. One student stated that if her parents had not become so anxious and just “chilled out,” she probably would not have had to take medication. Carol said that she was surprised by how many of them had started taking medication at such an early age. One student related the self-fulfilling prophecy of
going to a doctor and hearing the doctor and other people say, "You're depressed. And you start to believe it and become depressed." A student then mentioned a Discovery article he had read which related to the topic. As Carol listened to the student, other students indulged in personal conversations with their classmates. Carol drew two different symbols on the board representing the ego along with the word "derealization" and discussed its meaning. I was impressed by one student's comments on schizophrenia and religion. He was clearly knowledgeable of some of the different world religions and spoke with a degree of confidence and intelligence. (Researcher's log, March 23, 1998)

Carol is another part-time instructor and teaches a class on depth psychology and one on dreams. She is a Quaker and a Jungian analyst with her own practice. Reflecting on the class, Carol remarked, "Teaching depth psychology is to teach content, and I find them in my class, quite, quite resistant to that. They like to speak about what they do know and out of their own experience" (Interview, May 27, 1998). She admitted that she felt the students were too young for depth psychology because it made them "too self-conscious." In describing the essence of a great class, Carol said, "In dreams class, one kid [was] sharing a dream, another kid [was] writing it on the board, and the other kids [were] responding, 'If this were my dream.'" Carol also added that she had been "too easy" on the students regarding assignments, papers, and quizzes. (Interview, May 27, 1998)

At Chapman Friends School, students cleaned their area of the building everyday. The duties rotated among the study groups, and teachers supervised the clean-up period. A description follows:

As classes ended, students moved into the hallway for clean up. Students grabbed brooms, mops, and sponges. They split up into groups and began sweeping floors, washing blackboards, emptying trash cans, and cleaning bathrooms. I noticed that each teacher had a sheet with a description for each cleaning job. As the teacher held out the form, students read the description, and then signed off on it. The clean up lasted for about 15 minutes. While some students meandered in the hallways, most were hard at work. (Researcher's log, October 13, 1997)

As I entered Peter's science fiction class, the students were discussing science
fiction movies and TV shows they had seen. Peter informed the students that on Friday they would watch the movie 1984. During the classroom discussion, students expressed their views on particular science fiction movies and TV programs. Peter joined in, adding to a student’s description or agreeing with a student's evaluation. The discussion was open, free flowing, and lively. Two students were sitting at a card table playing chess. Every now and then they participated in the discussion. (Researcher's log, March 23, 1998)

After this class I had a chance to talk to Peter who taught most of the math classes. He stated that what made teaching science fiction so interesting was that you ended up integrating other subjects into the discussion. It was Peter's idea to offer the science fiction class because of his personal interest in the topic.

John also taught at the school twice a week. Following is one student's description of his class:

It was kind of like Meeting for Worship where you can get whatever you want out of it. It's your time. . . . John treated it more as a bunch of friends getting together. . . . to discuss our ideas about thought, and the process of thought, and some of the key philosophers over the past 150 years. I read the material more than half the time. John wasn't going to penalize you for not reading it because it's your choice. If you don't read it, your punishment is you're not going to know it. (Interview, July 30, 1998)

This student's latter comment illustrates well the philosophy I heard frequently expressed: “To not intervene between students and the reasonable consequences of their behavior.”

**Perceptions of the academic program.** In interviews with parents, five themes arose regarding the curriculum and academic program: (a) a focus on needs and talents of individual students, (b) an emphasis on independent thinking, (c) limited academic course offerings, (d) student accountability for performance, and (e) a lack of academic rigor. Acknowledging the school’s focus on the individual student, a parent remarked that the teachers “flow with the interest of students” (Interview, July 20, 1998) while another parent expressed appreciation for the way her child with special needs was accepted (Interview, July 21, 1998). Three parents addressed the limited number of academic course offerings, and one parent noted that her daughter was attending a local community college because of the “light" academic program at the school (Interview,
August 27, 1998). Two parents addressed the issue of academic rigor and said their own children felt they were not challenged enough. One parent, however, also appreciated the fact that her son "gained some real inner strength" (Interview, September 4, 1998) along the way. Another parent stated her son "was reading more . . . more thought-provoking books" (Interview, July 28, 1998).

Regarding student accountability, parents raised concern about homework on more than one occasion at the parent workshops. In December, John sent a letter to parents regarding the school's policy on homework (see Appendix C). John explained in detail the school's philosophy on homework and student accountability in this area. John advised, “If the issue of homework has been a battleground at home, we encourage parents to back off and not stand between the student and the reasonable consequences of his/her actions, which can be failure.” One teacher commented that parents used the homework issue as a “handle, something the parents can talk about and judge about. But I think it's a symptom. It isn't the main issue" (Interview, May 17, 1998).

My interviews with students revealed some themes similar to those expressed by the parents. Three students alluded to a lack of academic rigor, and a third remarked that the school was teaching “life lessons, not necessarily fabulous academics” (Interview, July 11, 1998). Four students discussed the way teachers assisted them individually and challenged them personally. According to one student, the teachers "tailor the curriculum to the students" (Interview, July 20, 1998). Addressing the issue of student accountability for completing assignments, a student stated, "John wasn't going to penalize you for not reading it. . . . If you don't read it, your punishment is you're not going to know it" (Interview, July 30, 1998). Capturing elements of the school's philosophy, one student remarked:

It's not so much of a lecture as it is in public schools and they answer almost every question that you have, and they make things very clear-cut here. For example, I had trouble with physics this year and I went to my teacher and she gave me a lot of help on that. It's up to you if you want to take a hard course or not. I've taken a lot of stuff that has challenged me. I've actually enjoyed it. (Interview, September 7, 1998)

The Teachers

One could easily describe the full-time staff as young and the entire staff as dedicated and
caring. A parent remarked, “They really, really labored over [the kids] . . . really looking after the kids and doing things in the kids' best interest” (Interview, August 7, 1998). As shown in Table 9, eight teachers had some previous teaching experience, and all of them had at least an undergraduate degree in his or her own subject field. Only one teacher identified herself as a Quaker and two others noted attending Quaker Meetings. Katie, Patrick, and Peter were the only teachers who had some experience with other Chapman Friends Schools. However, many of the teachers had an opportunity to visit the parent school and spend some time there before making a decision to teach at Chapman Friends School. While not noted in Table 9, most of the teachers also taught an elective each quarter and selected a personal area of interest. Other relevant information regarding the teachers is displayed in Table 9.

**Teacher orientation and practice.** Prior to the first week of school, the teachers participated in an orientation which included an expedition to a Quaker camp and an all day workshop conducted by Fran, wherein she talked about the “Chapman way.” In January, faculty and staff from all three schools attended a two-day retreat where they spent time discussing “What Is Chapman?” The Chapman way included spending the year “observing and learning by doing.” Fran informed the teachers that at times they would need to abandon their lesson plan and “go with what is happening.” She also advised the teachers to bring their problems to the weekly faculty meetings. During my interview with Fran, she commented:

> People who work here will either be changed by Chapman or they'll leave. I tell them that when they come; that this is a hard, hard place to work. You'll either love it or you'll leave. And if you love it, you will be changed by it because we're trying to get at the “authentic” within each person, because that's the level of truth. (Interview, June 23, 1998)

A teacher's comments illustrate well Fran's sentiment:

> What this teaching experience does for me is it makes me feel good about myself. It's important to somehow be a part of the struggle that these kids go through. It has real meaning being here. . . . These are kids who are adolescents, whose struggles with the meaning of life, if you will, are right there on the surface. They're content with achieving stability and confidence as opposed to the more intellectual academic achievement. I just identify with their life struggles more than I might with another group
of students. (Interview, May 19, 1998)

At the beginning of the year, Joan also told the teachers to “pick your battles.” This suggestion was truly one the teachers took to heart. It manifested itself in activities ranging from a student painting a friend's nails during class to students using Walkmans – which most teachers ignored. Although there was agreement among teachers on some of the “battle” issues, individual levels of tolerance came into play within their own classrooms. Teachers abandoned lesson plans, sometimes to indulge students and at other times, because of the value of the topic raised. A teacher remarked, “We spent an entire class talking about race relations last week. It was totally worthwhile to have that discussion” (Interview, May 18, 1998).

When it came to the selection of textbooks and the development of curriculum goals, there was tremendous latitude and freedom. Teachers selected their own textbooks and defined
Table 9
Faculty and Staff Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Quaker</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Part time</th>
<th>Degree in subject area</th>
<th>Past teaching experience</th>
<th>Subjects taught</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Biology, chemistry, env. Science</td>
<td>Formerly taught at Chapman Friends parent school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Modern fiction, writing, math</td>
<td>Graduate of Chapman Friends School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Depth psychology</td>
<td>Jungian analyst with her own practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Math, algebra</td>
<td>Worked at the after-school program at Chapman Friends Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Previously taught at private all-girls high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>U.S. history, reading and writing, current events</td>
<td>Previously taught at school with &quot;Quaker roots&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Spanish, grammar/voc., journalism</td>
<td>Sister taught at Chapman Friends parent school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Current events</td>
<td>Vice President of Marketing for an educational organization. Volunteered to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td>Office manager and registrar. Son attended Chapman Friends parent school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

specific course objectives. When I asked one teacher how she created her course outline, she
stated, “I asked myself what I thought was important for a beginning literature student to know” (Interview, June 15, 1998). Two teachers remarked that the particular book they had asked their students to read was one they had also read in high school. A few teachers mentioned receiving some advice on materials from Fran and other teachers at the parent school. While they acknowledged the positive side of this academic freedom and autonomy, some commented on its challenge. As one teacher remarked, “I was not prepared, necessarily, for it to be, like, ‘Figure it out. Sink or swim. Dive in!’ kind of thing” (Interview, June 15, 1998). When I asked John to respond to this, he said:

It's certainly true that the first year of teaching at Chapman is incredibly difficult. I don't think that's a bad thing at all. Like an oyster grows a pearl, we grow in response to irritation and pain. . . . It is trial by fire. I don't want to inflict pain on anybody; but you cannot understand a mystical approach to the truth without being given the freedom to explore all possibilities. Because in the mind of God all possibilities exist and if we close off possibilities by listing things that you ought to be doing, that makes it easier, but it deprives the individual teacher of this opportunity for tremendous spiritual growth. (Interview, June 23, 1998)

One teacher felt that the reason for such teacher autonomy was because the students were hard to teach and “To dictate on high to a teacher for kids before you've met them or know how they are, would be very, very difficult. That's so antithetical to the Quaker way” (Interview, May 27, 1998). Such a philosophy on learning parallels Greenleaf’s (1977) belief in “dependable certainty.” According to Greenleaf:

One must have learned how to open one's awareness to receive insight, inspiration, in the moment of need. One must accept that only by venturing into uncertainty with faith that if one is adequately prepared to deal with the ambiguity, in the situation, the answer to the questions will come. The certainty one needs to face the demanding situations of life does not lie in having answers neatly catalogued in advance of the experience. Dependable certainty . . . lies in confidence that one's preparation is adequate so that one may venture into the experience without pre-set answers but with assurance that creative insight will emerge in the situation when needed, and that it will be right for the situation because it is
Thus, it follows, as noted by a teacher, that one needs to “have a strong inner core” (Interview, May 13, 1998) to teach well at Chapman Friends School, in addition to energy, patience, flexibility, openness, and tolerance for ambiguity, some of the qualities most frequently mentioned during my interviews with teachers. One teacher described the necessary qualities for teachers at Chapman Friends School accordingly:

Their patience has to be balanced with a certain amount of boundary setting. You want someone who can leave the books, who is not going to be dogmatic, who doesn’t need dogmatism. A teacher who’s willing to reveal parts of his/her personality so the students can kind of see there’s a three-dimensional human being. (Interview, May 18, 1998)

Connecting her teaching mission well to Quaker values, a teacher stated that teaching at Chapman Friends School involved “seeing the Inner Light in all students and bringing it out” (Interview, June 1, 1998).

**Concluding Characteristics**

Overall, five characteristics emerged in my study of the curriculum and instruction at Chapman Friends School this first year: (a) student focused and driven, (b) teacher autonomy and freedom, (c) discussion-based lessons, (d) thought processes over content mastery, and (e) lack of academic rigor. These characteristics speak to some of the core principles – values and beliefs – of Chapman Friends School. Focusing on the individual and emphasizing independent thinking acknowledges the belief that there is that of God in everyone. The limited course offerings and lack of academic rigor allude to an emphasis on the emotional and psychological needs of students. These needs of the students were as significant as, and at times took precedence over, the particular subject being taught. While this would be in keeping with the school’s goal to develop a positive self-perception within each student, the emotional needs of some of the students proved overwhelming at times and negatively affected the learning environment. The expression, “You came on a good day!” was made on more than one occasion as I moved in and out of classrooms. From what I observed, the “good days” were those in which students were thoughtfully and actively participating, respectful of their peers and teachers, and responsible in completing their assignments. They were “getting it,” as teachers stated.
The balance between students taking responsibility for their own learning and the teachers' role in challenging students was a seemingly difficult one to achieve for the teachers. While the majority of teachers did express a desire to “ratchet it [academics] up a bit,” they were also confronted with some students who simply did not want to put forth much, if any, effort. Individual teaching styles and varying degrees of experience also affected the overall instructional program. As one teacher remarked, “I think it's been hard for many reasons. It's my first year of teaching, period. . . . and I've never taught before” (Interview, June 15, 1998). A majority of the teachers informed me that they “would do things differently” the following year based on their experience this year. One student described the situation accordingly:

I think all those teachers . . . know their drawing line. There's a point to where you can teach a student and then you can't. That student can't learn anymore. That student is fed up, frustrated, not understanding, and won't do it because they're stubborn. But they [teachers] try extremely hard not to get them to that point. (Interview, August 4, 1998)

When I asked teachers to describe for me a “Chapman moment” – that which embodied the essence of Chapman Friends School at its best – a number of the teachers related a classroom story in which their students were either in charge of their own learning or making the connection between the subject matter and real life. As one teacher described, a Chapman moment is:

When all of a sudden, you're in a class and the kid goes, “Oh, yeah! I get it!” and they want to run up to the board and show you and you let them, and you say, “Yeah! Show us!” You sit down and . . . let the student become the teacher. . . . That's the kind of thing you want to see happen here. (Interview, May 13, 1998)

Simply stated by another teacher, “It's those moments . . . where somebody is touched and is learning” (Interview, May 19, 1998).

One teacher summed up her year at Chapman Friends School in eloquent poignancy:

This is hard. Everyday is a challenge. It's a very powerful experience. It goes to the heart. Sometimes it punctures the heart. Sometimes it holds the heart. But it is definitely a heartfelt experience, like no other school I've ever been in. (Interview, May 27, 1998)
Summary

Through religion, the Seven Commitments, and the curriculum, Chapman Friends School expressed its core principles – beliefs and values – which undergirded and influenced the practices and behavior of the administration, faculty, staff, students, and their parents. Most profound was the Quaker belief that there is that of God in everyone. This belief evidenced itself in the school's emphasis on respecting each person's individuality and avoiding controlling students. The weekly ritual of Meeting for Worship testified to this belief and the importance of setting aside time to listen to the voice of God within.

The Seven Commitments spoke to the paramount value of personal integrity and emphasized taking responsibility for one's actions. This minimalist approach in the area of rules and regulations further underscored the belief that controlling blocks God's will. Subsequent consequences imposed on students for not complying with the commitments reinforced the value of personal accountability. Finally, in the area of curriculum and instruction, creative freedom and autonomy were highly valued as demonstrated in the latitude afforded teachers and the focus on the individual student. Helping students to feel good about themselves and develop inner confidence took precedence over developing a strong academic program and spoke to the preeminent value of personal authenticity.

Leadership and the Creation of Culture at Chapman Friends School

In looking at Chapman Friends School and the role of leadership in the creation of culture, one must be careful not to simplify the lines of authority and influence through such definitive titles as headmaster, principal, teacher, student, and parent. Undergirding the philosophy of leadership is the Quaker belief that there is “that of God” in each person, as well as a long tradition of arriving at decisions through “a sense of the Meeting.” When I asked Joan Anderson, the principal, “How is authority delegated here?” she responded, “That's a dangerous question! I think that every staff member has a certain amount of authority and power.” A teacher responded similarly, commenting, “We have a say in everything, and that is incredibly freeing to us.” While data did confirm this view of shared and collaborative decision making, what became evident over the course of the year were the unique roles played by the headmaster, the principal, and Katie, one of
the teachers.

In reviewing taped interviews, recorded observations, and cultural artifacts, three significant themes emerged (see Appendix D): (a) John Smith was the spiritual and moral leader, (b) Joan Anderson was a resilient principal, and (c) other emergent leaders existed, Katie Kipple being the most prominent. In comments and observations, John and Joan were identified as leaders, albeit each with a different mission. Clearly, John exhibited the role of “symbolic leader” during this first year. “Spiritual and moral leader,” “old master,” and “very wise man” were terms used to describe John and his influence on the school community. On the other hand, “Where the buck stops” and “she supports us” were terms applied to Joan's leadership style which centered on student discipline, teacher empowerment, and the daily tasks of a school principal.

