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ABSTRACT

This dissertation describes a study of teachers' attitudes and feelings toward the school in which they work, in this case, an unorthodox junior high school in a suburb of an eastern metropolis. The investigation deals primarily with how teachers feel about the goals of the school and how these affect teachers professionally and personally; what they perceive to be a supportive environment in which they can grow professionally and personally; and how they perceive the socialization which occurs in the school.

Chapter One establishes the specific conditions in which teachers at Bright Meadows find themselves. This is done by first presenting a history of the school's fourteen years of existence, and then by analysing the various relationships among staff in the school.

Chapter Two places the school in context by demonstrating how Bright Meadows incorporates several ideals of the progressive movement in education; and then establishes a framework for this particular study by examining genres of literature which are relevant.

Chapter Three discusses the methodology employed in the study. This study was conducted by means of a series of interviews, using a schedule. The information thus collected was then coded, placed on the computer and each question was analysed for frequency distributions.

Chapter Four discusses the analysis and interpretation of the data.
From the data twelve individual teachers are selected and presented as profiles in Chapter Five. These twelve represent outstanding characters and also issues which are significant to the institution. This chapter also includes a composite of the ideal teacher as perceived by the interviewees. Finally, Chapter Six discusses the conclusions.

Two major samples were used in this study; the larger sample was made up of teachers at the school in the second half of the academic year 1969-70. The second sample was composed of teachers who had taught in the school since 1961 when Bright Meadows instituted the program which led to its unorthodoxy, but who were no longer at the school.

In general the study establishes that teachers at Bright Meadows feel positively toward the school and think that the goal for students in fact contributes to their own professional freedom in the school.

The study shows that the following factors constitute a supportive environment in which teachers can grow professionally and personally: 1) that the school has stated goals for students; 2) that teachers perceive that the implementation of the goals is different from what happens in most schools; 3) that teachers have the freedom and opportunity to learn and try out new skills and competencies in the course of teaching because the teaching role includes a variety of components; 4) that there is an opportunity for leadership among teachers; 5) that teachers can develop the curriculum and have control over what and how they teach; 6) that teachers are involved in the governance of the school; 7) that teachers are working with what they consider to be a very competent staff in a way which is open and helpful; and
g) that teachers relate to children in a humane manner.

The study also demonstrates that the informal socialization which occurs at Bright Meadows is considered to be insufficient to prepare them to implement the goals of the school as effectively as they would like. Teachers express the need for continuous in-service training and clear leadership.
Preface

Institutions, like individuals who establish meaningful relationships, create private languages. One long-lived Bright Meadows expression is that "the school is built on paper." This refers, in part, to the fact that Bright Meadows has been very well documented by people both from within and without. But one aspect of the school which has been little discussed, certainly on paper, is what it is like to be a teacher there.

On the national scene, the trend has been the opposite. Teachers are very much in the literature, as writers and critics, as objects of surveys, as subjects of conferences, as heroes in television dramas, and as factors in the educational debate. For example, whether one looks at the Plowden Report which asserts the need and efficacy of the informal or open classroom, or whether one looks at the Silberman report which finds American schools joyless, oppressive and mutilating, one cannot but see the implications for teachers. If schooling is to change, teachers' customary roles must change.

While it has long been a tradition in America for the schools to socialize children into the society, as well as to prepare them for doing the work of the society, it is now becoming fashionable also to expect the schools to cure the societal ills; this at a time when it is becoming unquestionably accepted (although John Dewey pointed this out in 1916)
that the school provides only a small fraction of the total education of the child; this at a time also when the society is changing more rapidly than ever before.

Whatever one believes to be the function of schooling, one cannot avoid the fact that one places a great deal of the burden for fulfilling the job on the shoulders of teachers. Myron Lieberman in The Future of Public Education goes even further, saying that "most worthwhile educational reforms will have to be initiated and carried out by teachers" (underlining mine).

We know a great deal about what teachers are like in the typical school. We can look at our memories of teachers we have had. We can look at non-fiction like Myron Brenton's book, What's Happened to Teacher, or we can look at a novel like Up The Down Staircase, for that picture. But what are they like in a school that is trying (the word is advisedly underlined) what the Plowden and Silberman reports suggest, what the Romantic critics cry out for? This is what interests me about Bright Meadows and this is what I plan to examine in this dissertation.

Before looking at the teachers themselves, one must examine the setting in which they find themselves. The setting of Bright Meadows is best described by a history of the school.
Chapter One: Part One: The Historical Setting

1. The Problem of Historiography

As Joseph Conrad so clearly demonstrates in his novels, arriving at the truth, whatever that may be, is a tortuous path, strewn with quotations within quotations and approximations within approximations. Reconstructing what actually happened in an institution, and why it happened, has the same kinds of hazards. This particular institution, Bright Meadows, offers the historian several kinds of obstacles, because in some ways more than enough has been written about it, and in other ways there is a shocking paucity of documentation. For example, no running record of experimental classroom practices was kept by the school over the years. While there is always the problem of distance and bias in the resurrection of events from a variety of sources, Bright Meadows has been the center of so much controversy that for every event there are undoubtedly more interpretations extant than for most schools.¹

There were three specific problems which were faced in trying to establish what happened at Bright Meadows and why. First, the problem of people; people's memories are frail. They simply cannot remember some details such as names, numbers, dates. For example, it was impossible to

¹The problem was, however, not unknown to other educators. Tolstoy reports that the parents of the students at Yasnaya Polyana thought absolutely contradictory opinions of what was happening in the school.
ascertain exactly how many parents asked to have their children not participate in the pilot project. The people questioned all agree that it was in the area of a handful, but that is as precise as they can be. While it would be interesting to know the accurate number, it will not detract from this paper if the estimate is off by five.

Perhaps a more serious question is why in 1967 the use of data processing was abandoned. Again here, many people remembered various feelings of dissatisfaction, either because it was discarded or because it was not discarded sooner, but the teachers who are still at Bright Meadows who were present when that decision was made cannot remember its origin.

A second issue, which seems extremely significant and infinitely more complex, is the issue of reputation, which is to say, how do people want to appear as a result of what happened at the school. If it is important to them to seem to have thought rigorously of all contingencies and have made careful, calculated decisions, they may report what they wish had happened, or they may imply that something was considered and forsaken which in fact was not. If they have not much at stake, either because they were not closely involved in the management of the school, or because their reputation was already established, they may report events more informally, less defensively or less apologetically. A good example is the issue of parental participation in the original planning of the pilot program, which has today become important since we are in a period of discussion about "community control." One of the Centerville city-wide administrators, who was closely associated with
Bright Meadows, and is now a superintendent of schools in a nearby community, said "Nobody thought about parents being involved in those days. Certainly not in Centerville, where there had never been any question of the community being behind the school system." The first principal said, "We were in a hurry and we didn't know where we were going so we didn't really want to include parents." The coordinator of the original project who is still at Bright Meadows explaining the program to visitors says, "It was our greatest mistake not to have included parents. We've been paying for it ever since." A former Bright Meadows teacher who later became assistant principal and is now teaching in an experimental school in Centerville said that "the community was involved from the very beginning. I think the reason we are saying that the community was not involved is because people believe it. I don't think that's true at all. If we made any errors at all, it is because we may have been taking the pulse of the people who were for us in the first place." The result of these various views is that it is not clear to what extent and how the community was involved.

The second category of sources is the printed word. To glean anything from this category requires all the skills of literary criticism. Everything that is published in the school is always proofread with an eye to the community because there is no piece of paper in that school which might not go home with some child, either accidentally or purposely.

---

2 Henceforth, unless otherwise indicated all quotations come from the interview transcripts.
While the school tries to be honest in what it writes, it does not want to publicize all of its problems since as everyone knows, everyone has problems. As a result most reports such as Title III reports concentrate on progress and potential for growth; Newsletters to Parents tend to be full of factual items intended to inform parents of what is happening, but of necessity these are not full accounts. Dissemination descriptions sent all over the country are designed to pass along ideas to start other people's imaginations working. Articles and papers and theses written about the school are composed with specific biases and therefore also leave gaps, or may even be slanted. Even the minutes of the School Committee are not verbatim transcripts of what people have said. They are expanded from notes taken by hand by the Secretary to the School Committee who is never a trained secretary. Thus, although a great deal has been written, not all of it can be relied upon to have its face value.

A third issue is, of course, the writer of the history who is herself naturally biased since she has held several positions in the school since 1963 and like everyone else has an imperfect memory and definite ideas about why certain events occurred. Besides her own opinions, she is filtering all the remaining data.

Nonetheless, despite all this uncertainty and imprecision it is possible to set out the truth (as defined by Conrad), or at least as

---

3 This is changing with the third administration, and with the increase in the number of school problems which have their root in the community. See Appendix I for Position Paper on Metco, 1971.
much of the truth as is required to communicate the nature and quality of the setting in which the teachers, interviewed for this study, found themselves. That, indeed, is the purpose of this chapter.

2. A chronology

A brief chronology of the significant events in the history of Bright Meadows is presented in Table 1, and expanded in the remaining sections of chapter one, part one. Since a veritable multitude of events has occurred in the fourteen years of the school’s existence, this outline is provided to facilitate the reader’s grasp of the development of the school on the temporal dimension.

3. The Pre-Innovation Period

The school, a modern two-story structure on a small hill, was built in 1956 and its first years paralleled America’s concern for curricular reform which was sparked by Sputnik. This was the time when the national curriculum development groups produced the New Math, the New Science and the New Social Studies4 and tracks in foreign language, all influenced by the conference that led to Bruner’s *The Process of Education*.

The school was built in an area where education is valued: Centerville, the people, the School Committee, the Superintendent of schools had long been known to prize quality education. The School

---

4 A number of Bright Meadows teachers were selected in the early sixties to help create the first ESI social studies unit on the American Revolution. Later, other ESI units were developed with the help of Bright Meadows teachers. Bright Meadows was the scene of many field tests of these and other new materials.
Table 1. Chronology of Bright Meadows

1956 - The original building was completed.

1958-60 - Bright Meadows participated in study of grouping practices (SUPRAD)

1961 - School population and staff doubled. Decision taken to start pilot project in individualized instruction.
Summer workshop produced Red Book.

1962-63 - First year of pilot project. Five teachers and 155 students involved. Addition to building completed.

1963-64 - Two more teams established in Continuous Learning. French teacher added to each team.

1965-66 - A small fourth team created so half of the school was on "experimental program."

1966-67 - Entire school converted to program. Four teams double in size. Concerned Parents Committee is organized. Faculty Evaluation Committee established.

1967-68 - Jerry Gross replaces Elizabeth Crown as principal upon her retirement. Will Nevis appointed Acting Superintendent upon James Norwood's retirement.
Bright Meadows selected as one of 36 national demonstration schools in country, and receives a three year Title III OE grant for dissemination.
Publication of NYTimes article and Herald Traveler article.
School Committee led by Irving Franck agrees to have State Department of Education undertake a limited study of Bright Meadows program.

1968-69 - Acting Superintendent Nevins agrees to having Bright Meadows give grades.
Counter parents group formed, calls itself Centerville Citizens for Education.