**Headmaster and Founder – John Smith**

Following is a portrayal of John Smith, headmaster and founder of Chapman Friends School, and his unique role in the creation of culture. As the headmaster of both Chapman Friends School and its parent school in a neighboring state, John spent his time between the two schools. In general, he was at Chapman Friends School two to three times a week until Joan's leave of absence required his full-time attention and presence in the school.

**Background**

John Smith, the headmaster of Chapman Friends School, is an unpretentious, personable, deeply philosophical man in his mid-60s. Of medium, slim build, he is casual in appearance and has a welcoming smile and gentle voice. John is married to Fran, an English and literature teacher at the parent Chapman Friends School. They have four grown children and grandchildren.

In the early 50s, John attended Swarthmore College but “wasn't ready for it” and, thus, entered the Air Force as an aviation cadet. He graduated first in his class in 1955 as a 2nd Lieutenant. John flew 33 missions across the Atlantic, visiting 18 countries. He was also a Camp Commander at the Base Defense Training Camp in Dover, Delaware, and lead navigator during the Suez crisis of 1956.

John returned to Swarthmore in 1958. He later graduated from Valparaiso University in 1961 with a B.A. in Government and a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship. He did graduate work at the
American University in Washington, DC, the University of Tennessee Colleges of Law and Education, and the University of Maryland in curriculum studies. John has had a varied career path. As a Foreign Service Officer, he served three years in Taiwan and Hong Kong, held administrative posts at St. John's College, Miles College, and the University of Hawaii, and was press assistant to the acting governor of Hawaii. John was also, briefly, President and CEO of a company in Tennessee. After four years as dean at a Quaker school, John joined Chapman Friends School in 1984 and became the headmaster in 1985.

In 1964, John and his wife joined the Society of Friends, having found “a spiritual home” among them. An avid soccer player and coach, John co-founded a Small Schools League where he met Joan. John is a self-proclaimed, recovering alcoholic whose unrelenting search for authenticity and truth has not only shaped his own passionate views about learning, education, and life, but has also attracted the interest and dedication of others.

**Spiritual and Moral Leader**

While Joan and John's titles clearly differentiated their leadership roles, the circumstances of the first school year sometimes blurred such distinctions. Whereas Joan was responsible for managing the daily operations of the school and responding to the concerns and problems brought to her attention by the faculty, students, and parents, John, too, was intimately involved in the school's activities. John taught courses in “Modern Thought” and “Dreams,” attended faculty meetings, participated in school events, handled some discipline problems, and facilitated the “Trust” workshops for parents. John also addressed issues related to the ongoing relationship with the temple administration, neighbors in the surrounding vicinity, and the larger community. In representing Chapman Friends School before the city council planning commission regarding the school’s special use permit, John clearly portrayed himself as the school’s leader.

In their significant work, *Leadership and Organizational Culture: New Perspectives on Administrative Theory and Practice*, Sergiovanni and Corbally (1984) asserted, “The business of being a leader is therefore the business of being an entrepreneur for values” (p. 120). Such a definition of leadership aptly describes John. During an early conversation with John to discuss the possibility of this case study, John exclaimed, “We're an open book!” In that immediate and generous response, a deeper value and larger truth was being expressed. John’s beliefs about
education are intrinsically tied to his own life experiences and are rooted in Jungian psychology, Quaker philosophy, and his tenure at St. John's College with its “Great Books” approach. At the heart of John's leadership is a strong and palpable desire for authenticity, “being the same on the outside as on the inside,” as he defined it. At the first Trust workshop for parents, John disclosed that he once had a problem with alcohol and went on to assert that “failures” are “opportunities for growth.” This belief was evidenced in John's advice to parents that they “should not stand between their children and the reasonable consequences of their behavior.” John explicitly modeled the values he sought to imbue in the culture of Chapman Friends School, honesty and authenticity being foremost. According to one teacher, “John is the 'be all' and 'end all' of Quakerism. He is the silence that we are trying to achieve” (Interview, May 27, 1998).

Similar to Senge's (1990) finding that outstanding leaders possess a “purpose story,” John connected the school’s mission to a broader cause beyond that of a high school education with a community service requirement:

Of course, community service is a very important part of our program. But more important is the notion that in working toward the spiritual growth of others that one is able to grow spiritually oneself. Living a deeply spiritual life, without it being a life of service is an oxymoron. It's more than that. It's a deep commitment to the ongoing creation of a healthy world. I see us as a pocket of health spreading out into the world. Thus, our paramount goal is to restore these students to a trusting relationship with themselves, with their parents, with the institutions of their culture, and to restore their hope that there is a positive future possible out there for themselves and for the world. (Interview, June 23, 1998)

Such thoughts were not limited to my interviews with John. John's letters to parents, his remarks in Chapman News (a monthly newsletter sent to students, parents, and alumni), his comments following the weekly Meeting for Worship with students, his remarks to parents at the Trust workshops, and his public statements before the city council spoke to the work of a cultural leader. As Schein (1992) noted, “In a growing organization leaders externalize their own assumptions and embed them gradually and consistently in the mission, goals, structures, and working procedures of the group” (p. 375). Thus, in the April 1997 edition of Chapman News,
John stated, “Chapman students learn how to be authentic people, how to be true to themselves, how to trust in themselves and their visions for a better world. There is nothing more powerful we can do now for the future of the world” (p. 12). In a letter sent to parents, John noted:

Students change at Chapman . . . . The best we can do as parents and teachers is to support that change, to support the growing of each student's Inward Guide (or Inner Light) which will guide her/him to a life full of commitment, challenge, and productivity.

Most telling is the following comment made by a parent at one of the workshops, “You may get tired of hearing John say, ‘What we do at Chapman Friends School is help students to think and to realize they are part of a bigger community,’ but that is one of the themes we come back to.” John distinguished himself as a cultural and spiritual leader, and this view of him was recognized by the teachers, students, and parents. As explained by one parent, “John [is] the spiritual and moral leader of the community.”

In examining the role of the leader in hiring people with like-minded views, parallels can be drawn between John's approach and Deal and Peterson's (1990) finding that private school administrators “have more control over the recruitment, selection, and firing of staff, which helps increase the congruence of teachers' and leaders' values and beliefs” (p. 82). At one of the Trust workshops, John stated, “There are a lot of things I am not good at; but hiring, I am good at that!”

While both John and Joan selected the faculty and staff, John's role appeared more involved. When asked about the hiring process and selecting faculty and staff, John commented, “We just look at everybody we can think of that might bring us special gifts. We look at resumes.” (Interview, December 18, 1997)

The interview guide (see Appendix E), one page in length and developed by John, clearly reflects his values and philosophy. The frank and direct questions relate more to the applicant's inner, spiritual life than to professional experience and credentials. According to John, questions about the applicant's parents, significant friends, favorite TV shows, and personal aspirations are the means by which he appraises the candidate's values and comes to know him or her more authentically. When I asked John to explain the reason for interview questions about the applicant’s parents, he responded, “Because we're a community; and it's like inviting somebody into your family. We need to know what kind of family relationships they've had before”
Similar to Pettigrew's (1979) finding that "the entrepreneur may initially be able to recruit on the basis of prior acquaintance and homogeneity of background" (p. 579), John had previously known some of the faculty members he later chose to teach at Chapman Friends School. John selected Joan "after watching her operate for ten years . . . I just admired her, the way she loves kids in a tough, demanding, and, in someways, an uncompromising way." In choosing faculty members, John shared how he met two of the part-time teachers at local Quaker Meetings where he had spoken about the school's opening. Both teachers approached John after his presentation and inquired about the possibility of teaching at Chapman Friends School. In seeking homogeneity, at least to the extent that the teachers were "truth-seekers and authentic," John stated, "We think about our graduates. One of our graduates is now teaching here. I just casually mentioned to him during his senior year that if he ever wanted to teach here, he should let me know" (Interview, December 18, 1997). John summarized his thoughts on the hiring and interviewing process by remarking,

They're a great staff, and they've come from various . . . synchronicities; we might call them "serendipities." I believe people find each other when they need to. And we [faculty and staff] found each other. The interview I give to people probes into their psychological state as much as to their credentials. What I am looking for is healthy people with a good, active, spiritual, questing mind. (Interview, December 18, 1997)

As defined by Sergiovanni (1990), John embraced the "'high priest' function of being a leader. . . : defining, strengthening, and articulating enduring values, beliefs, and cultural strands that give the school its identity" (p. 87). John also led the parent Trust workshops, which were held in a large meeting room in the temple. At these meetings, John shared his philosophy on parenting, education, homework, relationships, and life in general, quoting from The Prophet by Kahlil Gibran, the Tao de Cheng, Siddartha, and Ralph Waldo Emerson.

During the city council hearing on Chapman Friends School's special use permit, John spoke to the school's core values and philosophy and affirmed, "We believe in speaking truth to power," and "Self-esteem is the bedrock" of a Chapman Friends School education. John noted the attributes – "honesty, compassion, service, and scholarship" – of a Chapman Friends School
education and emphasized how they were “rescuing bright students who have not been thriving” in the public schools. At the Trust workshops, in interviews, during announcements, and in news articles and school marketing literature, John continually and clearly articulated the school’s mission and goals regarding the education of its students. As noted in a local newspaper:

To love, give and receive love, think clearly, express yourself convincingly, listen attentively, read penetratingly, write compellingly. . . . and teach our students that they can do anything they set their mind to as long as it is a realistic goal and to challenge the world to meet their expectations. (Ciafone, 1997, p. 26)

John’s practice of publicly explicating and promoting the school’s vision – rooted in his own deep beliefs – easily distinguished him as the school’s leader and an effective cultural leader. While it appeared as if John engaged in this culture-building behavior without much forethought, I observed John during an announcement period with the students specifically direct them to “Please listen attentively” – a core Quaker value. Deal and Peterson (1990) noted that cultural leaders “model the values and actions they want for their organizations” (p. 69).

From inviting a disgruntled neighbor to visit the school and speak with the students, to welcoming opposing views and publicly revealing his own weaknesses, John modeled the behaviors he sought to develop and nurture in the Chapman Friends School community. According to Senge (1990), John possesses the characteristics of an outstanding leader:

What distinguishes them is the clarity and persuasiveness of their ideas, the depth of their commitment, and their openness to continually learning more. . . . The ability of such people to be natural leaders . . . is the by-product of a lifetime effort – effort to develop conceptual and communication skills, to reflect on personal values and to align personal behaviors with values, to learn how to listen and to appreciate others and others’ ideas. (p. 359)

In my last interview with John, I asked how he was preparing and training Kevin, the school’s future headmaster, prior to his retirement. John mentioned that he and Kevin took walks together on a regular basis. More often than not, their discussions were about a particular school concern. John then expressed his own views on leadership:

But you know, leadership has to do with learning how to be calm in a crisis. Pretty much,
that's it. If you can keep your head in any situation, under any kind of pressure, then you're ready for leadership. That's what I've tried to model to the three principals. And to the extent that they have learned it, they've learned some of it from me. The rest is just experience. The more crises you have, the more comfortable you are with crisis. The more different kinds of individuals you've dealt with, the less you're surprised. There's not a book on leadership. Well, yes there is! It's called the Tao de Ching. Which I do refer my staff to. But it's Taoist leadership, it's a new way. It's doing without doing. And it's not the kind of thing you learn from a book. It's very subtle. (Interview, June 23, 1998)

Summary

In seeking to summarize John's charismatic leadership style, Sergiovanni's (1987) words are poignant, "Leadership cannot exist separate from what people find significant and meaningful" (p. 116). One of the parents shared a story about a meeting with John that aptly describes his capacity to relate to others in profound ways:

We spent three or four minutes giving him [John] the highlights of our situation. . . . Then we thought, “Well, where do you want to go now with the conversation?” And his words were, “Tell me about Colin's journey.” That led us into really talking about the heart and soul of what the school was all about. That's where we learned . . . that he is in recovery and the respect he has for that whole process. And that was contrasted with an encounter I had . . . with a different school where I sat for almost an hour and a half and the woman never even asked me about my son. What John communicated to us right away was this whole notion of “We want to understand where the kids are, and we want to work with that to try and get them where they ought to be.” At another point in the conversation, he articulated the five goals. . . . It was a very succinct vision of the graduate of Chapman in terms of their intellectual and emotional abilities. (Interview, July 15, 1998)

That a teacher commented, “John's presence is felt even when he's not here,” speaks to John's ability to connect, at an intimate level, with others in the school community. This connection, however, was not simply an emotional one. John's own underlying assumptions about human nature and human relationships resonated deeply with those individuals he sought to lead. In a sense, he spoke their soul's desires. As Greenleaf (1977) described, “The leader always knows
what it [goal] is and can articulate it for any who are unsure. By clearly stating and restating the
goal, the leader gives certainty and purpose to others who may have difficulty in achieving it for
themselves" (p. 15).

**Principal – Joan Anderson**

Following is a portrayal of Joan Anderson, the principal of Chapman Friends School, and
her substantive role in the creation of culture. Moreover, Joan's significant role in creating a
“moral community” (Sergiovanni, 1996, p. 45) is clearly outlined. As the founding principal, Joan
had tremendous influence on the establishment of procedures, policies, practices, and daily
activities which would eventually become part of the foundational cornerstone in the creation of
culture at Chapman Friends School.

**Background**

Joan is a friendly, unassuming, African-American woman nearing 50. Short and of medium
build, Joan has a calm presence, a steady reserve, and is not easily unnerved. While she has a
serious side, Joan also has a sense of humor and can easily laugh at herself. In describing herself,
Joan remarked, “My past has been to try to be relatively mellow. Which drives some people crazy.
But, that’s the way I am” (Interview, March 16, 1998). Joan is single and does not have any
children, although she did mention her close relationship with a nephew during one of the faculty
meetings. Since graduating from Clark University with a degree in mathematics in 1970, she has
committed herself to the education of youth. According to Joan, she pursued a degree in
mathematics because, “Whenever I said to someone in college I was a math major, they would just
freak out, and I decided there must be a way to teach people math so they don’t have that reaction
all the time” (Interview, March 16, 1998).

After graduating from college, Joan spent one year teaching in the public school system
before joining the faculty of a small private school associated with the Episcopal Church. In
addition to her teaching responsibilities at that school, she was also the athletic director. Through
her co-founding and involvement with the Metropolitan Small Schools League, she met and
became friends with John. In 1995, as she began to experience some “dissatisfaction” with her job,
Joan visited the parent Chapman Friends School. In describing her visit, she remarked:
I went to visit Chapman. I think John knew that I was a little restless, so my visit was a visit and an interview. Chapman was changing some of its personnel and John was going to become headmaster. They needed a new dean, and John felt that I would be a good choice. At the time, he also said that in perhaps two-to-five years, there was a possibility I would be heading up another campus. (Interview, March 16, 1998)

Although she had to take a salary cut, Joan accepted the position of dean of students at the parent school because she “just found that a lot of the Quaker values were my values.” Then, in the fall of 1997, Joan became the principal of the new Chapman Friends School. In addition, she also taught geometry and coached the soccer team. Joan is not a Quaker.

**Resilient Principal**

Joan's calm manner, casual dress, low voice, and easy rapport with the students created a relaxed, easy-going atmosphere at Chapman Friends School. One teacher described Joan as a leader with influence, who did not “overpower” them but “supported” them. Teachers also identified Joan as the “disciplinarian,” the one to give students the “yea” or “nay” and who “sets the tone.” One teacher commented on Joan's influence, particularly in the area of discipline:

> She does it without really disciplining very many people very much. . . . She has this rapport with students, where I've heard several students talk about “Joan's 'death look.'” That's what they call it. She has this look that's enough to make you kind of stop doing whatever it is that you were doing. So in that way, I think that Joan has an awful lot of good points. (Interview, May 19, 1998)

At the same time, one student remarked:

> Joan says things like, “You will have fun.” Students just don't like hearing that. I personally love Joan. I think Joan is funny. . . . Joan is more verbal about it [when she gets mad]. The students really don't like that. I'm actually worried about that next year because students were just like blatantly disrespecting her and not caring what Joan thought. (Interview, July 11, 1998)

On one level, Joan could be viewed as the “senior manager” sent “from the home country” to reinforce the culture's values and assumptions (Schein, 1992, p. 259). When I asked Joan why she was selected to be the founding principal of Chapman Friends School, she stated:
I think that I am firm but fair. I will enforce policies which can be hard to do for some people and that I don't mind doing. It is not that I enjoy it, necessarily, but I will do it. At the same time, I try to be fair. I tend to be honest, especially in dealing with the students. I'm reasonably calm. When the world is falling down around me, I try not to fall down with it. I think that I've always been that way in various situations. I don't know if people view it as not caring. It's just that I'm more likely to assess what is going on and then act, as opposed to flying around like a crazy woman first. Although I have this booming voice, that I use on occasion, I can also be quite calm. I do a lot of listening. Do a lot of listening. I don't necessarily say much, but, when I have something to say, it is usually relevant and important. And I listen. I learn a lot by listening. (Interview, March 16, 1998)

“True listening builds strength in other people" and effective leaders listen well according to Greenleaf (1977, p. 17). A teacher alluded to this strength, remarking, “The faculty truly feels as if we have as much say in things almost as [much as] she [Joan] does." Whether it was at a weekly faculty meeting, a parent Trust workshop, or during the end-of-the-year contract- renewal discussion, I frequently observed Joan simply listening. During one discussion on the final selection of a candidate for a teaching position, I noticed Joan listening, saying very little; one of the teachers declared, “I'd like to know what Joan thinks.”

A teacher, explaining her decision to leave the parent school to teach at the new Chapman Friends School, commented:

I actually came. . . . basically to keep working with Joan and really felt like she was a huge mentor to me. . . . I just really felt like she had a magnetism with the kids. She had this ability to both show them love and to be a great disciplinarian. . . . I wanted to keep working with her, keep learning from her. (Interview, May 13, 1998)

Herein lies what Senge (1990) described as “personal mastery – the spirit of the learning organization” (p. 139). Essential to a learning organization is the learning of the individuals within that organization and the degree of personal mastery they achieve. Leaders in such organizations model personal mastery by “approaching one's life as a creative work” (p. 141). According to Senge, this involved being able to recognize what is truly significant and to separate reality from
our illusions of it. Joan had the ability to do this and, thus, attracted others to join her in the process. Likewise, Owens (1987) claimed that the "leader must . . . signal to others what is important and what is valued. . . . She seeks out opportunities to preside at ceremonies and rituals symbolizing and supporting the goals and values she intends to emphasize" (p. 28). While not in highly ritualized or very formal ways, Joan did "preside at rituals" which reinforced the school's values. One story, in particular, exemplifies this well. It was nearing the end of the year, and Joan, in the tradition of the parent school, was planning a field trip. Some of the students were vocal in their objection to the trip and questioned if it was a mandatory activity. Joan shared this concern with me during one of our weekly phone conversations. She stated:

I've heard grumbling from the students who don't want to do this. The teachers want to do this. The question now is, "Do we want to do this, and do we want to deal with the kids who have a problem with this?" I have waffled on this. There are some nay-sayers.

(Researcher's log, May 5, 1998)

Joan went on to say that she called the principal of the parent school to seek his advice. When a student, who was writing an article for the school newspaper, questioned her about the field trip, Joan responded, "It's not just to build community. Learning doesn't just take place in the classroom." Joan mentioned that while she had been going back and forth about this, she felt that they were just going to do it. At the faculty meeting the following day, a teacher reported Joan saying, "You know, we should do this. This is a thing we should do. There might be a few students who won't like it, but I think, all in all, we should do it. And it's important. So we're going to go ahead" (Interview, June 1, 1998).

To build strong organizational cultures in schools, leaders spend time articulating the purpose and the mission of the school. They socialize others to these values. They define and redefine the uniqueness of the school. . . . They reward those who accept and reflect the desired norms and values of the school. (Owens, 1987, p. 25)

Joan exemplified this trait of leadership in an emphatic and explicit way during the very last Meeting for Worship in June:

The students were pretty noisy and did not completely settle down. Joan spoke up and said, "You know, I hoped that this would be one of the best Meetings for Worship of the
year." It then quieted down. Throughout the Meeting, however, there were noises, and four students left. This was not typical of my experience at previous Meetings. As the Meeting ended and people began to shake hands, a teacher exclaimed, “This was the worst Meeting!” People began talking, and one of the students noticed that Joan remained seated and silent. The student told her peers to quiet down. Then, Joan said, “I am disappointed. I had hoped it would have gone better. I appreciate those students who did not get ridiculous during the Meeting for Worship. The Meeting for Worship is part of the Quaker religion and part of what we do here at Chapman Friends School. While I can appreciate that every now and then some people might have some problems, if you cannot control yourself, then Chapman Friends School isn't the place for you because this is what we are about. We created this school as an alternative school for you. But it takes cooperation on everyone's part. What makes me or the teachers happy at the end of the day is that we are all cooperating.” I was impressed with Joan's calmness throughout this entire disruption. (Researcher's log, June 15, 1998)

**Summary**

Clearly, Joan had a formidable influence, and during her absence things got “really hectic” and “really ugly,” as one teacher put it. While Joan's influence appeared most evident in the area of student discipline and behavior, it is important to recognize that her impact was broader than that. During announcement time following a Meeting for Worship, Joan read a letter written by the principal of the Hebrew School to the city planning commission commending the behavior of the students at Chapman Friends School. This was not the first time that Joan had praised the students. During a faculty meeting at the beginning of the year Joan informed the teachers that she had complimented the students during morning announcements, remarking, “They need to hear what they are doing right just as much as they need to hear what they are doing wrong” (Researcher's log, September 17, 1997). Such practices clearly distinguished Joan – not just as a principal, disciplinarian, or mentor of teachers – but as a leader caught up in transforming “the school into a moral community” (Sergiovanni, 1996, p. 45).
Other Emergent Leaders

In his description of leadership in Quaker schools, Barth (1988) stated, “Members work together as equals, sharing ideas, planning, giving feedback, and supporting each other in new efforts. Leaders emerge in various ways at various times and then give way to other leaders” (p. 144). While some interview respondents identified a teacher or a student as having the most influence at a particular time, Katie Kipple, a teacher, was mentioned frequently, and my own observations support the finding that she had considerable influence on the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School. She easily distinguished herself as an emergent leader and was, according to two teachers, a “model” among her colleagues. Katie provided insight and a cultural perspective based on her past Chapman Friends School experience.

Katie Kipple

**Background.** Katie is an outgoing woman in her late twenties with a warm and welcoming spirit. Tall, with brunette hair and a pleasant smile, she was popular among the students. Katie completed her undergraduate work at Mount Holyoke College and earned her Master's Degree in Biology from the University of North Carolina. Katie taught science at the parent school for three years and, due to her admiration for and camaraderie with Joan, decided to join her in opening up the new Chapman Friends School. While not a Quaker, she embodies those characteristics which are attributed to them, as enthusiastically conveyed by one student, “Everyone loves Katie! She was the best teacher I ever had! She taught well. You could tell her about anything. She gave good advice. She was clearly herself ” (Interview, July 11, 1998).

**Influence.** From the start, I observed Katie as a leader among the faculty. Primarily, this was due to the “institutional history” she possessed and so eagerly shared during the weekly faculty meetings. At the beginning of the year when Joan mentioned the possibility of procuring a grant from a local Quaker Meeting, it was Katie who described the process, having written a grant proposal the prior year. When a teacher expressed concern about not having enough tables in her classroom, Katie recommended asking the Temple administration if they could borrow a few. When a question regarding how to complete financial reimbursement forms arose, Katie volunteered to explain the process to the teachers. Because none of the teachers had any
experience with student academic reporting forms, Katie explained the entire process, emphasizing
the importance of distributing them during study period and calling the parents of any students who
were flunking a class. At a later point she also informed the teachers that their written comments
on the students’ reporting forms should relate to the commitments. In response to this, a few
teachers asked Katie if they could review her comments. During a discussion of students arriving
late for class, Katie shared a similar story from the parent school and how they resolved the
problem by ringing a second bell. Katie also explicitly reinforced the values of Chapman Friends
School, and during one of the weekly Meetings for Worship remarked, “Please be respectful of
students who want to participate in Meeting for Worship” (Researcher’s log, January 8, 1998).

In creating a learning organization, Senge (1990) identified “mental models” as a key
component and stated, “Mental models’ are deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even
pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (p. 8).
Katie’s mental models about what it meant to be a Quaker and what a Quaker education should
look like appeared to be keen, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

As I sat in the main office and chatted with the teachers during the lunch break, Katie
shared what happened during her interviews at two Quaker schools. At one point she said
that she felt “so good” about one school. In talking about the gentleman who interviewed
her, she stated, “We really connected right away. He was so Quaker!” I asked her what
she meant by that. Without hesitation or pause she said, “He was so peaceful. He was so
settled within himself.” She went on to say that in the other school she visited, the students
“seemed bored and it looked like a lot of rote learning was going on.” She added that she
would not want to be in such a school. (Researcher’s log, April 24, 1998)

**Summary.** Katie's mental models served to foster the vision and shape the creation of
culture at Chapman Friends School. Katie was a “cultural priest” – a “guardian of the culture's
values” (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 82). Because of her previous experience with the parent
school, Katie had a strong sense of the kind of community John and Joan were seeking to create,
and she was able to provide not only insight, but practical solutions that “worked well enough to
be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive,
think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 1992, p. 12).
Membership and the Creation of Culture at Chapman Friends School

“One of the most subtle yet most potent ways through which cultural assumptions get embedded and perpetuated is the process of selecting new members” (Schein, 1992, p. 243). Two significant practices – traditions, one might say – which profoundly impacted the selection of Chapman Friends School students were (a) the initial interview process with John and Joan prior to the beginning of school, and (b) the contract renewal process involving the faculty and staff at the end of the year. Most parents learned about Chapman Friends School through word of mouth – friends and acquaintances who had children at the parent school – and through published private school listings. One parent learned about it through her family counselor, and another mentioned that John had come to her Quaker meeting to make a presentation. Articles about the opening of Chapman Friends School also appeared in local newspapers in the spring of 1997, and readers were directed to call the school directly for more information.

Reasons why parents and students selected Chapman Friends School fell into three categories: (a) discontent with public or private school; (b) student not performing well, if at all, at public or private school; and (c) desire for small, alternative educational setting. One parent stated that she wanted a school “where my child would be accepted for what he is, nothing less, nothing more” (Interview, July 21, 1998), while two parents specifically noted that they “were desperate” looking for a place for their sons. Reflecting well the kind of student Chapman Friends School sought, a student explained:

Right before I came to Chapman, I was attending a [public] school. It was okay academically, but I was shocked by the huge classes. . . . I found the classes boring. Questions didn't get answered. It was basically all lecturing. I just found that very, very boring. I didn't like the bell system. It was like being herded around like sheep. I was just really unhappy. (Interview, July 11, 1998)

The Students

While some of the students at Chapman Friends had spiked or colored hair, pierced body parts, wore “gothic” style accessories, and, at times, dressed “totally different and as wacky as
possible," as noted by one student, many of the students looked like typical public high school students. According to registration materials, students were not to wear clothes which “advertise drugs, sex, or violence.” My own interactions with the students were quite positive, and I found them to be open, friendly, and polite. Although I was frequently in professional dress, the students appeared not to care and easily came to accept the fact that I would be around and about. “Yeah, Joan told us about you and that we should make you feel welcome,” a student remarked. As a general rule, they did not initiate discussion with me, but were willing to respond to my inquiries. On one occasion when I was in my car driving to the school, I happened to get behind the school van. One of the students in the van recognized me and began waving. During my observation of the yearbook class, a female student offered me a stack of pages to view, and a male student asked if I would examine some photos and recommend the best ones. When the under-staffed soft ball team needed an extra player one afternoon, the students seemed pleased to have me join them.

Similar to the teacher’s experience, however, I was not able to entice the students to commit to an hour-long interview with me. Of the eight students I interviewed, only three agreed up front after my initial request. I contacted the others by phone. Of the eight students interviewed, six were planning to return to Chapman Friends School, one chose to leave to enter college early, and one was not invited back.

John's views of the students revealed his intimate knowledge and experience with them. During an early interview he conveyed:

Many of the students we get operate out of an intuitive intelligence rather than a logical and linear intelligence; and they have been put down and abused for this for many years. Their parents are caught up in our national mania about numbers and about measuring things. And “If we can't measure it, it doesn't exist!” which is one of the great lies that science has foisted upon our culture. Everything that is important cannot be measured. Trust is one of those things. . . . Many, many students are jaded when they come to us. They look discouraged. They tend to look on the dark side of things. They come in saying, “This sucks and that sucks and the other thing sucks. Why is it worth the effort anyway?” So they stop striving and learn that if you don't care about anything, nobody can control you. (Interview, December 18, 1997)
The office manager stated that the students at Chapman were challenging and a number of them had mild learning disabilities and Attention Deficit Disorder. She added:

The kids, as a group, are different from the average kid. They think differently; they're more creative. Most of them are “right brained.” [We] administer the Myers-Briggs Test to all these kids when they come in. . . . They're definitely different. And that's one of the things that brings them to Chapman because they have always felt different from the other kids. Here, that is a very positive thing to them, and they feel that they belong here because they're all like that. These are really the kids who can become the prime social movers of society when they grow up if it's handled in a positive way. (Interview, June 2, 1998)

In describing the students at Chapman, one student remarked:

Some of the students who were accepted into Chapman went there because they have problems, but they didn't want to fix them at all. They were there because their parents said, “Well, maybe this will make them get better.” That's not the case at all. The students who need to go to Chapman are students who want to end up somewhere because they have taken that responsibility on themselves. They want to become what they should be. They want to do what they want to do. . . . You have to enter the school wanting to change and needing help. (Interview, August 4, 1998)

Students who were accepted for admission to Chapman Friends School were initially interviewed by John and Joan separately. Parents also met with John or Joan prior to their children being accepted. In addition to the interview process, many of the students and some of the parents visited the parent school prior to making a final decision. Both the students and parents commented about their interview with John and the personal, intimate nature of it. According to one student, it was “one of the weirdest” interviews: John asked him about his parents, his dreams, whether he had any experience with drugs, and if he smoked. The student summarized his views about the interview by stating, “John wanted to get a sense of who I was. Not who I was at school” (Interview, September 4, 1998). Other students mentioned how John asked them about what they liked to do, how they learned, and how they got along with others. One parent retold the story of her son’s interview with John and how he reported that he had spoken very candidly
and honestly and “they took him anyway” (Interview, September 4, 1998). As claimed by one student, “A lot of what happened in your past doesn't matter. It's a good place to start over again” (Interview, July 30, 1998).

When I asked John about the interview process, he responded, “The interview process . . . is very, very important. I tell the kids about myself. I am not sure why, but they tell me anything. They walk in here. They sit down. Don't ask me how that works” (Interview, November 3, 1997). Parents also mentioned the personal nature of the interviews and how John was mostly interested in what their child thought. A parent described her interview with John as “such an honest experience” and noted:

My husband was really pushing to put [our son] in a rehab with the county. John told my husband, “Stay away from the county agency. That's not what . . . a creative mind needs. That suppresses it.” And that's exactly the way I felt. (Interview, July 28, 1998)

John's intimate approach demonstrated his desire to build a trusting community. According to Ouchi (1981), to create such a community, one must “evidence complete openness and candor in a relationship” (p. 100). John's practice of telling the students and their parents about himself relates to Ouchi's finding that “one who seeks to conceal nothing from me is one who, in all likelihood, does not seek to harm” (p. 100). In such an atmosphere, trust develops. In reflecting on the interview process and the selection of students, a parent concluded that John was able “to see beyond the behavior, to see the essence of the child” and believed that he could “have an impact on that child” (Interview, September 4, 1998).

I was unable to determine exactly the number of students who were not accepted to Chapman Friends School this first year. Joan had initially interviewed more than 50 students. During one of our interviews, Joan commented that they had rejected one student at the start because of some “authority issues.”

After the interview process, students completed a questionnaire and submitted school transcripts and four letters of recommendation: two academic and two personal. Once the school procured the student's transcripts, at least three of the letters of recommendation, and a registration fee, a student was eligible for consideration. The application process took place in the spring and the school informed parents and students that “Students who are not admitted one
month may be considered for the following month's pool" of eligible candidates (Chapman Friends School Registration Materials, “Application Procedures,” 1996).

**The Contract Renewal Process**

The contract renewal process, adopted from the parent school, was the formal process by which students were informed whether or not they would be invited back to Chapman Friends School. The process was in two stages. The first occurred in February when students received letters stating that they would be offered a contract for the following school year or that the decision was being delayed. As a general rule, students who were not meeting school expectations or who had entered after the year began, received the “decision delayed” letter. Students were instructed, within the context of the letter, on what they needed to do to be invited back. The second stage occurred at the end of the school year in June when students received final notice as to whether or not they could return to Chapman Friends School. Both in February and June the entire faculty and staff met to discuss the students and decide whose contract would or would not be renewed. Joan sent a letter to the faculty in late January and explained the first stage of the process. She included items for the teachers to consider in their decision making (see Appendix F). John joined the faculty for the contract renewal discussions in February but excluded himself from the discussion in June, believing that the returning faculty should have the primary determination.

In January, Joan sent a letter to the parents describing the contract process to them. She wrote, “Most students are offered contracts at this time of year.” She noted the criteria the teachers would use in making their decisions: “participation in Meeting for Worship and community service, interactions with peers and faculty, academic work, and student responsibility.” She informed the parents that all decisions would be “made by ‘Sense of the Meeting,’ which means that all faculty agree before a decision is made.” She instructed the parents to call the school if they had any “questions or concerns.”
**Contract Renewal Discussion**

I attended the faculty meeting in June and observed the end-of-the-year contract discussion. I found it to be exhausting and a little emotionally draining. The teachers clearly knew and cared for these students. They painstakingly deliberated over each student whose contract was in question. Following is a description of that observation:

The meeting began and Joan distributed a student roster and a form with discussion points (see Appendix G). Joan noted which students’ contracts needed to be discussed and stated the guidelines for discussion. Since Tom had to leave early, the teachers began discussing his study group students first. Katie interjected and offered an explanation of the process for those who didn’t know. Tom said that he did not know how the process worked but felt he could catch on easily enough. The issues centered on the school’s commitments, respect for others, relationships, foul language, drugs, racism, participation in Meeting for Worship and off-campus outings, and safety as it related to a student’s anger. About twenty minutes into the meeting Joan excused herself to get copies of the letter regarding contracts that she had given the teachers in January. As each teacher spoke about a particular student, the rest listened attentively. Each teacher added his or her own comments about the student in question and cited specific student behavior to support this view. I heard comments such as, “I just wish we could save them.” To which one teacher responded, “Maybe we are giving ourselves too much credit. We can only do so much here.” “We are not a therapeutic school.” “We are a safe haven for him.” “He wants to be here and that is really important.” “He doesn't value our values though.” “He’s not a good role model for the younger students.” “In our literature we say we provide a safe environment, and we have a student who fears this other student. We need to be sensitive to that. We need to make sure we create a safe environment.”