1969-70 - Faculty Committee formed to select new principal.
Harry Strong becomes new superintendent.

1970-71 - George Schaeffer replaces Jerry Gross as principal of Bright Meadows.

---

5 The names are fictitious.
Committee had felt that quality could be achieved to some extent by offering a high degree of autonomy to building principals, and by encouraging individual school planning and diversity.

Even before the structure was completed, Elizabeth Crown, then Assistant Principal at Troop Junior High School and soon to be Principal of Bright Meadows Junior High School, began to meet with her faculty to discuss the creation of the kind of school they wanted at Bright Meadows. When John Shores, the Superintendent, told Miss Crown that she would be Principal (the first and only woman secondary school principal in Centreville), he told her that she would take 500 students from Troop and half the Troop faculty. After the disposition of the faculty was made (she and Joe Clare, Troop's Principal, bargained that out), the Bright Meadows faculty began to meet to deal with the challenges the Superintendent had given them that Bright Meadows did not have to be like any of the other four junior high schools in the city; that the school was to be designed to be appropriate to its students; that anything could be done with the students which 1) made sense to a lay school committee and 2) did not hurt them when they came up against students from other junior high schools at the high school level.

So the faculty talked about such things as the atmosphere of the building—the they decided that it should be fairly relaxed, flexible, where neither students nor teachers felt threatened, where the usual barriers between students and teachers were broken down. (They considered the use of first names for teachers but then felt that was not an important element in breaking down barriers.) They thought about their own
experiences in schools and ruled out bells, called the cafeteria a dining room, and bought tables for four. (They even talked about placemats and flowers.)

The faculty, then numbering about 25, also discussed curriculum and decided that since so many of them had spent so much time and effort developing the Troop curriculum, they would adopt that, keeping the English-Social Studies-Guidance combination which they liked (one teacher dealing with all three and called an ESG teacher. The counsellors tried to match students to their ESG teachers in order to provide an opportunity for the best possible relationship between each child and at least one of his teachers.)

During that period, that is, from 1958-60, Bright Meadows participated in an university-organized study (SUPRAD) of grouping practices, to explore the value of heterogeneous and homogeneous grouping. Neither the faculty nor the consultants were satisfied that grouping was the answer to how to teach better. As a result the faculty began hesitantly to consider individualized instruction. The idea became especially appealing since by 1961, the student population and the staff had doubled and there was concern among the faculty about how to maintain the kind of intimate and open relationship between teacher and students that had been natural when the school was small.

4. The Innovation Period

In the spring of 1962 after many meetings at which three young

male members of the faculty (all of whom had already, within their own classrooms and among themselves, been exploring ways of "breaking out of the system," including some student experiences at an outdoor camp, and some teacher experiences in team teaching) argued the need for the move, the faculty voted to start a pilot program in individualized instruction the following September. During the summer, seven people (the principal, the assistant principal, the project coordinator, three guidance counsellors and one teacher), three of whom are still on the faculty, hammered out their assumptions about the learning process and their objectives for children in the junior high school. They produced a document, The Red Book, or A Junior High School Pilot Project in Continuous Learning, which stated their philosophy and described some of the structures which they believed would implement their ideas.\(^7\)

During the school year of 1962-63 the pilot project, Alpha, was established and was composed of 155 students randomly selected from grades seven, eight and nine (every sixth child from the school's roster was taken) and five teachers (three social studies and English, one science, one math teacher and the program coordinator). The parents of the children were then told of the nature of the proposed program

\(^7\)Four teachers, the ones who were to be in the pilot program, were asked to be in the summer workshop but by the time the request was made, they had all made other commitments for the summer.

\(^8\)While the document does not footnote specific sources for their ideas, several members of the group remember talking about Trump's ideas about groups, Maslow's concept of self-actualization, Erikson and Friedenberg's thoughts on adolescence and Bruner's statements about the spiral structure of the disciplines.
and were asked to approve the participation of their children. Only a few parents objected. A matched group was selected to provide for evaluation of the Continuous Learning program. The students were matched for age, sex, IQ, feeding elementary school and socio-economic status.\textsuperscript{9}

Once the \textit{Red Book} had been written and the teachers for the project team had been selected, the administration left the specific implementation of curriculum to the teachers. Since no materials were available for individualizing each child's program, this meant that the five teachers stayed in school every afternoon talking about students, writing up materials and correcting papers. Rachel Miller, the experienced English teacher who was selected for the pilot project because the administration felt she provided validation and credibility for the older faculty members in the school who tended to be skeptical of the project, and because she had the support of the parents, claims that all five were "on the verge of exhaustion before April vacation." But, she adds, if they "had waited for the appropriate and necessary materials for individualizing, the program never would have started." And she says, "It was exhilarating being in the unique position of practically living with the team of students and teachers."

5. The Pilot Project: Philosophy and Original Implementation

The \textit{Red Book} stated the philosophy of Alpha in the following manner:

\begin{quote}
The pilot project is concerned with a way of living and
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{9}Because the pilot program lasted only one year, the control group was lost and only limited data was gathered, and that not entirely valid since it is hard to measure actual changes due to the program and actual changes due to the Hawthorne effect.
learning. This way of living and learning can be used by any group of teachers and pupils in a school of any size. It has been designed to bring together the inseparable activities of teaching and learning and to provide an opportunity for both students and faculty to work to their best advantage; a favorable environment in which to do it; a closer and more cooperative relationship. It is an organization of school life based upon the following philosophical ideals:

...that inherent in man's existence is the right to develop his individual potential

...that given the opportunity, man will select goals which are beneficial to both self and society\(^{10}\)

In order to implement the purposes of the project, a unique setting must be provided, and the philosophical attitude toward the individual and the learning climate must be described. The following are the basic assumptions and premises underlying the various facets of the project:

**ASSUMPTIONS RELATED TO THE LEARNING PROCESS**

...that learning is evidenced by a change in perception and behavior, and that the most meaningful learning takes place through the process of inquiry and discovery for oneself

...that relationships are uniquely drawn from an experience by each individual

...that there are similarities among individuals and differences among individuals

...that learning can best take place when the individual has freedom of choice

\(^{16}\) Despite this clear statement in the Red Book, for a number of years the emphasis on self outweighed the societal aspect of students' development. A realignment of priorities was forced in 1968 when there was a serious injury done to a student as a result of intergroup bickering among the students, and the faculty became conscious of the degree of the divisions in the student population and began to search for ways of teaching tolerance.
that the individual reacts to a stimulus, initiates action and progresses at a rate and depth which may be independent from other members of a group.

that learning takes place best when an individual makes a personal commitment to and becomes involved in his own education and its selective use.

Knowledge

that knowledge is that ever-growing and changing body of information which man has collected about himself and his world. Involved in this body of knowledge are his techniques of gathering, classifying and using this information.

that knowledge can be useful in and of itself, and can be used for building attitudes and developing patterns of thinking.

that there is no prescribed amount of knowledge which all children must hold in common, although there may be certain minimal standards toward which each individual should work.

The Child

that the child is in the continual process of individual growth and learns in a transactional process between his own goals and the goals set by society.

that there is a direct relationship between meaningful learning and the amount of personal, dynamic involvement.

that the child has rights and responsibilities as an individual and as a member of groups.

The Teacher

that the teacher has the primary task of contributing to a change in the perception and behavior of the student.
...that by providing opportunities for freedom of choice, the teacher helps the student accept the responsibility for his own education.

...that in fulfilling this task, the relationship between the teacher and pupil should be viewed as a transactional one where the teacher acts as a resource person.

...that learning situations must be provided at many levels, in different groupings, and enhanced by a variety of individual needs.¹¹

**The Environment**

...that the environment must be one which provides for integration of experiences, offering a daily opportunity to meet in a situation which encourages a feeling of belonging and security.

...that the student must have the chance to think and work as an individual and as a member of a small group composed of various age levels in a situation which is free from the pressures of subject content.

...that a daily opportunity must also be provided for learning to take place through the process of inquiry and discovery by a personal commitment to a task.

**The School**

...that the school should be considered an institution which is specifically

¹¹Gross and Herriot (1965) point out that the principal's Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) serves as a model for his teachers and as an expression of his definition of their role. His behavior towards them informs them of how he expects them to act toward students (p.39). So Bright Meadows teachers had not only this definition from the Red Book, but also the example set by Miss Crown.
designed to provide a setting within which the child may prepare for the place he will make for himself in society.

In order to implement these ideas, the Red Book designers and the teachers in the pilot project developed several constructs and some vocabulary. House was one of these. Each teacher on the Alpha team was, in addition to a teacher of his subject matter speciality (i.e. subject advisor), a House advisor. Each student belonged to a House which carried his House advisor's name. The House advisor tried to create an environment in which the total House group felt free to discuss any issue of concern. Such matters as school politics and student government, money-raising activities and House trips, subject-course choices and evaluations thereof, and such guidance topics as smoking, drugs, sex, racial and religious and economic differences, etc. were raised either by the students or by the House advisor and discussed by the group. As individuals, students talked about some of the same issues with the House advisor as well as family problems and other personal difficulties; but primarily the function of House for the individual student was to plan and monitor his individualized study program. This program was built by the student as he consulted with his House advisor, subject advisors and parents. His interests, needs, talents, weaknesses were all balanced. The role of the House advisor was considered key to the functioning of the program. The planning and decision-making

---

12 The number of house members has varied from 12 to 20 over the years.
which took place with the pupil, the lack of a specific subject content, such as mathematics, in the pupil-House advisor relationship and the quality of concern for the individual child symbolized the goals of the school.

A House advisor stayed with the same house for three years so that the relationships would build and grow. And the House advisor was charged with the responsibility of interpreting the program and each individual child's progress to the parents of his House students in a twice-yearly personal conference.¹³

In order to enable the House advisors and the subject advisors to provide a program which was suitable for the children on the team, the team of teachers met, on the average over the years, twice a week for about 1½ hours per meeting to discuss individual children, administrative details or demands, curriculum problems and ideas, the philosophy of the school and any other topic that was deemed relevant for the functioning of the program, including the relationships among the teachers in the team themselves.

¹³The functions of the House advisor have been a source of controversy since the second year of the program. Teachers claimed not to know how to deal with guidance issues in small groups, especially the diverse small groups which Houses always seemed to be, since they were supposed to be microcosms of the total school. While many teachers asked for help and some attempts were made to design activities for House and to explain the philosophical underpinnings of the idea, not much that was useable was forthcoming since so little was known about how to teach teachers to be House advisors. Those teachers who had success felt they had it by instinct, personal charisma and/or loyalty and were a little uncomfortable sharing their knowledge. The issue of House is a perfect example of the findings reported by Gross, Giaquinta and Bernstein (1968) and the Dundee Project (1965).
The school year was divided into four terms and before each new term the team of teachers determined the subject offerings for the following period and informed the students of the choices. This was true only of English, social studies, science and the Fine and Applied Arts. Math and language were sequential (and were the only subjects in which textbooks were regularly used). Language was taken outside the team in this first year. Courses were designed by individual teachers, groups of teachers and "professional curriculum makers" such as EDC. An attempt was made to provide a variety of materials and approaches in each course so that children of all levels and abilities could handle the course according to their own learning styles and at their own paces.14

Each child had essentially an unique program in that he manipulated the time and the subject. There were only the most general distribution requirements and those in terms of exposure. A child was expected to have an experience in each of the Fine and Applied Arts before leaving the school; he was expected to carry math, language (if he took one), three English and social studies courses (any course which was difficult to classify under traditional categories was placed in that slot), one science, and physical education each term. But even that was not a hard rule, and it was not unusual to see a child take three years of art, or two sciences in one term, for example. The House advisor would bring

14 Needless to say this was not always possible, and some courses were designed for specific groups of students and whatever prerequisites there were, were made clear to the students at course selection time.
such a special request up in the team meeting for approval.