Joan reminded the teachers that they were to evaluate each child on an individual basis. A teacher remarked, “There should be some consistency in who we renew and don't renew.” At a later point a teacher added, “If he returns, how will the other students view this? I know I am not supposed to think about that, but.” The discussion regarding each child continued until all who desired to make comments had, and there was consensus on
whether to renew or not renew the student's contract. The process was very deliberative, and I sensed that the teachers understood the gravity of their decisions. (Researcher's log, June 17, 1998)

The contract discussion illustrated well Schein's (1992) finding that "such debate also provides opportunities for testing mission statements, goal clarity, and means clarity, illustrating how several cultural elements are simultaneously being created, tested, articulated, and reinforced" (p. 76). Thus, when the staff member raised the point of school safety and the corresponding school literature on the subject, the teachers had to wrestle with what the school was and what it wanted to become. In the end, six students were not invited back. When I asked John about this, he remarked, "Six is high, normally it is two or three." He noted, however, that he was not surprised considering this was the school's first year. He also added that he did not attend the contract renewal meeting in June because he left those decisions to the faculty and principal. He generalized that the reason the students were rejected was because "they didn't buy into the prevailing culture of the school – service, authenticity, simplicity, growth, health" (Interview, June 23, 1998). Joan also stated that it was higher than usual and said, "It's very rare that you tell somebody they can't come back. And I think it was a bold step for us to take... Larry [Chapman Friends Middle School principal] said he felt you really needed to be, perhaps, more careful in the initial years of establishing a good culture, a community" (Interview, July 10, 1998). According to Schein (1992), "Defining the criteria for deciding who is in and who is out of an organization... is one of the best ways of beginning to analyze a culture. Moreover, the very process by which a group makes those judgments and acts on them is a process of culture formation" (p. 79).

Students' and Parents' Responses to the Contract Process

To discover what the students and parents understood regarding the contract process, I asked them if they knew or could speculate as to why some students were not invited back. As illustrated in Table 10, responses fell into six categories: (a) lack of community spirit, (b) negative behavior, (c) immaturity and negative attitude, (d) lack of respect for others, (e) poor academic performance, and (f) a drug problem. Most responses fell into the category of "negative behavior." Some of the parents' speculations were based on what they had heard from their own children and,
in the case of the students, what they had heard from those students whose contracts had not been renewed.

Three other themes emerged from my discussions and observations regarding the contract process and included: (a) the actual administration of the contract renewal process, (b) its anticipated effects, and (c) the make-up of the student body. Regarding the administration of the process, two students, a parent, and Joan noted the negative response from students who received decision-delayed letters in February. The student stated that “everyone thought the letters were a bad idea" and recommended “parents-student-teacher conferences in order to help the student improve his behavior" (Interview, July 11, 1998). In the school newspaper, a student wrote, “The letters really discouraged the people who I talked to and also discouraged me from thinking I have a chance to return to Chapman." Not knowing until the “bitter end if you were going to be invited back or not” was a cause of concern for some students in the parent's view. Joan was well aware of this tension and acknowledged:

[Next] February, when we review contracts, Theresa and I have talked about meeting with each student whose contract is going to be held before the letter goes out. In retrospect, I wish I had done that this year to everyone. I did it to students I thought wouldn't take it well, and I didn't realize how many wouldn't take it well, because there was no established feeling about that process. (Interview, July 21, 1998)

Although a teacher noted during the contract meeting that they were not to be concerned with what the “other students thought," both a parent and Joan spoke of their expectations in light of the students who would not be returning. “I am hoping that [six students not returning] will make a big [positive] difference," declared the parent. Personifying Ouchi’s (1981) finding that “failure to adhere to the norms of the group can bring loss of group support, approval, and ultimately the group can throw the offender out of the membership” (p. 28-29), Joan concluded:

Overall, there were a number of students that were just negative about school and negative about things we were doing. For me, it was like cutting out a sore that was seriously affecting a number of students, I think, and just the overall morale of the school. My hope is that without those negative forces, the students will notice and be able to express out loud, and without any threat, their positive feeling about the school.
### Table 10

**Thematic Data Matrix: Reasons Why Students Did Not Get Their Contracts Renewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF DATA</th>
<th>THEMES AND RELATED RAW DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of community spirit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **INTERVIEWS WITH STUDENTS AND PARENTS** | **S1Q:** “I guess because the school didn't think that the student really could offer anything or that they could offer the student anything. They weren't really being part of the community.”  

**S2:** “You actively pursued to create cliques that John totally spoke out against.”  

**S4:** “Because of the student’s behavior.”  

**S5:** “I think they may not have gotten invited back because of their behavior towards other students, towards the teachers, more towards other students.”  

**S6:** “It wasn't about me... I got along with everybody as they got along with me. My grades were just about average or above... They found us a little threatening. We would encourage other students to actually express their opinions and not just be their puppets. [In their letter to me] they said something to the extent of ‘your behavior in class is something we can't continue with.’”  

**S7:** “I know a couple students who didn't get their contracts renewed. The students who didn't get their contracts back...created big problems... Distracted other people, made it hard for other people to want to go to school. Made other people unhappy.”  

**P1:** “In Joan’s letter, she talked about the fact that [my son] was not able to manage his needs in a group and that if he wasn’t totally engaged, he would be totally disruptive, and was not able to work in the classroom groups.”  

**P3:** “I got the sense that it was mostly...behavioral stuff that interfered with learning... Consistently being disruptive in class. Just not following the very simple rules that they laid out.”  

**P5:** “I suspect in many cases, various types of discipline problems.”  

**P6:** “Something to do with... the way she was telling other [students] to ‘get off of it’ wasn’t acceptable with the teachers.”  

**P7:** “I think for the most part, the kids were given certain rules and they chose not to follow them. Some kids might be too disruptive.”  

**P8:** “They were totally disruptive the whole year, is my assumption.” |
| **IMMATURETY AND NEGATIVE ATTITUDE** | **Lack of respect for others** | **POOR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE** | **DRUG PROBLEM** |
| **S2:** “I guess it was a combination of maturity and attitude.” | **S2:** “If you treated other people with disrespect... If you were a racist or homophobic or anything like that.”  

**S3:** “A kid said, ‘I didn’t get my contract renewed because the teachers think I’m racist.’”  

**S7:** “It’s all about how you treat others. They didn't treat others as you would like to be treated.”  

**P9Q:** “My assumption is, they did not have respect for the community.”  

**S3:** “[Teachers said] there’s a problem with respect.”  

**S1Q:** “They weren’t succeeding academically.”  

**S4:** “Academic scores... If they fail their college boards, that’s going to make the school look bad. They have to keep a 90% graduation and [entrance to] college rate.”  

**S3:** “One student said [it was] because of his ‘outside-of-school drug problem.’” |

**KEY:**  

**P** - Parent  

**S** - Student  

**Q** - Quaker

**Note.** The interview data in this table came from responses to the question: Do you know or can you speculate why some students did not get their contracts renewed?
The entire contract process got to the heart of the student makeup at Chapman Friends School. Prior to the school’s opening, John was asked by a local journalist to describe the model Chapman Friends School student, he responded, “Alert, engaged, trusting, open to challenge, articulate, persuasive and self-disciplined. . . . We are not a school for troubled kids. No acting out in serious ways, no serious authority issues, not seriously depressed” (Ciafone, 1997, p. 8). Clearly, not all the students were of this ilk. Three parents expressed concern about some of the students whose behavior and attitude negatively impacted the school. Summarizing these parents’ views, a teacher remarked, “There is a feeling among some [parents], and it’s not the first time I’ve heard it, that some of these kids are . . . too alienated to contribute to an environment where success will be achieved” (Interview, May 19, 1998). Teachers also felt that “if only we could weed those negative forces out, then we’d be okay” (Interview, May 13, 1998). I asked Joan if she felt they had been too open-minded in accepting some students at the outset. She reflected:

When I look at those students that we said no to [at the end of the year], they didn't start out the year acting like we made a mistake. Things developed during the year and came to a head at the end of the year. They didn't respond well to our suggestions in the contract letters in February. (Interview, July 10, 1998)

**Summary**

Clearly, the contract process affected the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School. The contract renewal discussion among the faculty was a defining moment for the school. Faculty members had to examine their own values and the school’s mission against students who did not buy into those values and then make some very difficult decisions. Such a challenge is at the core of culture. As Bates (1992) said, “Culture . . . is historically the result of painful struggles to integrate the collected knowledge, values, beliefs and experience of real people” (p. 11). As Fran remarked, during her interview with me, “We don't succeed with every student.” In rejecting the six students, the faculty, in turn, was accepting a particular vision of Chapman Friends School which included “a lot of success stories of kids who have done really well and who ‘get it’” (Interview, May 27, 1998).
The Parents

Perhaps the best way to describe the role of parents is isolated, in the sense that the faculty, staff, and administration, for the most part, defined the parents' role primarily in terms of what occurred outside of the immediate school setting. “Parents were to parent,” setting limits and boundaries for their children, loving them, supporting them, and allowing them to experience the “reasonable consequences of their behavior.” At the Trust workshop in December, a parent voiced a popular concern – it seemed as if the school did not want parents around. John responded, “You're right!” and went on to say the students “feel as if it is their school and they have ownership of it. They do not want their moms and dads around.” While John assured the parents that the teachers, Joan, and he would be willing to meet with them and have conferences, he was quite emphatic about their respecting the fact that it was “the kids' community.” The parents were very much aware of John’s sentiment. While some expressed frustration with that, others accepted it as a condition of sending their child to Chapman Friends School.

Based on my observations and interviews, three themes emerged regarding the role of parents at Chapman Friends School (see Appendix H). The themes included: (a) limited parent involvement in the school, (b) no parent involvement in the school, and (c) a desire on the part of parents and some students for more parent involvement in the school. In their comprehensive review of the “effective schools” literature, Purkey and Smith (1983) found that parental involvement and support in schools positively affected the learning environment. At Chapman Friends School, however, a different atmosphere prevailed. According to John, some parents' desire to be involved had more to do with control than support of the school and “allowing such parents free rein in the school was very counterproductive.” The role of parents at Chapman Friends School the first year was limited.

In addition to the Back-to-School night in November, the school offered a series of workshops for both parents and students on the subject of trust. John led these workshops, and attendance varied between 30 to 50 people, most of whom were parents. The workshops were designed to assist parents in dealing with their children:

It’s [the workshop] helping parents understand that their job is not to re-create or to create someone. . . . Their job is to sit back in wonder and awe at this unique human being who is
unfolding before them and to be cheerleaders. But we're not taught that. (Interview, December 18, 1997)

During one workshop I observed the following:

John told the parents, “The best advice I can leave you with tonight is to have faith, and to have faith in raising your kids. Do not let your fears guide your actions. Separate out those fears.” John also talked about setting limits and boundaries but reminded parents to keep in mind that this is the age at which the kids will break away. John spoke about “choosing your battles.” He said it was time to step back regarding their child's homework. (Researcher's log, December 16, 1997)

These workshops were also opportunities for parents to raise their own concerns about their children. Frequently, school issues arose and included the academic program, smoking, students getting their driver's license, community service, educational resource materials and books (the need for more), and, of course, homework. On occasion, a parent or two would praise the good work of the teachers.

In addition to the workshops, parents attended a pot-luck dinner in October, a gathering with alumni and parents (“How to Trust Chapman and Let Go of My Anxieties”) in January, an annual auction in March, and an international dinner and talent show in May. When parents had concerns, they called either Joan, John, or their child's teacher directly. Teachers would also call parents to inform them of their child's academic performance and, when necessary, unacceptable behavior. One parent recalled how John had met with him and his wife and recommended that they investigate the possibility that their son might be suffering from depression. Another parent expressed great frustration with the “You shouldn't be here” atmosphere in the school and felt the existence of “a wall of secrecy” (Interview, August 27, 1998).

Sergiovanni (1990) claimed that for democratic, practical, and moral reasons, parents should be involved in schools but acknowledged that finding the right balance between the school professionals and the parents was difficult. Both the Chapman Friends School professionals and the parents struggled to achieve this balance. While parents understood, or simply came to accept, that it was best for them not to be in the school much, they still had reservations about their relationship with the school. One parent, whose son was not invited back, remarked, “I think they
should have called us sooner than they did. They were not using us as a resource to try and understand him" (Interview, July 15, 1998). Teachers, parents, and even a student suggested more interaction was warranted. The nature of that interaction, however, was left unresolved. John's remarks in response to my question, “What have the parents learned this year in light of the Chapman Friends School culture?” speak to this challenge:

I think some of them have learned to trust their own intuition, and, to some extent, to trust providence or God that their children will survive even if they're not managed every instant. The whole thesis about giving children room to grow is sorely tested in this school because many parents have not been exposed to this theory of child raising: That it is [just as] important to leave spaces into which they can grow, as it is to create restrictions which will presumably keep them safe. (Interview, June 23, 1998)

**Practices and the Creation of Culture at Chapman Friends School**

Deal and Kennedy (1983) maintained, “Rituals and ceremonies provide tangible opportunities for values to be reinforced, heroes to be celebrated, and symbols to be displayed and exchanged” (p. 14). Chapman Friends School had its share of rituals, ceremonies, and heroes to reinforce its core values and to foster a community of trust and respect. Some of the daily practices and rituals were adopted from the parent school and had been part of the Chapman-way tradition. Others, such as the lunch van run and talent show, were unique to the school. In this section I address the specific rituals, ceremonies, and heroes and their influence on the creation of culture as well as some discussion on the influence of the parent school.

**Rituals and Ceremonies**

In seeking to discover the creation of rituals and traditions, I asked the faculty, students, and parents to identify symbolic practices, celebrations, ceremonies, and traditions. Responses included: (a) Meeting for Worship; (b) morning study group and sharing goods and news; (c) Christmas party with Joan in attendance; (d) international dinner; (e) talent show; (f) van run to the local deli at lunch time; (g) singing “Happy Birthday” to students during announcement time, followed by donuts or cupcakes; (h) end of the year picnic and farewell to John; (i) pot luck dinner
at the beginning of the year; (j) mountain climbing trip; (k) town meetings; (l) wearing a costume
to school on Halloween; (m) the auction; and (n) the Quaker camp and “fire circles.” The Quaker
camp and fire circles were mentioned most frequently. While the camping experience manifested
the school’s philosophy that learning occurs beyond the school building and classroom setting, the
fire circles illustrated distinctly the school's desire to build a trusting and caring community.
Teachers, students, and parents spoke of the “bonding” experience at the fire circles and how,
according to one student, there was “so much community” (Interview, July 11, 1998).

**Fire Circles at the Quaker Camp**

Following the tradition of the parent school, the students, faculty, staff, and administration
of Chapman Friends School spent three days of the first week and two days of the last week of
school at a Quaker camp in a neighboring state. In school marketing literature, this camping trip is
portrayed as an opportunity to “bond and cement strong feelings of community, safety and trust”
among the students and faculty. In a letter to students, the office manager described the trip
accordingly:

This is a **mandatory** trip. Students and faculty stay at . . . [a] Quaker Camp. . . .
[Students] will take day hikes, conduct some organized discussions and activities, enjoy fire
circles, cook, clean up, etc. This is primarily a time for students to get to know each other
and the faculty.

An additional flyer on the camping trip provided specific information on what to wear and bring to
camp. The following directive appeared in large bold type on the flyer: “**NO ELECTRONIC
MUSIC ALLOWED!!**”

Camping, hiking, canoeing, swimming in the lake, sharing meals together, and just being
out of the school building for a few days were reason enough for enjoying and appreciating the
trip. However, the tradition of the fire circle proved most powerful and memorable for many
students and faculty members. Some of them defined it as a “Chapman moment.” According to
Joan, a fire circle begins with everyone coming together in silence. An individual then introduces
a topic which prompts reflection, such as, “For what are you most thankful?” and the students and
teachers respond to it. People speak when they feel moved to do so. Following each person's
remarks, there is to be some silence. There are also “day circles” which do not take place around a
fire and where all students are expected to respond to the posed question.

Describing the fire circle at the end of the year, a student remarked:

I’ve spoken at all the fire circles except that one because I was so busy listening. Everyone was in tears and people were comforting them. We were so much a community. It was one of the most beautiful things I’ve ever seen. People who hated each other all year – this boy and girl I know – apologized. Amazing things were happening. (Interview, July 11, 1998)

The office manager described the fire circle as a Chapman moment and stated:

The question was put forth to the circle . . . , ‘How have you grown since the beginning of the year?’ This one student . . . started sobbing. He was worried about his mother and about being left alone in the world. . . . He started crying and crying and crying. He never did anything like that during the school year. The kids just went over to him, one by one, and sat with him and held him. Everybody was just sitting there with tears in their eyes. It was a very emotional moment. . . . Other kids spoke, very heartfelt. They felt comfortable enough there. They could just come out with the rawest feelings and emotions and . . . receive comfort. (Interview, June 12, 1998)

What made the fire circles significant, then, was that they were a “catalyst for community building.” Students “voiced their deepest yearnings; they went deep” (Interview, May 27, 1998). These circle rituals, whether in the day or at night around the campfire, clearly left a lasting impression on the participants. That they were identified as Chapman moments – critical moments – speak to their defining nature in the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School. One teacher remarked that the students who came later in the year and had not attended the Quaker camp were at a disadvantage as it was “a big melting pot where we were all equal” (Interview, May 18, 1998).

Johnston (1987) claimed, “Rituals guide behavior and dramatize a school’s core values. Behind each ritual is a belief that is central to the school’s culture” (p. 86). The openness and gut-level honesty expressed by the students and teachers during the fire circles poignantly illustrate one of the school’s core values – authenticity.
Heroes

To even associate the term "hero" with Chapman Friends School may seem paradoxical when one considers the Quaker value of equality among individuals. To set a student apart and publicly recognize him or her, at least in terms of an honor roll or citizenship award, is contrary to the Chapman way. According to Joan, it was "not a Quaker thing" (Interview, July 10, 1998).

The Chapman way did not include a competitive learning environment unless you were competing against yourself, as one student noted. Another student described the philosophy well, remarking:

When you put a bunch of students on the honor roll, you are publicizing how much better they are than everyone else, and with Chapman, they don't want to do that. That's like saying, “This is the elite of the school. Ha, ha! They're better than you.” Chapman philosophy says, you know, that's like the [worst] thing you can do. (Interview, September 4, 1998)

Parents, too, were aware of the absence of publicly recognizing students in this manner, and as one parent explained, “If you raise somebody up, you push somebody down" (Interview, August 27, 1998).

John made his views on student recognition very clear during one of our interviews:

We celebrate each other every day. We celebrate everybody equally in so far as we are able. . . . We don't participate in national, regional, or local contests where students compete to be the best. The notion that competitiveness aids learning . . . is a misguided notion. . . . The Quaker faith holds that we are truly equal. Because there is that of God in each of us, we are each equally wonderful. We celebrate that you have gifts that are different from mine, and I have gifts that are different from yours. It doesn't make your gifts better or worse than mine. (Interview, June 23, 1998)

The teachers' views echoed John's. The majority of them stated that they informally recognized students within their own classroom on a daily basis. Teachers recognized and thanked students for "doing the right thing," participating in daily clean up, and for expressing a good idea or completing an assignment well. Some of the teachers also identified the talent show – with students "struttin' their stuff" – as a venue for student public recognition. One teacher commented:

A student may just make an announcement [at announcement time] about something. . . .
And that just sort of gives that person recognition right there. A particular example that comes to mind is [a student] talking about her Philadelphia trip . . . following a Meeting for Worship, [where] I really thought she shined. (Interview, May 19, 1998)

A teacher described a school circle – “where you can talk, . . . say whatever you want to say” (Interview, May 18, 1998) – and how one student was asked to lead it:

We had a school circle. . . . [and] we particularly picked one student to star it. That's kind of a covert example of us [teachers] singling out somebody. It had a lot of impetus for us, the student we picked. We needed somebody that was respected by all the students; someone known to be kind of fair minded; someone who wasn't on one side or in a clique, or something like that; someone that related to everybody; and someone who would say some positive things about the school to start off. (Interview, May 18, 1998)

The teacher added that he had told the student why she was chosen among her peers. While this action on the part of the teachers may have been “covert,” it illustrates Deal and Kennedy's (1982) belief that heroes reinforce core values by role modeling, setting a standard of performance, and motivating employees (pp. 39 - 40).

The “Patrick Story”

More obvious and overt was the public recognition of Patrick, a teacher at Chapman Friends School and a graduate of the parent school. Within the first few months of my study, I heard the story about Patrick and his first year of college. John relayed the story to the parents at a Trust workshop. This story was also mentioned during interviews and, eventually, by Patrick himself at an alumni gathering. Patrick's story was a “vehicle of indoctrination” (Schein, 1992, p. 183) in that it reinforced some of the school's core values. During my interview with Patrick, he told his story:

In the first couple weeks of [college] classes I really, really had a hard time. The workload seemed to be tremendous. . . . I was reading through all these syllabi and thinking, “There's no way I'm going to be able to do all this.” It just got to feel really overwhelming. . . . I . . . called my parents and said, “I don't know that I'm going to make it.” Kendal [a student that I met] had gone to . . . a New England prep boarding school. . . . I was talking to him about what he thought it [class workload] was like, and he commented on how easy it was.
At this point, I was really flipping out because I'm thinking, “There's no way I can compete with people like that. . . I'm not going to make it.” . . . But about the third or fourth week, I think I just decided, “I'm going to do my best while I'm here and that's all I can do” . . . and things just really started getting easier even though the workload wasn't getting any lighter. . . . I made Dean's List that first semester. . . . I graduated with a 3.43 [G.P.A.] with departmental honors. I ended up doing very well in school. Kendal . . . ended up really struggling through college. He was on academic probation. . . . [and] ended up not graduating within four years.

My take on that whole thing . . . is that I had always been at Chapman, and I'd never had that really hard academic load that was being expected of me. It was completely new, and that's why it was so difficult. But I had been given the inner strength, or allowed to have the inner strength, to make my own decisions, and to decide what I wanted, and to act on that, and to work toward my own goals. When I realized that I could, and decided that I would just do the best I could do, then I did. Then I really got into it and did perfectly well. . . . I did what I needed to do to do really well. Someone like Kendal had always been pushed from the outside, I think. . . . When it came down to having to make his own decisions, then he blew everything off. (Interview, May 19, 1998)

Patrick's story is a hero story in that it speaks to the qualities that Chapman Friends School seeks to develop in its graduates and illustrates the school's philosophy on developing a student's intrinsic motivation. Self-motivation and a confident self-perception are keys to success for the Chapman Friends School graduate. That both John and Joan recounted Patrick's story points to its potential for shaping the culture by illustrating some of the school's core values. As Schein (1992) wrote:

Through stories, parables, and other forms of oral or written history, an organization can communicate its ideology and basic assumptions – especially to newcomers, who need to know what is important not only in abstract terms but by means of concrete examples that can be emulated. (pp. 91- 92)

**A Heroes Gathering**

Perhaps the most obvious display of school “heroes” was the night the alumni visited in
January. Four former graduates, including Patrick, attended a meeting for students and their parents. The idea to conduct such a meeting occurred earlier in the year. At a faculty meeting in November, John expressed that he would like to invite a few graduates “who have done well” back to Chapman Friends School as a way of showing the parents and students that “There is life after Chapman.” Patrick volunteered to contact some graduates he knew who were living in the area, adding that they would probably be willing to participate in a panel discussion.

Approximately 50 people attended the event which was advertised as “How to Trust Chapman and Let Go of My Anxieties” in a letter sent to parents. Along with the four alumni, John also invited “experienced parents” from the parent school and asked them to share their insights with the new parents. Following is a description of that gathering:

John opened the meeting and asked everyone to introduce himself. He then opened up the floor to questions. The professionally dressed alumni appeared quite successful and exemplary. All of them had graduated from college and were gainfully employed. They were composed, articulate, friendly, and witty. One of the male graduates spoke about his first year at Chapman Friends School and how he had spiked hair and wore leather and chains. He said his parents show him photos now of what he looked like then, and he can’t believe he “actually did that.” He mentioned how he had been bored with public school and was going to fall through the cracks because of its size. Going to Chapman Friends School “made all the difference because people knew me.” Patrick also told his first-year-of-college story to the group.

An experienced parent addressed a new parent’s concern about there not being a library or enough resource materials, stating, “These material things in the end don’t really matter. What’s most important is what my son is getting at Chapman Friends School. He’s getting a value system, a commitment to the community. That’s what I want for my son because that is what he will need in order to live.” Another experienced parent noted, “My child became so interested in learning again that he was actually talking to me about school.” A parent alluded to the students at Chapman Friends School who had Attention Deficit Disorder.

The graduates also mentioned how close they still were to one another and
attributed that to their years at Chapman Friends School. One of the graduates addressed the limited number of extra-curricular activities and commented, “They did not have a drama program, but I wrote a play for my senior project and half the school performed in it.” Another graduate described a high school course he had taken on the subject of time. He said the class viewed two movies, created a time line, and then got into quantum physics. Other topics raised by the graduates included: being able to pursue a topic of personal interest, competing only against oneself, the positive impact of their community service work, and Chapman Friends School being a “safe place” to learn. The dominant theme of the graduates was that through their Chapman Friends School experience, they had developed the confidence and the ability to do what they needed to do. (Researcher's log, January 29, 1998)

I left that night thinking, “What a perfect culture-creating event!” These alumni heroes and heroines spoke to the essence of Chapman Friends School at its best. They spoke to its core values and its mission to serve the bright underachiever and to graduate students with a positive and confident self-perception. One parent remarked that the alumni gathering “was an excellent idea. . . . The students that came back were balanced enough that you knew that, “Yes, you probably did look just like my son and now look at you” (Interview, July 28, 1998)! According to (1987), “Instead of sending out memoranda about the school’s achievements, they [principal] should tell ‘people stories' about students or teachers who have had some success or whose story exemplifies some special value” (p. 85). The atmosphere throughout the evening was positive, encouraging, and hopeful. With the help of his “alumni heroes,” John was creating the culture quite purposefully and poignantly that night.

The Parent School

The very fact that Chapman Friends School was borne out of the success of two other schools in a neighboring state dictated, to a considerable extent, many of the practices and daily operating procedures which occurred. The parent high school had “a pattern of shared basic assumptions . . . considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members” (Schein, 1992, p. 12). Hiring practices, the design of the academic program and degree of teacher autonomy,
Meeting for Worship, the Seven Commitments, goods and news, the Quaker camp outings, fire and day circles, annual auction, the contract renewal process, grade reports with teacher comments, weekly faculty meetings, community service, and break/lunch bunch were practices which had been employed for over twenty years at the other two schools. The longevity of these practices and traditions, however, did not necessarily guarantee a smooth or effortless application of them at Chapman Friends School. As one teacher commented, “Even though we took things from [the parent school], [the practices weren't] even established in the minds of those who were supposed to be establishing it” (Interview, June 15, 1998). During the course of the school year, students from Chapman Friends School had the opportunity to visit the parent school to attend a student drama production and play intramural sports. In the spring, students from both schools took a trip to Mexico.

Teachers and students at Chapman Friends School also expressed a desire to create a new school identity and to be “independent” and “distinguishable” from the parent school. A teacher remarked that the faculty looked to the parent school for guidance regarding various procedures and policies and then decided to “either toss it [the particular procedure] or embrace it” (Interview, June 1, 1998). According to Kline and Saunders (1998), this stance is inevitable in learning organizations:

> Everything is subject to re-examination. There are no sacred cows, and the assumptions on which we operate should always be subjected to further reconsideration in the light of new data. Some of our most excellent ideas may in the end be best discarded in favor of even better ones. (p. 19)

One teacher expressed the situation well and stated:

> We have to say, “Well, this is the way it's done in the other school,” especially with the faculty. I think I do a lot of that. I think in some ways that hurts our ability to form our own identity. Sometimes we'll use circumstances from the other school when [our students are worried about how things are going here], we'll sometimes say to them, “It happens every year. Don't worry. This is part of our process. It will feel better in a month or two.” We use the other school to assuage the [students’] fears. (Interview, May 13, 1998)
Visits and Observations at the Parent School

I visited the parent school on three occasions: (a) October 28, 1997, to attend a trust workshop for parents, (b) June 6, 1998, to attend the retirement celebration for John and Fran, and (c) October 5, 1998, to observe classes and Meeting for Worship. My experience with the parent school left me with a definite image, that of a ripe fruit. In many ways the parent school and new Chapman Friends School were similar, but there appeared to be a greater sense of groundedness and stability at the parent school. Its culture was not in question or being created for the first time.

During my school visit, I had an opportunity to talk to Nolan, the principal. I came to appreciate John's comments about Nolan being “thoroughly Quaker” regardless of his religious affiliation. Although I had not scheduled an appointment with Nolan, he was welcoming and generous with his time. Unassuming in his casual dress, Nolan talked freely and candidly. He spoke about the absolute necessity of Meeting for Worship, how it is within the silence that one learns so much, and how he just recently “got it!” He also reiterated the favored phrase that “responsible people don't need rules.” He, too, was very open to my visiting the classrooms and observing.

I visited four classrooms – writing workshop, literature, calculus, and physics. The students were engaged in substantive discussions. In the calculus class students were solving problems using calculators. The physics class was the most unstructured. Students, sitting on top of desks, were emphatically challenging each other's remarks. The teacher was very enthusiastic and took the serious and not-so-serious challenges in good humor. Throughout the lesson students excused themselves for one reason or another and left the room. The teacher, new to the school, mentioned to me afterwards that his approach with the students was very different from his previous style at a private school.

I also had the opportunity to participate in Meeting for Worship while at the parent school. The students settled down quickly and, while a teacher had to ask one of them to be quiet, the students remained quiet throughout the 20 minutes. Following the silence the students shook hands, a teacher made announcements, and the group sang “Happy Birthday” to one of the students. Another teacher then announced the names of the students who had lunch bunch and
added, “Doing homework is not optional.”

The “ripeness” of the parent school had much to do with the transference of the culture year after year. As Patrick, described:

That school has been there for 25 years. . . . That type of community takes work; it doesn't just happen. . . . Each year [at the parent school] you have a quarter to a third of new students. The rest of the students are all returning, understand the way the community works, and have participated in the community for at least a year. [They] come back and teach the new students how it works. Here [Chapman Friends School] we try to do that just by the teachers passing it down. Only Joan, Katie, and I have ever done it before. . . I did it as a student. . . . So for all of our students and most of our teachers, it's new, which I think has been a real difficulty. (Interview, May 19, 1998)

In Schein's (1992) terms, the community at the new Chapman Friends School had yet to develop a “pattern of shared basic assumptions” (p. 12). In many ways, the teachers and students were operating out of their individual assumptions based on their own previous problem-solving experiences. Confirming my view of the “ripeness” of the parent school in relation to the new Chapman Friends School, John remarked, “You cannot make a pickle by squirting vinegar at a cucumber.” John believed that Chapman Friends School would develop a deep and recognizably unique culture born out of experience and made strong in time.

Decision Making and the Creation of Culture at Chapman Friends School

In examining the ways in which decisions were made at Chapman Friends School, I identified three approaches (see Appendix I). Decisions were made (a) through a sense of the meeting, (b) with input from others, and (c) unilaterally. While Joan or John took “executive privilege" at times, such instances were few and had the genuine support of the teachers: “I trust them a lot. So it doesn't feel like I'm handing over any authority” (Interview, June 1, 1998). Within their own classrooms, teachers made many decisions unilaterally, as one teacher remarked, “We have a say exactly as to what goes on in our classroom” (Interview, May 13, 1998). More often, however, in making decisions with wider implications, the faculty, Joan, and John arrived at them through a sense of the meeting, resulting in very long faculty meetings at times.
**Sense of the Meeting**

In his study of effective Japanese organizations, Ouchi (1981) identified the practice of participative decision making as critical to an organization's effectiveness and noted:

This apparently cumbersome decision process takes place within the framework of an underlying agreement on philosophy, values, and beliefs. These form the basis for common decision premises that make it possible to include a very large number of people in each decision. (p. 45)

Quakers have a distinctly unique approach to decision making based on “an underlying agreement on philosophy” which includes the belief in arriving at decisions through a sense of the meeting, what Fran described as getting “to the one truth, the one elegant solution to a problem. . . . It's not a compromise. It leaves everyone feeling okay with it” (Interview, June, 23, 1998). In his book, *The Quakers: Their Story and Message*, Brayshaw (1938) summarized:

This willingness to *wait* and *persuade* until a large measure of spiritual unity is reached is one of the most cherished possessions of Friends, saving them as it does from smart scoring of debating points or impatience in pressing for a decision. It has to be admitted that often, in deference to timid individuals, a desirable forward step is over-long delayed, but, once taken, it meets with general acquiescence free from the bitterness which might at an earlier stage have arisen had one side carried its point by force of majority. Not infrequently it happens that those who have been against the proposed step will, when once it has been decided on, help to carry it out. (pp. 168-169)

The teachers, Joan, John, and, to a much lesser extent, the students engaged in this method of decision making. Senge (1990) identified this type of decision making as the “second type of consensus. . . . If I can 'look out' through your view and you through mine, we will each see something we might not have seen alone” (p. 248). Following is a teacher's description of the Quaker way of decision making:

We're all sitting in a circle, and my image of this process is that we're all sort of throwing things out there and they're landing on the floor. All of a sudden you look at the floor and you realize that something has taken shape on the floor and that you didn't know was there
before. . . . It's not what I thought would happen. . . . After this process it's very easy to
come around to a different point of view. . . . We don't stop until everybody can see that
“lump” on the floor. (Interview, May 13, 1998)

In recounting the contract renewal discussions among the teachers and Joan, a teacher
remarked,

It was a really formative time for faculty to see this decision-making process in action,
where no one person really has complete control. We all have pretty much an equal say in it. I think Joan's voice carries a little more weight, but there were situations where
everyone else felt differently about it than she did, and she was overruled, so to speak. I
mean the sense of the meeting was, “So and so should or shouldn't get a contract.”
(Interview, May 18, 1998)

This teacher went on to describe how good he felt about this decision-making process and the
extent to which his own arguments, for or against renewing a student's contract, were accepted.
This teacher's experience epitomizes Ouchi's (1981) conviction:

This combination of collective decision making with individual responsibility demands an
atmosphere of trust. Only under a strong assumption that all hold basically compatible
goals and that no one is engaged in self-serving behavior will individuals accept personal
responsibility for a group decision. (p. 79)

Students were aware of this Quaker approach to decision making but only experienced it in
isolated circumstances. As a general rule, if students had concerns or suggestions, they could bring
them before the teachers at a faculty meeting. Joan recalled one occasion when a student did bring
his concern before the faculty. More often, however, students raised issues during announcement
time, class time, through petitions, or to individual teachers and Joan. I did not see any of these
petitions and was informed by a student that they were, in effect, “futile.” In explaining the
decision to utilize the van to transport students to the local mini-mall for lunch, a student observed,
“The students were, like, ‘Let's have a van or something. We need some place to go.’ The
students weren't really nagging or anything, but, surprisingly, the teachers were, like, ‘Okay’”
(Interview, July 11, 1998).