After a course was selected, the student "contracted" to undertake a certain amount of work with each of his subject advisors. Bright Meadows' contract was a modified form of the Dalton Plan\textsuperscript{15} and was the instrument by which a student engaged in a personal commitment to a particular subject area and a particular teacher. Course requirements, activities, materials selected by the teacher and the student were all included on the contract and student and teacher engaged in a written dialectic of the student's efforts.\textsuperscript{16} Each subject advisor contracted in a slightly different way which suited his course and his personality. And a child who did not fulfill his obligations when the term ended was encouraged to continue his project while he undertook or did not undertake new contracts. If he decided not to fulfill his obligation this was noted on the contract. It was felt by the faculty and the administration that part of the decision-making process was learning to live with poor decisions and their consequences.

As the \textit{Red Book} implied, students would be learning because they wanted to, not because there were external rewards and pressures. Thus no grades were given (until the very end of the ninth grade when a predictive grade was issued because the high school and the colleges

\textsuperscript{15}Robert Skidelsky, \textit{English Progressive Schools}, p.26. According to Skidelsy, the Dalton Plan was one of the few "progressive" educational experiments carried out on the secondary level.

\textsuperscript{16}Without secretarial help for teachers, this important job was a tremendous load on teachers who sometimes taught four or five different courses with 25 to 30 different children in each course.
required it). Students were constantly evaluating themselves with their advisors through the contract. Subject advisors took into account the goals set for the course, the goals set by the individual child and the child's ability. Evaluations of students at the end of a term were written in conjunction with the student's profile, that is, a graphic representation of the child's scores on ability and achievement tests administered in the junior high school years. These scores showed where the child stood in relation to Centerville and national norms. The profile was shown to parents in the twice yearly conferences. Only in cases where the team felt that it would be traumatic for the student to see his profile was the child not shown his test scores.

6. The Expansionist Period

In 1963-64 Miss Crown decided that the program should be enlarged and so two additional teams (Beta and Gamma) were created, and a French teacher was assigned to each team. It was Miss Crown's contention, supported by some members of the faculty, that all subjects could be individualized, hence the addition of the language teacher to the team. The population on each team was increased to 160 students.

In 1964-65 the size of all three teams was increased to 180 students while the teacher size remained constant. This variation in size was due to the complaints, first of the Tri-Delta (the unchanged half of

---

17 This issue of whether all subjects should or should not be taught the same way, that is, through individualized materials, was a source of much friction among factions on the faculty. Some teachers felt that this was a de facto limitation of their right to determine the curriculum.
the school) teachers, that they were the forgotten members of the Bright Meadows faculty, that all the attention of the administration was directed toward the program; and then to those of the Continuous Learning teachers who maintained that they were doing many more jobs than their more "traditional" counterparts. They were having to be subject advisors, curriculum designers, guidance counsellors, schedulers, secretaries and clerks, teachers of teachers, public relations managers and counsellors to parents, supervisors and custodians, attenders of meetings and leaders at some, and sometimes even mothers and fathers to the children.

So in 1965-66 a fourth team, Sigma, was created and a paraprofessional was assigned to each team which had by then also acquired a newly-created learning center (that is, a place for students to explore ideas, topics, materials, etc. on their own without the classroom ambience). Subject advisors were, however, required to participate in the centers; the paraprofessionals' primary responsibility was housekeeping. Some of these aides, of course, expanded their roles to include designing programs, providing special services etc.\(^\text{18}\)

The faculty felt that one way in which students learn to make decisions is by making them daily as well as for long periods of time.

\(^\text{18}\)Over the years quite a number of these aides were subsequently hired as full members of the faculty. It is a curious trend at Bright Meadows, that because roles are never strictly defined since no one wants to restrict an individual, people often move out of their original slots (especially if they are clerical in nature) into more people-oriented positions. Everyone at Bright Meadows wants to be a teacher. Sometimes new people are hired for the original slots. But there are often small vacuums in the school because people are more interested in people than in things.
For this reason and to allow flexibility for students to see teachers on an individual basis outside the classroom environment, "unscheduled time" (approximately an hour every day) in which students could move through the building, pursuing their needs and interests, both remedial and supplementary, was institutionalized. Data processing was introduced to facilitate the use of unscheduled time, because by now half the student body was in the program. 19

Each day the student could determine his own needs for unscheduled time. That day he "pulled the card" of the teacher and/or center he wanted for the next day, and the next day two print-out sheets arrived. One was for the House advisor so that he could see the choices and patterns of choices of his House members (later this could lead to a discussion in House) and one was for the teacher or center aide so that they would know whom to expect during unscheduled time. The use of unscheduled time and centers allowed theoretically for greater individualization in that students could proceed at a pace commensurate with their ability and interests. They were not dependent entirely on the class pace or the teacher.