While one student bemoaned the fact that most decisions relating to them were not arrived
at through a sense of the meeting, another shared the following anecdote about changing the
course title of one of his classes:

[Someone mentioned that] we ought to refer to this class as “Essays on Culture.” Toward
the end of class a student said, “Do you want to rename this class? I don't think the
[present] name really does justice to what we do in this class.” We had a discussion on it
and came up with some ideas of names. We eventually decided on a new title. Our
teacher. . . . changed the name. There was nothing stopping us. (Interview, July 30, 1998)

This student went on to say how their decision did not need the approval of some “high-level
ranking official” and that it was a “perfect Chapman moment.”

One teacher recalled:

That [discussion regarding the creation of a peer mediation program] was a really good
example of almost the whole school – the students – engaging in this sense-of-the- meeting
process. There was a student or two who was, like, “Let's just wait until next year [to
begin peer mediation]. Why bother now? It won't do a lot of good.” And many more
students said, “No, it would be good to get it started now.” No one ever said, “It appears
the sense of the meeting is that we should do this now.” It was, [however], clear to me
from my experience that that was the sense of the meeting among the students. (Interview,
May 18, 1998)

Parents were less informed as to how decisions were made at Chapman Friends School.
When they had concerns or issues, they generally contacted Joan, John, or the appropriate teacher.
Two parents noted the prominent role the faculty played in making decisions, and one told of her
experience in being delayed in ordering some free computer items because the office manager
informed her that “we've got to get a consensus before we can place an order” (Interview, August
27, 1998).

For John, what significantly affected the quality and outcome of the decision-making
process was the silence that preceded and interrupted it. John maintained:

Silence is also incredibly helpful when we do Quaker business. When we try to reach
consensus, it happens much more easily if you can lapse into silence occasionally and not
have to talk all the time. Words get in the way of agreement constantly. . . . If you can
build silence in, it allows people to reflect on what is being said and to penetrate not just the obvious meaning but the hidden meaning – what's behind what's been said. (Interview, December 18, 1998)

**Summary**

Employing the phrase “learning team" for members within a learning organization, Senge (1990) asserted:

A unique relationship develops among team members who enter into dialogue regularly. They develop a deep trust that cannot help but carry over to discussions. They develop a richer understanding of the uniqueness of each person's point of view. Moreover, they experience how larger understandings emerge by holding one's own point of view “gently." (p. 248)

The teachers, Joan, and John did hold their points of view “gently" and practiced the art of arriving at decisions through a sense of the meeting. While the students engaged in this decision-making art form much less, they had glimpses of it and, as expressed by one teacher, a desire for more of it the following year. Clearly, this way of making decisions connected to the core belief that there is that of God in everyone and honored, one might even say celebrated, the authentic voice and solitary truth in each person. According to Steere (1984), the result of this process is “respect and affection for each other that cuts through all diversity” (p. 37) and, one could surmise, serves as a unifying and strengthening force within the culture.

**Environment and the Creation of Culture at Chapman Friends School**

In examining the impact of the environment – the Jewish temple facility and surrounding neighborhood – on the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School, Schein's (1992) remarks on the effects of “external forces" are noteworthy:

The culture that eventually evolves in a particular organization is thus a complex outcome of external pressures, internal potentials, responses to critical events, and probably to some unknown degree, chance factors that could not be predicted from a knowledge of either the environment or the members. (p. 93)
External forces came into play at Chapman Friends School during its nascent year and clearly affected the behavior of students as well as the actions of Joan, John, and the faculty members. The limitations and restrictions of being situated in the temple as well as the constraints imposed by the surrounding neighborhood were significant and, in one respect, threatened the very existence of the school in the area. The following description of the setting details these environmental challenges and provides insight into the relationship between the creation of a new culture and a long-established one in the neighborhood.

The Setting of Chapman Friends School

In searching for a suitable facility to accommodate a high school of eventually 50 students, John learned of classroom and office space for lease in a Jewish temple situated in a major metropolitan area. John applied for a special use permit from the city planning commission in November of 1996 and Chapman Friends School opened its doors to 38 students in August 1997. While the special use permit did come under scrutiny during the school's first year of operation because of concerns expressed by some neighbors about students loitering and smoking in front of their homes, the city planning commission did renew the permit in June of 1998.

The Jewish Temple

Chapman Friends School is located in a Jewish temple in an affluent, well-established residential area of brick colonial homes with landscaped yards. Occupying most of the second floor of the temple, Chapman Friends School shares the space with the temple's Hebrew school which operates outside of Chapman Friends School’s hours. A child day-care center, managed by the temple administration, is also located on the second floor in a wing separated by a portable partition. In addition to five classrooms, bathroom facilities, and two office areas, there is a large room which was used throughout the year primarily for Meeting for Worship, town meetings, and faculty meetings. Aside from the industrial-style kitchen located on the first floor, most of the other rooms in the temple were off-limits to the students during the day. A perimeter of trees encloses a large parking lot and a small children's play area located at the back of the temple.

The main office suite has two small rooms, a front reception area and Joan's office in the rear. Cramped with furniture and office equipment, the front office is informal but welcoming.
The rooms are smaller than the average high school classrooms and the furniture is conventional with desks, bulletin boards, a chalkboard, and windows running the length of one wall. Jewish symbols and educational materials adorn the bulletin boards and classroom walls. Throughout the course of the year, however, teachers and students displayed Chapman Friends School artifacts – a list of the Seven Commitments, student art work and projects, instructional aids, announcements, college information, and a New York Times article on Quaker meditation. The large room, wherein students gathered for daily announcements and Meeting for Worship twice a week, is carpeted and furnished with worn couches, folding chairs, and a desk. Off to one side of the room is a piano which was used during chorus class.

John's office is situated right next to the meeting room and overlooks the front of the temple grounds. Furnished with a desk, a bookshelf, a small bulletin board with notes and family photos, and a few chairs, John's office is simple and modest. Posted on the outside of John's office door throughout the entire year was the following note:

As WAY OPENS is a phrase used by Friends to express our belief that if you have trust and faith, and work for the good, the way will open for you to serve and to serve with meaning and joy.

Following is a description of my first visit to the site in August of 1997:

Upon entering through the temple's back entrance and the school's only entrance, I noticed a piece of paper on the wall with the name of the school and an arrow pointing left in the direction of the hallway. In proceeding to the stairwell, where another sign was posted, my sense of smell was aroused by the odor of cleaning solvents as I passed by the janitor's room. Reaching the second floor landing, I walked down the tiled hallway, noting symbols of the Jewish faith – posters of Moses and “The Ten Commandments,” charts with Hebrew scripture, and mezzuzahs affixed to door frames. How fascinating, I thought, to find a Quaker school enveloped in Jewish symbolism! (Researcher's log, August 12, 1997)

While I was initially fascinated by the idea of a Quaker school housed in a Jewish temple and the impact such a religious setting would have on the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School, an early experience shed some interesting light on this phenomenon. During one of my visits to the school in the fall, I observed a succah – a shack-like structure made of sheets,
branches, cut vegetation, and leaves – right outside the school's back entrance. In celebration of Succoth – the Festival of Tabernacles – the Jewish community had erected this temporary abode. When I questioned some of the students about the structure, one responded that he did not know what it was while another student expressed some understanding. Overall, there was not much interest and, in general, the students did not appear to be significantly affected by the presence of rich cultural symbols and images of the Jewish faith surrounding them.

On the other hand, students and faculty commented on the limitations of being located in the temple and sharing space with the Hebrew school. The temple administration did impose some restrictions on wall displays, musical instruments (electric guitars), food (pork and shellfish), and access to other rooms in the building. As one teacher remarked:

I do not like this facility. I really resent the immense restrictions on what to put on walls, the limited campus opportunities, the fact that it is remote from any kind of commercial place which is obviously important to these kids. I resent the fact that to get to the classes every day you have to go through . . . this ammonia-laced corridor. I think these kids deserve better than that. (Interview, May 19, 1998)

While the temple was well maintained, safe, and conveniently located, it lacked the amenities one would find in a typical high school, including a gym, lockers, fully functional science lab, library, cafeteria, and outdoor playing fields. Unlike other high schools where students generally “hang out” after hours or engage in extra-curricular activities on campus, Chapman Friends School essentially closed down at the end of the instructional day. Throughout the year, teachers sought off-site locations for physical education instruction and sporting events, while students found a lunch haven and smoking outlet at a nearby deli. Regarding how the facility actually affected the school community, one staff member reflected a common sentiment:

Down the hall is the nursery school, so there is an emphasis on them [students] behaving themselves because we have these little kids here – not using bad language, being polite. Being in the synagogue itself, having respect for the synagogue as a holy place, a place of worship, not just a regular building. They can't bring any pork or shellfish in. So that's been a little different. They can't be quite as open as they might be otherwise. There's a little bit of feeling like we're guests here. The synagogue is our landlord and we're right
inside of it. That's a little awkward. It would be better if we had a separate building.

(Interview, June 12, 1998)

While teachers noted that “students complain about the temple,” I became privy to students' sentiments only during my taped interviews with them. Students' comments regarding the facility ranged from, “I think it's a great location and a great facility,” to “Terrible! I would have done anything to get it out of the temple!” While the temple proved to be a limiting and restrictive factor in certain respects, this did not preclude John from seeking renewal of the special use permit for the following year.

The Neighborhood

Whereas the temple facility clearly affected student behavior, the instructional program, after-school activities, lunch options, and even the school calendar to the extent that the school was closed on Jewish holy days, its severest limitations did not threaten the school’s existence as did the neighborhood surrounding the school. Within just a few weeks of the school’s opening, a next-door neighbor called John to complain. The woman informed John that “the neighborhood was not used to this” (students walking around, loitering, and smoking). She inquired as to whether Chapman Friends School had a dress code and made some disparaging comments. John shared this with the faculty at a meeting and cautioned, “While we have a year's lease, it is possible that we may need to look for a new site at the end of the year if such sentiments as expressed by this neighbor escalate.”

A few prominent neighbors continued to complain, sometimes to John, to their own neighborhood association, and eventually to the city planning commission which had authorized the special use permit. John met with the members of the neighborhood association to address their concerns and even invited one of the most vocal neighbors to come to the school and meet and speak with the students. At the close of Meeting for Worship on December 11, 1997, John informed the students that he had received reports from the temple administration that some students were still smoking on the grounds. John admonished the students and stated, “There is to be no smoking on campus or in the vicinity.”

At a neighborhood association meeting which I attended in June, prior to the renewal of the permit, a neighbor expressed the following:
My child said, “Mommy, there are strange, weird people walking down the street.” They [Chapman Friends School students] really have an attitude. It’s an attitude problem. And I’m convinced they’re on drugs. It's an attitude problem. It's ghastly having to live next to them. I don't want my children to see them. (Researcher's log, June 11, 1998)

In addition to the smoking, a neighbor also complained about the students' “unsavory and slouchy look” and “property values being endangered.”

Schein (1992) addressed this phenomenon accordingly:

The meaning and use of space are among the most subtle aspects of organizational culture because assumptions about space . . . are likely to be taken for granted. . . . At the same time, when those assumptions are violated, as when members of different cultures confront each other, very strong emotional reactions occur. The basic reason for this is that space comes to have very powerful symbolic meanings. (p. 115)

Until the final city council meeting on June 13, 1998, the status of the special use permit was in question, and the students were aware of this. One student remarked, “We've had some dealings with the surrounding neighbors. They were not pleased with us smoking cigarettes in their neighborhood. We almost threatened our existence because of this” (Interview, September 4, 1998). Another student commented, “We felt like we were being attacked by the neighborhood. Once we were informed, we really tried to stay out of that neighborhood” (Interview, July 11, 1998). In order to ease the tension and reduce student loitering in the neighborhood, the faculty instituted a daily van run to the local strip mall at lunch time. Summarizing her thoughts on the “neighborhood issue” at the end of the year, Joan was philosophical:

I keep hearing, “The dress is abominable and the smoking is outrageous!” I think there has to be discussion on that [next year] because we're here on a yearly basis in terms of approval by the city, and it's not just that. John has always emphasized that we want to try to be good neighbors wherever we are. (Interview, July 10, 1998)

From the faculty instituting the lunch van run, to students encouraging the smokers to find other smoking venues, to the most outspoken neighbor visiting the students, the neighborhood clearly had an affect on Chapman Friends School during its first year. In his review of leadership reform movements and external forces affecting schools, Bates (1992) reported a similar pattern:
Battles over how the cultures of schools are to be constituted are commonplace: they occur regularly within and between communities, regions and nations. They frequently incorporate elements of the persistent and characteristic divisions of our societies: class, race, gender, religion, and geography. They are both personal and social. That is, they are essentially cultural battles, battles which address the meaning and purpose of our shared existence and the nature and production of individual identity. (p. 6)

**Summary**

While not resolving all the issues which related to the environment, particularly the limitations of the temple facility, the Chapman Friends School community succeeded in establishing itself as a rightful entity in the area or, as John termed, “good neighbors” desiring to “extend the olive branch of peace.” John's desire in this regard and his proactive stance throughout the smoking-in-the-neighborhood imbroglio illustrate well Schein's (1992) finding that leaders must be able “to notice changes in the environment and then to figure out what needs to be done to remain adaptive” (p. 382).

**Critical Events and the Creation of Culture at Chapman Friends School**

Two very significant critical events – crises – affected the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School during its nascent year: (a) Joan's medical leave of absence for two months, (b) and the challenge to the school's special use permit due to complaints from neighbors upset over students smoking in front of their homes. Whereas the challenge to the permit threatened the school's external survival in the neighborhood, Joan's absence threatened the school's “internal integration,” what Schein (1992) defined as “daily functioning and the ability to adapt” (p. 11). Having already addressed the special use permit, I focus on Joan's absence in this section.
Joan's Absence

At the end of October, Joan was admitted to the hospital and underwent surgery for, what was later disclosed, a malignant tumor. John informed the students of this and sent a letter to their parents explaining that Joan would be on medical leave. John informed them that he would assume the principalship. In a subsequent letter dated November 13, 1997, John notified the parents that he had hired George Monk as interim principal, a man he had known for five years and who had previous administrative experience. John stated, “He will provide a stabilizing force in the school pending Joan’s return.” George began his brief tenure on November 17 and, within the first week, became ill with pneumonia, requiring John to become the principal again. George eventually returned to Chapman Friends School and was acting administrator for about three weeks. My observations of George were very limited. When I contacted him regarding an interview, he declined, responding, “I feel a little uneasy because I was there for such a short period of time. John and I have been friends for a long time, and I would end up talking more about my relationship with John than the school” (Researcher's log, August 3, 1998).

The impact of Joan's absence on the school community was immediate and significant. Teachers, students, and parents commented on how it “brought the school closer together as a community because we relied on each other” (Interview, July 11, 1998) and that it was a very challenging time as well. One teacher described Joan's absence accordingly:

Joan's absence was really good and bad for Chapman. Good, in that it brought us together. . . . Suddenly we had to be doing things . . . [and] figuring out more about the school than we ever knew was going on. For the students, there was a sense of “things are in peril,” and they had to come together to get through it. I think any kind of stressful or otherwise uncomfortable situation tends to bring people together. I also think it was a very difficult period in our development as a school. . . . I think at some point it even crossed my mind, “Oh my god! This place could fall apart and come out from under us! If we didn't really work at it.” For me, what stood out were the difficulties of starting the first year of a new school. It is really, really tenuous! . . . People [students and teachers] are coming from all over. There's absolutely no established [patterns]. (Interview, June 15, 1998)
At this time John asked Theresa to take on the role of “acting student dean” and to assist with some of the administrative tasks. Schein (1992) addressed this response-to-crisis paradigm:

Crises are especially significant in culture creation and transmission because the heightened emotional involvement during such periods increases the intensity of learning. Crises heighten anxiety, and anxiety reduction is a powerful motivator of new learning. If people share intense emotional experiences and collectively learn how to reduce anxiety, they are more likely to remember what they have learned. (p. 237)

During my visit to the school on November 3, 1997, one of the teachers stated that it had been “a hard day” and that they “really missed Joan.” Following is an account of the faculty meeting which occurred that same afternoon:

When I saw John in the school hallway, he told me that there was going to be an “emergency” faculty meeting and that I was welcome to attend. “You will learn something,” he added. John began the meeting by stating that the students were getting out of control, and while they were initially on their best behavior after hearing that Joan was in the hospital, they had now sensed a power vacuum and were trying to fill it. He said that the students had to realize that they were the students and the teachers were the teachers, deserving of respect. He recommended more firmness in dealing with the students. He told the teachers that he would facilitate a town meeting the following morning and everyone would have a chance to speak. Katie asked about the teachers’ role during the town meeting. John assured the teachers that he would not allow the students to attack them and that he would not be addressing their responsibilities during the town meeting. (Researcher’s log, November 3, 1997)

What John said next illustrates Sergiovanni's (1996) thinking:

In time, communities of relationships, of place, and of mind become communities of memory. Being a part of a community of memory sustains us when the going is tough, connects us when we are not physically present, and provides us with a history for creating sense and meaning. (p. 51)

For John, this “community of learning” was the parent school and it was out of that experience that John spoke to the teachers:
John commented, “What we are doing is right.” He said that this type of behavior happens every year and has for the past 13 years, usually a little later in the year, however. He believed that in Joan's absence, a “power vacuum” resulted, and “the students are trying to fill it.” He stated again that this type of incident happened every year and that “Everything will be okay.” John said it was “time for tough love,” and if the teachers had any problems with their students, to send them to him. John closed the meeting by reiterating, “Everything will be okay.” (Researcher's log, November 3, 1997)

In this circumstance, John was seeking to shape the culture and was making what Kline and Saunders (1998) described as “an honest and fearless self-assessment of the climate and culture” (p. 56). Critical to this shaping, however, was the response from the teachers as they moved forward in relating to and interacting with their students. In advising the teachers to establish clearer lines of authority and exercise “tough love,” John was relying on his own assumptions and on what had been effectively employed in the past to solve similar problems. This critical event, Joan's absence and the subsequent challenging behavior of the students, created an atmosphere where the culture moved from “absolutely no established patterns” to established patterns that overtime would become shared basic assumptions.

Summary

The components of culture which were most consequential in the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School were addressed in this chapter. These components are: (a) history, (b) core principles, (c) leadership, (d) membership, (e) practices, (f) decision making, (g) environment, and (h) critical events. These components, while separated for purposes of organizing and reporting data, are, as indicated by the findings, inter-related.

Appreciating the limited time (31 visits) I spent at Chapman Friends School and desiring to present as fair and honest a portrayal of the school as possible, I invited John to review and comment on my findings as written in chapter four. He accepted my offer and responded to me by phone and in writing regarding the chapter's content. Overall, John's comments were affirmative, and where I had excluded pertinent information, he noted that on the manuscript he returned to me. In addition, he expressed an appreciation for my fairness in reporting and for “capturing the
essence" of Chapman Friends School.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

"Nothing should prevent a research question or problem statement from undergoing the same metamorphosis as the researcher during the course of a study" (Wolcott, 1990, p. 32). This phenomenon proved true in my study of Chapman Friends School. My purposes were twofold: (a) to conduct a descriptive case study of the creation of culture within a new school; and (b) to explore culture through the following concepts: core principles, history, practices, problem solving, language, membership, and environment. My experience and research findings dictated some changes to this original set: Leadership proved too significant to remain a subcategory under membership, decision making replaced problem solving, and I included critical events as a separate category. I also chose to integrate the language component with all the other components as appropriate. In ordering this final chapter, I have followed the advice of Wolcott, reporting "what is," not "what ought to be" (p. 55), and have organized the chapter into four sections: (a) concluding summary, (b) implications for the development of culture in schools, (c) recommendations for further study, and (d) personal reflections.

Concluding Summary

My study of Chapman Friends School supports Daniel's (1987) finding that "Culture may be viewed . . . as a learned product of group existence. Culture is transmitted to group members who over a period of time learn the appropriate organizational responses to problems that arise within the organization" (p. 12). In studying the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School during its first year, I confronted a community of students, teachers, administrators, and parents who were, together, learning "the appropriate organizational responses" as well as individual responses to not only problems, but every day situations and encounters with one another and with those outside the immediate school environment. To the extent that there existed among the school members some congruity of assumptions – about how individuals should interact, how relationships should evolve, how groups should function, and, fundamentally, how schools should operate – there was movement toward the creation of culture, what Schein (1992) characterized as "a striving toward patterning and integration" (p. 11). It is fair to say, and reasonable to expect,
that there was not a widespread pattern of shared institutional values and norms among the members of Chapman Friends School during its first year.

This first year saw the effects of what I have termed an “incongruity of assumptions.” Students, parents, teachers, administrators, and individuals in the neighborhood struggled, at times, in their attempts to shape Chapman Friends School into a shared image of what the school should be, how students should act, how teachers should teach, and how parents should be involved. One parent noted, “I don't think that his [John] idea of what the school should be and mine were quite the same” (Interview, August 27, 1998); and a student suggested, “Don't make any assumptions. Don't even assume this is a school” (Interview, July 30, 1998).

For Schein (1992), cultural instability results from “insufficient stability of membership, insufficient shared history of experience, or the presence of many subgroups with different kinds of shared experiences” (p. 11). These last two factors of Schein’s definition are helpful in explaining the challenges which the members of Chapman Friends School faced as they sought to create their unique school culture. The students and their parents came from different backgrounds and had experienced a variety of school settings – public, private, religious, alternative – with varying degrees of success. This diversity of experience, not surprisingly, resulted in a melange of expectations on the part of students and parents about the school's defining characteristics. As Schein could have predicted, these expectations were not always met. They were, however, straightforwardly confronted, and in this confrontational process Chapman Friends School came to be what it is.

While all the inter-related components which generally comprise a definition of culture were manifest during the school’s first year, the data presented in chapter four support the critical importance of the following three factors in the creation of culture: (a) core principles and the symbolic interactions where-by they were transmitted, (b) charismatic leadership, and (c) the consensus-based standards for student membership. These components emerge as the most effective for the development of normative behavior and responses as well as for the development of the tacitly agreed-upon values and assumptions which underlie such norms. Following are the concluding summaries.
Core Principles

Analogous to Schein's (1992) finding that “the essence of a culture lies in the pattern of basic underlying assumptions” (p. 26), the most important component in the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School was the fundamental Quaker belief that there is that of God in every person. This core belief, manifested in the Meeting for Worship ritual and an educational philosophy which decried control of students, was at the heart of John's compelling vision; and it was this vision which attracted others as well as challenged those who did not initially understand and appreciate the educational implications of such a belief.

In my final interview with John, I asked what he would want to see if he returned to the school in ten years. John identified four essentials: (1) Meeting for Worship, (2) simplicity, (3) authenticity, and (4) community service. John defined simplicity as “an anti-materialism stance" and authenticity as “deep inner travel for every member of the faculty" (Interview, June 23, 1998). My findings validate the importance and practice of Meeting for Worship, the emphasis on fostering personal authenticity, the call to live simply, and the integration of community service into the core curriculum. From the start, the members of the school community were instructed in the significance, power, and mystery of Meeting for Worship and then given regular opportunities to practice the ritual. Students’ lack of appreciation for its importance at times did not preclude their weekly participation in it. The deeper assumption underlying this ritual was that “God speaks to us” in the silence; thus Chapman Friends School made time for the silence.

Further evidence of the critical role of core principles is found in the contract renewal process. When Joan and the faculty came together to decide which students would not receive an invitation to return the following year, they based their decisions on the individual student's adherence to the core values as listed in the Seven Commitments. The daily interactions among students and teachers were shaped by these commitments and the underlying Quaker beliefs from which they originated. In the end, students who were not invited back were those who did not observe these commitments, nor share the underlying values and beliefs. Thus, while Joan and the teachers ultimately made the contract renewal decisions, their reliance on the commitments as a basis for those decisions identified the Quaker beliefs as the school's essence.

The core principle of “that of God in everyone" also influenced instruction and curriculum.
Complete teacher autonomy derived from an educational philosophy that identified control as “blocking God's will.” Thus, the teachers' struggles and triumphs, as they sought to realize the “Chapman way,” became what Schein (1992) identified as culture – “the residue of the learning process” (p. 68). In the area of curriculum, the school’s lack of academic rigor was a concern for some teachers, parents, and students. Important to note, however, is the school's foremost commitment to creating an environment where individuals grow in authenticity and personal integrity. Consequently, the students' emotional and psychological needs were as significant, and at times took precedence over, the academic program. For a few students, the fact that they were even attending school on a daily basis was a considerable accomplishment. While the teachers believed more academic rigor was in order, it is important to realize that Chapman Friends School was serving a unique student population whose needs went well beyond a high school education and preparation for college.

In drawing conclusions about core principles, an important question remains to be answered: “What makes this school Quaker?” For John and Fran, Meeting for Worship is the “sine qua non” of Chapman Friends School. Yet, not all members of the school community had this same conviction. My research revealed some discrepancy in the members' understanding of the importance of Meeting for Worship. While I was not surprised to find such an inconsistency among the students and their parents – all except one of whom had had no prior experience with such meetings – the same uncertainty among the faculty was unexpected. One wonders if the ritual of Meeting for Worship, alone, regardless of an individual participant's view about it, is sufficient enough to confirm its critical status in identifying a school as Quaker.

A related factor is the absence of a Quaker majority among faculty, staff, and students. My interview data indicated that some teachers, students, and parents believed that for a school to be Quaker, it had to have some Quakers in it. John and Fran spoke to the necessity of having a majority of Quakers on the school board and expressed some concern in finding teachers who were also Quaker. Yet, in describing Nolan, the newly appointed principal of the parent school, John stated, “He's thoroughly Quaker. He may not call himself that. But his spiritual depth makes him a Quaker” (Interview, June 23, 1998). Such a statement raises the question: Just how significant to the Chapman Friends School culture is the presence of Quakers as opposed to those who are
non-Quakers but embrace the Quaker philosophy and commit to its principles? Moreover, how will the school maintain its Quaker identity as it continues to secularize? Remaining faithful to the school’s Quaker roots and traditions in an increasingly secularizing environment might possibly involve more formal codification of the beliefs, values, traditions, goals, objectives, and “rules and regs” for the benefit of future headmasters and principals who may not be Quaker.

Leadership

Leadership played a profound role in the creation of culture at Chapman Friends School. John, Joan, and Katie influenced the school culture in unique and diverse ways as they acted on shared assumptions and values grounded in Quaker philosophy and their own previous experience at the parent school. John, as founder and headmaster, distinguished himself as the critical, culture-bearing leader. My findings support Schein’s (1983) claim, “The ultimate organizational culture will always reflect the complex interaction between (1) the assumptions and theories that founders bring to the group initially and (2) what the group learns subsequently from its own experiences” (p. 14). John's leadership significantly affected the creation of culture to such an extent that he was, according to one teacher, “the ‘be all’ and ‘end all’ of Quakerism. . . , the silence” itself.

Joan, the faculty, staff, students, and their parents spoke about John's influence on the school and them individually. Whether or not John consciously intended this, his actions and words carried symbolic meaning for the members of the school community and shaped the vision of what Chapman Friends School should be. In appointing Joan principal, hiring like-minded teachers, interviewing potential students, discussing the importance of the silence, participating in Meeting for Worship, negotiating peacefully with the neighbors, conducting trust workshops, and challenging parents’ views on education and parenting, John was performing the work of cultural leader and actively realizing his vision for the school.

John's charismatic, authentic, and intimate approach with the students also influenced the parents. During John and Fran’s retirement celebration, a parent remarked:

Even though the students learn to be people of honesty and integrity, the parents, too, are influenced by the experience of their own children. As the students bring home things John
said in class, the parents found that they could not help but become a little introspective themselves. Such experiences led to their own spiritual growth. (Researcher's log, June 6, 1998)

Responding to questions about his retirement, John alluded to this influence and stated, “A school shouldn't become too much the reflection of one person.” While the school was not “too much” a reflection of John, it had become “a reflection” of him to the extent that his vision, grounded in strongly-held Quaker beliefs, was being realized. According to Sergiovanni (1996), “effective following” is about being “compelled by the same . . . ideas, values, and commitments” and not simply the magnetism of a charismatic leader (p. 153). An illustration of this is found in the remarks another parent made during John and Fran's retirement ceremony:

When I first came to Chapman Friends School and interviewed with John as to whether this would be a good school for my son, I asked a lot of questions about science, math, computers, etc. I realized they didn't seem to have a lot of that, and I was concerned. Then I saw the book The Road Less Traveled [Peck, 1978] on John's bookshelf, and I just knew this was going to be the right place. And it has been. (Researcher's log, June 6, 1998)

What made John an effective leader was his ability to articulate in speech, writing, and action Quaker beliefs and values as well as a philosophy of education which attracted the support of Joan, the faculty and staff, and, to varying degrees of congruity, the students and their parents. John's vision for the school was compelling, and his efforts in creating a shared sense of meaning, rooted in these beliefs and values, proved influential.

Membership

According to Schein (1992), at the outset, it is the leader who defines the criteria for membership, and this proved to be the case at Chapman Friends School. In seeking to create a new school the “Chapman way," John selected a principal and teachers who shared his values and mirrored his educational vision. In one sense, he hired other “co-creators of culture" whose beliefs were congruent with his. In initially selecting students, John and Joan sought to accept those students who appeared to “buy into” the Chapman Friends School philosophy and way of doing
things. These decisions on membership provided an opportunity for John and Joan to shape the culture in a specific way, at least to the extent that their perceptions of individual teachers and students were accurate.

According to meeting notes from a faculty and staff retreat in January 1998, a teacher asked, "Could [Chapman Friends School] have happened if Patrick, Katie, and Joan had not already experienced it" (Price, 1998, p. 4)? Such a query illustrates the critical influence of the original members on the creation of culture. Patrick, Katie, and Joan had previously experienced the Chapman way and, thus, already shared some basic beliefs about educating as well as a commitment to Quaker values. In addition, John sought to hire teachers who were Quaker or who were Quaker in spirit, if not in name, as demonstrated by his invitation to Carol and Tom to teach at the school. The data presented in chapter four underscore the function of these co-creators of culture at Chapman Friends School.

Regarding student membership, an incongruity of assumptions existed, as one parent noted: Depending on where you're coming from, you might have a totally different view of the school. If my child was on house arrest . . . and was failing in school, and he suddenly becomes more of a norm to society, then, yes, I'd think the school was wonderful. . . . But my window is entirely different. I've got a student who needs to be taught. . . . Chapman Friends School should be totally honest about who they will accept. . . . I would have liked to have known that. (Interview, August 27, 1998)

A teacher also commented on the student body and observed:

We try to accommodate so many people that it starts becoming really wishy-washy in my mind as to what this place is going to be like. It's still a school. We do have expectations, and we're not just going to give you credit because you happen to think you deserve it. Also, we're not going to just let anyone in here. (Interview, June 15, 1998)

Both these comments highlight Schein's (1992) finding that "the presence of many subgroups with different kinds of shared experiences" (p. 11) poses challenges to the creation of culture. Whereas some students were truly the "bright underachievers" seeking an alternative to public education, others were "high risk" students seeking some place that would take a chance on them. This mix proved a challenge to both teachers and parents who were acting as if the students enrolling in
Chapman Friends School were “those whose very creativity and intelligence make a ‘standard’ school seem pallid” (“A New Chapman Friends School?” [Brochure]). Yet, during my interview with Fran, she expressed hope that Chapman Friends School would “always take high-risk, high-gain applicants” (Interview, June 23, 1998).

This conflict of standards for membership was eventually resolved through the contract renewal process, which was an absolute index of the culture in that it identified definitively who was in and who was out of Chapman Friends School. The contract renewal process separated those students whose behavior reflected some shared beliefs about how to be and act from those whose behavior reflected opposing beliefs. As the data illustrate, the contract renewal process enjoined the faculty and staff to collectively articulate the kind of school Chapman Friends School would be, the kind of culture it would become.

**Implications for the Development of Culture in Schools**

In identifying the implications for the development of culture in schools, a parent's comments are noteworthy, “I think you've got a very unique school, and I'm not sure that it's going to carry across to other places. There are just so many unusual, unique things about Chapman that it's hard to get a generalization out of it” (Interview, August 27, 1998). Chapman Friends School’s uniqueness notwithstanding, my findings do have some general implications for the development of culture in schools, most specifically for private and religious-based schools. These implications focus on (a) core beliefs, (b) authentic leadership, (c) hiring practices, (d) the process and procedures for selecting and declining students, and (e) the environment.