Also in that year, an attempt was made to describe the goals of the school in a way that was at once more rigorous and more easily transferable to people who were new to the institution. The school's

---

19 What before could have been done informally now began to require official accounting, and in some cases, conformity.
evaluator, Ernest Fitch produced the four terms which, with a few minor alterations in definitions, have been used extensively by Bright Meadows people for the dissemination and explanation of the program:

Agency...to help each student learn how to take charge of the development of his own potential, and to understand that only he, in the long run, is responsible for his learning.

Creativity...to help each student develop enough confidence in himself and in others to be able to think imaginatively and explore openly ideas, values and relationships.

Motivation...to help each student become personally involved in his learning—to be free to actively explore his own resources and those of the school and the larger environment.

Scholarship...to help each student find true satisfaction in learning, and understand that the subject matter skills acquired are not only useful in themselves, but are tools with which to meet situations and solve problems.

And finally in 1965-66 the community dissatisfaction with what they called "the unstructured" program, which had not been very evident or widespread before, suddenly took visible shape with the formation of the Concerned Parents Committee. This Committee intended to 'act as a pressure group to force the School Committee to listen to its complaints.'

20 This work was done with the help of Dr. David Tiedeman of Harvard University. They used the model of decision-making in a teaching/learning process in a school setting developed by Frank Field of the University of California, and also Lawrence Kubie's view of creativity.

The Concerned Parents Group voiced an objection to the impending elimination of the TriDelta program at Bright Meadows. At a School Committee meeting in the spring of 1966, they secured a promise from Superintendent Norwood that a "structured program would be available at Bright Meadows for children who desire and need more direction." 22

In 1966-67, Elizabeth Crown's last year as principal, the remainder of the school was divided in four and placed on the four existing teams, despite Norwood's promise to the Concerned Parents. The teams were increased in teacher size from six to twelve: five SSE teachers, two math teachers, two language teachers, two science teachers and a guidance counsellor. The term Continuous Learning was dropped to indicate that the program was no longer experimental, that it was in fact the school.

This decision, made by Miss Crown, which was not greeted with acclaim by many school people, was a crucial turning point for a variety of reasons. First of all, it eliminated choice for parents (of course, also for children). If they were not happy with the program they no longer had the option (albeit sparingly used in the past as a safety valve) of putting their children in the "traditional" (TriDelta) half of the school.

It also eliminated choice for teachers. Every teacher who wanted to continue at Bright Meadows had to teach within the Continuous Learning organization. A few of the veteran teachers and even some newcomers felt they could not deal with the program, either because they considered

22Minutes of School Committee Meeting, April 11, 1966.
it to be too demanding (too many roles) or because they felt they were not competently trained to undertake all the challenges (such as counseling children). Two or three teachers left rather than take on a House. Others stayed and were not committed to the structure of the program.

On the other hand to make the school one again did reduce some of the divisiveness that had grown among the school population. Both teachers and students had begun to feel like either "haves" or "have nots" in the Bright Meadows society. Among teachers there had developed a good deal of political intrigue and backbiting. One technique used abundantly during 1966-69 to help teachers deal better interpersonally was sensitivity training. Miss Crown, and later Mr. Gross, made funds available for the entire faculty to participate in T-groups and group dynamics workshops both as individuals and as actual faculty groups such as teams.²³

Once the entire school was committed to the program, a number of other changes occurred, because not everyone was equally trained to be in the program and because with the larger numbers of people involved, all transactions had to be more formal. The issue of individualization began to be more spoken of than practiced. Too many teachers, both experienced and new, were ignorant of how to accomplish this task and no attempt was made to give teachers any training. The contract gave way to the "study plan" which was less individually oriented and more

²³For such activities, as well as team, department and other group meetings, Bright Meadows faculty members voluntarily, and without pay, give up after school hours, evenings and sometimes even weekends.
directed toward group requirements. (No provisions were made for students to continue after a course came to the end.) Eventually even the use of the study plan became a matter of default, of each teacher's decision on how to use it. (There are teachers today who use the study plan in the old contract manner as a way of engaging the student in a dialogue about his progress. Most people use it as a way of keeping track of what students do or do not do.) The study plan, unlike the contract does not require a student's signature, and is usually determined by the teacher in advance for the entire class. Independent study continued to be an option but it began to be used not because children wanted to study by themselves and had particular projects in mind, but because there were no courses suitable for some children.

In the last year of Miss Crown's tenure as principal she started a committee of the faculty which was called the Evaluation Committee. At first a selected group picked by Miss Crown to examine the ways in which Bright Meadows evaluates students' progress, it soon expanded to include a great many of the faculty and no subject was taboo for discussion, dissection, revision and evaluation. The faculty was, in essence, working through the process of education as the original faculty had in 1956. Now, however, because the faculty was about three times as large, Miss Crown decided to formalize the process. She also felt the need to leave a working model of teachers questioning and making decisions, since she felt this was essential to the uniqueness of Bright Meadows.
One of the accomplishments of the Evaluation Committee that year was that a subcommittee surveyed teachers' attitudes toward the schedule and recommended that there be three rather than four terms in the school year. This would allow more time for teachers to help their students learn to set goals and to evaluate their progress. The recommendation was accepted by the faculty and implemented by the administration.

Also at this time because of the concern about the community's awareness of what transpired in the school, the teams formalized the course offering process. A catalogue which described each course: its requirements, its goals, its content, its teacher, started to be printed by each team and became the basis upon which the child, with all the personal help available to him, made his decisions.24

7. The Maintenance Period

When Jerry Gross took over after Miss Crown's retirement, his move was paralleled on the city-wide level by the appointment of Acting Superintendent Nevins. The year 1967-68 brought the school not only local notoriety but also national fame.