**Core Beliefs**

Chapman Friends School's desire to connect Quaker beliefs to school practices was at the heart of creating its unique culture during its first year. The Quaker belief that there is that of God in everyone and the way in which the school sought to genuinely realize it, has profound implications for other religious-based schools with similar beliefs. For while this particular belief is promulgated in other religious-based schools, actual practices do not always manifest it. This is evidenced in the top-down decision-making policies and controls placed on teachers and students
in some of these schools. The findings from Chapman Friends School illustrate the positive effect of arriving at decisions through a sense of the meeting, through a process which recognizes the significance of each voice. Such a consensus-based structure poses a challenge to those institutional structures which rely on a more hierarchical or bureaucratic method of operating.

Subsequent to the belief that God resides in each person is the school’s sincere desire to not control high school-age students. The absence of a student handbook at Chapman Friends School evidences this further. What would be the consequence of educators asking students and their parents to commit to principles grounded in their school’s philosophy, as opposed to agreeing to and signing off on an ever-increasing list of “dos and don’ts” as a condition of enrollment. Chapman Friends School’s Seven Commitments find support in Sergiovanni’s (1996) call to create school “covenants” (p. 63) and to view schools as “sacred enterprises” (p. 63). In a decade which has seen a proliferation of standardized testing and mandated curricula, the Chapman Friends School philosophy of allowing teachers great latitude in designing course objectives and selecting textbooks appears restricted in most schools. The alignment of practice with the core belief that God speaks to each person individually demands a certain degree of freedom of expression for Quaker teachers for that particular “voice of God” to be heard. At the very least, the absence of a student handbook and the generous degree of autonomy afforded teachers should cause other religious-based school administrators to pause and consider the extent to which their core beliefs are aligned with school practices.

For Quakers, the important things in life cannot be measured, thus Chapman Friends School emphasized learning and growing in authenticity, not achievement scores, honor rolls, and standardized testing. While many school leaders would agree that the important things in life cannot be measured, their actual school practices often underscore the significance of academic success and high standardized test scores over less tangible values, such as authenticity, honesty, integrity, charity, compassion, and understanding. The earnest desire of the school to steadfastly integrate Quaker philosophy and principles into the many facets of school life presents a model for other religious-based schools with similar beliefs and values.

Perhaps most compelling is the whole notion of “letting go of control.” While the research literature is replete with findings affirming the importance of conscientious and deliberate culture
building (Cook, 1998; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Deal & Peterson, 1990; McDonald, 1991; Owens, 1987; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Pettigrew, 1979; Shafritz & Ott, 1987; Stolp & Smith, 1995).

Chapman Friends School allows for ambiguity and room for the evolution of culture, as opposed to the conscious manipulation of it. Thus, teachers are not given a manual of guidelines and specific curriculum objectives, students are not given a long list of behavioral standards with specific consequences for transgressing them, and the value of the “ineffable” silence is paramount.

True to its core belief, the school allows for the “God within” to manifest itself as it will. In the mysterious, ineffable silence, Chapman Friends School finds its purest meaning, its very nature. Such a phenomenon answers the question Schein (1992) raised:

When we pose this issue of perpetual learning in the context of culture analysis, we confront a paradox. Culture is a stabilizer, a conservative force, a way of making things predictable. Does this mean, then, that culture itself is increasingly dysfunctional, or is it possible to imagine a culture that by its very nature is learning oriented, adaptive, and innovative? Can one stabilize perpetual learning and change? What would a culture that favored learning look like? (p. 361)

Such a culture would look like Chapman Friends School.

**Authentic Leadership**

Recognizing the unique status and mission of schools, Sergiovanni (1996) developed a new theory of school leadership and concluded:

The roots of school leadership are not found in providing “visionary leadership” as described by corporate writers, but in serving the common good, in ministering to the needs of the school, and in providing the oversight that protects the school and keeps it on a true course, clarifying purposes, promoting unity, and helping people to understand the problems they face and to find solutions. The image proposed for schools is leadership as pedagogy. . . . Leadership as pedagogy calls both leader and followers alike to higher levels of commitment, to higher levels of goodness, to higher levels of effort, and to higher levels of accountability. (p. xvi)

I believe Sergiovanni’s image of school leadership parallels the image which John, Joan, and the
faculty sought to realize. In the case of Chapman Friends School, however, I would replace “leadership as pedagogy” with "leadership as authenticity."

Leadership as authenticity challenges some of the current conceptions of school leadership and dramatically changes the leader's focus. Similar to Sergiovanni, such a leadership image demands more of school leaders and followers, yet it also alters the focus. The authentic leader's focus is not external, but internal. The first and primary focus of the leader is his or her own quest for authenticity. I believe this was the case at Chapman Friends School. To the extent that John and Joan realized this, Chapman Friends School was on course to becoming what it was to be.

The implications of such an image of school leadership are profound indeed. Much of school leadership training today is devoted to the methods, strategies, and dynamics of leading and managing effective schools and not to the development of “authentic” leaders. What would happen if the focus switched and school leaders, themselves, became the center of their study in school leadership? What effect would this have on training, mentoring, and professional development in schools? What effect would authentic leadership have on faculty, students, and their parents? What would happen if personal authenticity replaced academic achievement and high standardized test scores as the critical measure of a school’s success? Such a possibility appears to be far-fetched, but I sincerely believe that it is worth contemplating, at least to the extent that the educational establishment might acknowledge more readily that effective leadership in schools is rooted in personal authenticity.

**Hiring Practices**

Both the research literature and my own findings indicate the significant role of school leaders in hiring like-minded people as they begin a new school enterprise. The approaches John used in finding teachers (identifying former graduates, speaking at Quaker meetings) and the intimate, personal style of interviewing them aided John in selecting teachers who would later become co-creators of culture with him. Private and religious-based school administrators have considerable autonomy in this regard, and their attention to the hiring process and the selection of faculty and staff can serve to foster the kind of school culture they desire. Selecting individuals who have had related, positive experience with the kind of culture the leader seeks to create
maximizes that possibility.

Another finding with implications for those involved with hiring school personnel is John's appointing non-Quakers (in name, but not spirit) as principals of Chapman Friends Schools. Such an action acknowledges the valuing of the absoluteness of authenticity of character over credentials, titles, and official religious affiliations. It also provokes discussion on the criteria for hiring and the requirements expected of individuals seeking employment. Presently, as the number of individuals entering the educational field declines, private and religious-based school leaders will be confronted with a smaller pool of candidates, some of whom may not possess the customary and traditional credentials (i.e., official members of the organized faith), but who, nonetheless, share the same basic underlying assumptions which reflect a particular school philosophy. The success of Chapman Friends Schools over the years can offer some assurance to religious-based schools with declining numbers of faith members.

**The Process and Procedures for Selecting and Declining Students**

The selection of students is also a critical factor in creating a new school culture. At Chapman Friends School, John and Joan played key roles in choosing which students would eventually be accepted. During the interview process, both John and Joan tried to discern whether a particular individual fit the image of a Chapman Friends School student. The interview and, to a lesser degree, the letters of recommendation served as the initial culture screening devices. In creating new schools, private and religious-based school administrators have the power to establish parameters and specifically define the criteria for acceptance. The extent to which this screening process is aligned with a school's core beliefs, values, and mission, the greater the likelihood that the students selected will buy into the school culture.

A second implication relates to the involvement of the faculty and staff in the contract renewal process. In many private and religious schools, the expulsion or non-acceptance of a student is generally made by those in administrative positions. At Chapman Friends School, all the members of the faculty and the principal were involved in a consensus-based selection of the students who would not be invited back the following year. Such a practice, rooted in the Quaker tradition of arriving at decisions through a sense of the meeting, poses a challenge to private and
religious-based school administrators and their faculties. The involvement of all the teachers in such decisions introduces an unprecedented degree of accountability for defining a school's cultural parameters as they relate to membership. In addition, such a process is a means by which school faculties can regularly confront and articulate their school's beliefs, core values, and behavioral norms. Such an exercise can serve to strengthen a school culture and reunite school members in realizing their school's mission.

**The Environment**

One of the questions raised on my first visit to Chapman Friends School was, “Could a Catholic school ever be housed in a Jewish temple?” As a general rule, schools are built, not found and leased, as in the case of Chapman Friends School. While there existed some dissatisfaction with the site because of restrictions imposed by the temple administration and surrounding neighborhood, these limitations did not prevent the daily operating and functioning of the school. As opposed to building a school, using valuable natural resources in the process, Chapman Friends School sought to “build simply” within a space that created both opportunities and challenges.

What made this environmental condition poignant was the way in which the opportunities and challenges it presented became instruments of learning. Chapman Friends School students learned, if only superficially, about Jewish faith practices and to respect the sacredness of the temple. They also learned about the rights of the neighbors, as well as some neighbors’ prejudices and the means for addressing them. The students were learning “life lessons.” More so, the school’s location in the temple powerfully illustrated a core Quaker value of not looking “to outward symbolism for religious truth” (Punshon, 1987, p. 84). As one student remarked, “We're concentrating much more on what's inside us. We're more concerned with what's coming out of us than what's coming into us” (Interview, September 4, 1998). Thus, while Deal and Kennedy (1983) asserted the importance of a school building and its impact on the school culture, the location and site of Chapman Friends School disputes the assumption that schools should be separate institutions, in specially designed buildings, wherein the decor and symbols boldly manifest the school’s essence. As American society becomes more culturally diverse and an appreciation for our limited natural resources grows, might such intimate integration between
schools and other institutions cultivate understanding among students and adults that no curriculum could surpass?

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The findings and conclusions of my study of Chapman Friends School have highlighted four specific areas in need of further study in primarily private and religious-based schools: (a) screening practices and procedures that can be implemented at the initial stage of student enrollment that would favorably shape a school culture, (b) the impact of secular leaders on the creation of culture in religious-based schools, (c) the effects of the absence of a Quaker majority in Quaker schools, and (d) alternative school settings and their impact on school culture. In addition, the thought of returning to Chapman Friends School to study the evolution of its culture over the past two years intrigues me. My own research has led me to conclude that studying a school's culture comprehensively necessitates a longitudinal study. A longitudinal study would allow the researcher to discover “a pattern of shared basic assumptions, that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 1992, p. 12). Moreover, a greater depth of insight and knowledge of school culture would be gained.

Examining student screening practices that favorably shape a school culture is worthy of further study. In speaking to Joan about the initial screening process and whether some of the students who were accepted might otherwise not have been accepted, she noted, “When I look at those students that we said no to [at the end of the year], they didn’t start out the year acting like we made a mistake” (Interview, July 10, 1998). Other than interviews, letters of recommendation, and registration forms, are there other approaches which ensure a more homogenous group of students at the start? What enrollment practices, procedures, and policies exist within private and religious-based schools which foster a cohesive school culture without stifling growth? What has proven effective in identifying likely candidates for a particular school? At a time when parents are employing educational specialists to assist them in selecting the most appropriate school for their children, might the practices of these consultants, who are paid to make good matches between a
student and a school, be worth investigating. While there is always potential for unfair and unethical enrollment screening practices, this proposed study would examine enrollment practices which promote a cohesive and productive school culture.

The impact of secular leaders on the creation of culture in religious-based schools and the long-term effect of the absence of a Quaker majority in Quaker schools are related in that they address a growing pattern in Quaker and other religious-based schools – the increasing number of administrators, faculty members, and students who are not sanctioned members of a school’s faith tradition. What are the effects of this secularizing movement on the creation and evolution of culture in Quaker as well as other religious-based schools? Has this predicament fostered special mentoring and training programs for administrators and faculty which promote understanding of a school's faith culture? What kind of orientation do students who are not members of their school's faith tradition receive, and what is the impact of such orientation on the creation of culture in these schools? A study of the effects of the secularizing of religious-based schools and the schools' formal responses to this condition is both timely and worthy of attention.

The school’s location in a Jewish temple appears to contradict some of what the research literature states about the importance of the school environment and its impact on the school culture. While the temple setting was restrictive in specific ways, it also afforded the teachers and students with opportunities for learning significant life lessons. These lessons involved sharing space with other groups, building relationships, and finding solutions to problems which resulted from being in the temple. It is time to examine the “separate and detached” school setting philosophy and consider the possibility of a more “integrated and attached” philosophy. Thus, a study of alternative or non-traditional school settings and their impact on school culture is both warranted and philosophically daring.
Personal Reflections

It is not possible to remain objective or to leave the culture as one found it. One's very presence is an intervention; therefore, one's own role as an agent of change must become part of the analysis and written description. (Schein, 1992, p. 186)

In studying Chapman Friends School, I have been afforded a unique and rare opportunity. That John, Joan, and the teachers were open to my study during the school's first year of operation cannot be taken for granted, and such openness early on says something significant about these educators and their quest for authenticity.

There were times throughout my study of Chapman Friends School that I wondered if things would have proceeded differently had I not been present. I recall the weekly faculty meetings and sharing my "goods and news," which frequently related to my own challenges as a principal. During interviews I sometimes expressed my personal philosophy on education and shared with John, Joan, the teachers, and parents how my experience at Chapman Friends School made me reflect on my own beliefs and educational practices. When John introduced me at the parent workshops, I marveled at the parents' seemingly lack of inhibition and appreciated their candor in spite of my presence. In some respects, the fact that Chapman Friends School was the topic of a doctoral study added an element of notoriety to this novice enterprise. When the softball team was in need of an extra player one afternoon, I gladly volunteered, and my joining the students and teacher in the van ride to the softball field did not appear to squelch the students' comments on the happenings within the school.

As Joan and the teachers were deciding what to do with their unused "snow days," I casually mentioned what my school was doing and they followed suit. When Joan was ruminating over whether to insist on requiring the students to attend the end-of-the-year overnight field trip, I encouraged her to trust her instincts and require them to participate. During my midyear interviews with John and Joan, I suspect that some of my questions prompted their own thinking about Chapman Friends School and the direction it was taking. At times, I also wondered if comments were made and actions taken precisely for my benefit and in the hope that I would record them for posterity. Certainly, John's comment regarding the importance of the silence
heightened my own awareness of it and the attention I afforded it.

What I had not anticipated, however, was the considerable influence Chapman Friends School would have on me personally. My teaching and leadership experience has been in Catholic elementary schools – rich in faith, community, symbol, ritual, tradition, the written word, hierarchy, and structure. Almost instantly, I found myself comparing what I encountered at Chapman Friends School to my own experience as a principal in a Catholic school. Rephrasing a question asked by John Woolman, an eighteenth century Quaker leader "who almost singlehandedly rid the Society of Friends (Quakers) of slaves" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 29), I began to ask myself, "What does this practice [any practice] say about me as a Catholic school educator and leader?" Thus, the lack of “the written word” – policy manuals, parent and student handbooks, detailed discipline codes, curriculum guidelines – at Chapman Friends School caused me to question the ubiquity of it in my own school and my yearly additions to our parent and student handbook. What would happen if we created our own set of guiding commitments and asked students and their parents to commit to them, to make a covenental agreement?

The practice of arriving at decisions through a sense of the meeting challenged my administrative approach to making decisions. On one occasion with my own school community, I deliberately set forth procedures for a large group discussion which reflected a Quaker meeting. Instead of a question-and-answer format, I invited the parents to articulate their concerns but refrain from asking questions and from responding to each other's comments. This approach allowed me to gain insight into the parents' concerns and the end result was enhanced understanding on everyone's part. Had we proceeded with the typical question-and-answer approach, I have no doubt that an atmosphere of defensiveness would have ensued.

The school’s twice-weekly silent Meeting for Worship heightened my appreciation for and encouragement of the Catholic prayer tradition of silent adoration before the Blessed Sacrament. The ritual of the fire circles prompted me to recommend to my own teachers that they try something similar with their students to build community and foster understanding. The absence of an academic honor roll at Chapman Friends School persists to prod my conscience as I continue this academic tradition in my own school.

Finally, what has inspired me most throughout this entire process has been the openness of
John, Joan, and all the faculty and staff of Chapman Friends School. John wholeheartedly meant what he said during one of our early phone conversations, “We're an open book.” Early on, when John disclosed to the school parents that he was a recovering alcoholic, I learned something about authenticity. The Quaker call to live authentically, such that one's outside truly reflects one's inside, was evidenced to me again and again during my visits to the school. I continually felt fortunate to be among people who were candid and forthright about themselves and their daily struggles. In my final interview with John, he stated:

If a faculty member is unwilling to do the inner work, they don't stay very long. It's not like we're a religious order; but we do require this discipline of traveling in and doing the inner work. And that's what grooms you for authenticity, which is being the same on the outside as on the inside. (Interview, June 23, 1998)

Such “inner work” was not the faculty’s alone, it was also mine. Clearly, Chapman Friends School is a fascinating and thought-provoking place to study. As one student so poignantly stated, “Chapman was enough of a drug for me. Everyday at Chapman you got to experience new sides of people. For me it was almost a utopia, as much as a school can be” (Interview, July 30, 1998). The Chapman way has both enriched and challenged my own thinking and assumptions about learning, teaching, leadership, and the spiritual life. I am indebted to John, Joan, Fran, and all the members of Chapman Friends School for their part in moving me along the path toward authenticity. It has been a sacred privilege.