The local controversy was augmented by Irving Franck, a manager for Katron and evening instructor at a local university, who challenged the incumbent in Ward 8 for School Committee, running his entire campaign on the Bright Meadows issue.25 Franck's campaign was supported

---

24 An example of such a catalogue is in Appendix II.

25 Peter Schrag. Voices in the Classroom. p.115 ff. This was a precedent. The history of school committee elections in Centerville had been "clean and closed."
by the Concerned Parents Committee. In November 1967 he succeeded in
unseating the incumbent and in establishing Bright Meadows as an issue
of contention. At first the administration tried to act as a buffer
between the controversy and the teachers, feeling that teachers had
enough to do with all their in-school functions. But when the debate
became public, teachers could not help but get involved and a feeling
of being embattled pervaded the faculty.

In the meantime, however, in October of 1967, Jonathan Kozol
published, in the New York Times, an article entitled "A Junior High
School That's Like A College." The school had also, that year, been
selected by the Kettering Foundation as a "thoughtfully innovative
school" and by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities
(IDEA) as one of 36 demonstration schools in the country and was
awarded a three-year Title III USOE grant to finance dissemination of
its program. As a result of all this publicity, Bright Meadows re-
ceived 800 visitors that year, handled by the Title III team.

The Title III team also published monthly newsletters to parents,
reprinted articles which lent support to the Bright Meadows philosophy.
The Title III project director organized study groups for sixth grade
parents, and even organized an evening adult education program offering
some Bright Meadows courses taught by Bright Meadows faculty, all in an
effort to educate and involve the community.

Within the school the data processing system was dropped but
centers and unscheduled time continued to operate. Centers became not
only materials repositories but also areas where activities were
scheduled as alternatives and/or extensions of the classroom, where new techniques and ideas were sometimes tried. By now centers were no longer team centers but rather subject centers.

The Evaluation Committee met for about half a year dealing with such problems as the schedule, the reluctant learner, the division in the student population (upper middle class Jewish and lower class Italian Catholic) and the division in the faculty (Fine and Applied Arts vs. "academic teachers"). But in the spring, some members of the faculty, feeling that the Committee did not represent the entire faculty and that it "had too much power" concentrated in too few teachers' hands voted the committee out of existence. This created a great many bitter feelings among the people who had worked long and assiduously on the committee.

Also that year Bright Meadows established a sister school relationship with the Williams Junior High School in Kent, a ghetto section of the neighboring city, which wanted to adopt many of the Bright Meadows ideas. Exchange visits began at the administrative levels and soon spread to teachers, many of whom then worked on curriculum for Williams.

Furthermore Bright Meadows undertook that year to broaden its teacher training services in a rather dramatic way. Because of its location, that is, that it is part of the Centerville school system (as well as that it has a reputation as an unusual school) Bright Meadows has always been a teacher training institution. It has been the recipient of student teachers from most, at least six, of the
major colleges and universities in the area that are involved in edu-
cation programs. Bright Meadows has also hired interns from the MAT
program in the locale. At times there have been as many as twenty
student teachers in the building at one time. However, in 1967-68
Bright Meadows went even further. It initiated an undergraduate col-
loquium where juniors at one of the large metropolitan universities
nearby could have non-teaching exposures to life in a school before
actually committing themselves to a career in education. Along with
the twenty or so juniors who spent one or two mornings a week at Bright
Meadows, came two of their professors who gave seminars at Bright
Meadows for their students. Because of all this student teaching
activity some Bright Meadows teachers, especially in English and social
studies, have student teaching responsibilities as early as the second
half of their first year.

In March 1968 further opposition to Bright Meadows was seen in an
article published in the Sunday Herald in which the writer cited angry
parents criticising the school. Jerry Gross felt the article required
an answer and so he wrote a letter to parents in the Bright Meadows
community, dated March 8 in which he dealt with the "distorted...facts"
by providing "more accurate data." The issues to which he responded
were: the contention that Bright Meadows' program was good for the
brilliant and slow learner but not for the average student; the argu-
ment that Bright Meadows' dropping enrollment was attributed to students
going to private schools; and the notion that the high teacher turn-
over was induced by the school. Thereupon followed letters to the
editor from supporters of Bright Meadows in several issues of the Herald, and several parents who had been "misquoted and taken out of context" by the writer called the school to apologize. However, as a result of the uproar after the publication of the article, Franck pressured the Board of Aldermen, who usually stay out of school business\textsuperscript{26} to convince the School Committee to ask the State Department of Education to undertake a study of the Bright Meadows program. The results of the study were released at a school Committee hearing in July 1968. In August 1968 an open School Committee meeting was held at Bright Meadows at which the Concerned Parents asked that "the experiment at Bright Meadows be controlled and optional." Although Dr. Nevins insisted that the program was no longer experimental, he agreed to provide a program which parents could use wholly or in parts, in which there would be courses which provide the sequence and coverage a child might require. If necessary a child might be given additional courses to bring his academic class hours to 15 hours, 50 minutes a week, making the time similar to the other junior high schools in the city. All ninth grade students would get achievement grades three times in their third year at Bright Meadows, and at the end of the second year if parents want it, and finally, a parent-teacher committee would be set up to investigate the reporting system.\textsuperscript{27} Many teachers felt that this was the last blow in a series designed to undermine the school. First,

\textsuperscript{26} Minutes of School Committee Meeting, March 25, 1968.

\textsuperscript{27} Minutes of School Committee Meeting, September 16, 1968.
the Kozol article had been distorted in one direction, then the Herald article had gone too far the other way. Now it looked as if the community and the School Committee were withdrawing their support.  

The parent-teacher study group which had been mandated was established by Mr. Gross. Six parents, six teachers and three other members of the faculty met weekly at night for six months in 1968-69 to review the options in evaluatory devices for Bright Meadows. They came up with a six-part form which they felt met the needs and desires of parents while also keeping Bright Meadows goals and teachers' interests in view. The report was sent to Dr. Nevins with the intention of having it brought up at a School Committee meeting. But nothing has been heard about it and the school is giving grades as it was directed to by the School Committee in August 1968.

As a result of the stir caused by the State Department Study and its consequences, the Central Staff spent a great deal of time at Bright Meadows during the early part of 1968-69 talking with the administration, teachers and students in an effort to get a clear picture of what was happening at the school. By that time also the city had moved in the direction of city-wide curriculum coordinators and the Bright Meadows administration and some teachers were involved in discussions about the right of the school to continue to design its own

---

28 Some teachers say they actually retrenched. Lawrence Andrews states clearly how this affected his classes. Shelley Grohman comments on the typical teacher reaction to parental opposition. Sandra Morris feels that teachers should have protested. See Profile Chapter.
curriculum independent of the city-wide efforts.

In 1968-69 several original members of the Evaluation Committee tried to revitalize it, calling it the Phoenix Committee but with the exception of a few diehards and some curious new teachers who wanted to talk about Bright Meadows, the committee did not get off the ground.

Meanwhile, in December 1968, a group of parents who had been inactive Bright Meadows supporters organized a new pressure group, the Centerville Citizens for Education, "to maintain quality education in Centerville by supporting innovations, informed controversy, preventing intimidation of personnel and expanding buildings and grounds, while bearing the costs necessary for quality education." 29

8. In Retrospect

As one looks back at the events of 1962-69, one can see some clear phases. By 1962 the stage had been set for a "revolution" of some sort. Present were a number of important factors (Pre-Innovation Period). The leadership was willing to take risks. Some attempts at change had already been made, by individuals and by the school as a whole, so change was in the air. The school was still thinking small and feeling new and therefore able to handle diversity and difference of opinion in a comfortable way since people knew and trusted each other.

The revolution occurred (Innovation Period) because there were teachers who wanted to "break away" and who had not only ideas but the ability to implement them. The community was receptive.

29 The printed platform they published.
When the administration mandated the spread of the revolution (Expansionist Period), that is, when the leadership, in order to subvert some of the opposition within the ranks, tried too quickly to incorporate the entire faculty without retraining teachers, many problems arose. Some of the early proponents left; the leadership did not pay attention to the changing community. New teachers came into the program (Maintenance Period) some impelled by the school's growing reputation as a modern educational utopia (the school was being imitated in many parts of the country and even in Canada); the remaining founders were placed in a position of being proselytizers of a once golden age, self-consciously institutionalizing what had worked because of individual personal strengths. The school took on even more tasks, partially because it was being told that it was incumbent upon it as an avant garde school to do so, and the burden of the school became enormous. Some teachers were unwilling and others unable to contend with all these demands.

The leadership changed and it was difficult for the new administrator to follow the path of what was already a kind of myth, even if their administrative styles had not been vastly different.

The ambiance in the community, both the parent community and the rest of the educational community, changed (partly as a result of the times) and the school was placed in the position where it had to defend itself, a difficult task for an institution that still saw itself basically as an open system, questioning, evaluating, changing, and was being forced to act like a closed system, describing what was as the way to be.
Miss Crown had always said that the lifetime of an educational experiment is seven years. Those seven years were drawing to a close.

9. The Year of the Interviews (The Interregnum)

There is a sense in which 1969-70 is part of the Maintenance Period because it was the last year of Mr. Gross' tenure. Gross had been Assistant Principal since the beginning of the Period of Innovation. However, it was the year that the new superintendent, Harry Strong, was appointed, and the school once again was the subject of a good deal of scrutiny.

As a result of this new development, this was a year of many meetings: between the school administration and the superintendent; between the school administration and the city administration; between team leaders and the school administration; between the team leaders and the superintendent. It was a year of many reports, some written and some verbal. Therefore, rumors abounded. As the interviews indicate much stress was caused by the state of comparative ignorance felt by many faculty members. Because many faculty were not privy to the meetings and only read and heard some reports, they were uncertain about what was actually happening.

When it became increasingly clear that there would be changes at Bright Meadows, the "As Yet Unnamed Committee" which soon became the "Faculty Action Committee" sprang up and acquired a broad base of support.30

30A presumed threat from the outside made possible a new Evaluation Committee, i.e. the Faculty Action Committee
From the work of a few subcommittees, a new understanding of House emerged and was accepted by the faculty, and a proposal for a teacher-growth program (called Consulting Teachers, the program was designed as a mutually helping relationship among teachers)\textsuperscript{31} was accepted and instituted for 1970-71.

One small change in the team makeup which was made in 1969-70 was that a few Fine and Applied Arts teachers who wanted to were placed on teams and given Houses. (The Fine and Applied Arts teachers had not been on teams before because they service the entire school population and it was felt by the administration and the FAA teachers themselves that their time was more valuable spent in their specialities.) There was talk of all FAA teachers being given Houses and therefore being placed on teams.\textsuperscript{32} This new definition of some staff roles raised again the issue of differentiated staffing (it had appeared in 1965) and created some discomfort among many teachers. Since 1966 there had been a growing split among the FAA and the academic teachers about who carried a heavier load and how much a teacher could really be a part of the school if he did not have a House.\textsuperscript{33}

Finally, when Mr. Gross actually announced his resignation, the

\textsuperscript{31} Both these proposals were much argued, and used by people who were filling what appeared to be a power vacuum in the school.

\textsuperscript{32} In 1970-71 the FAA people were all placed on teams.

\textsuperscript{33} This whole issue has still not been resolved satisfactorily. Teachers say that teachers should be individuals but when one of them tries to define his role in a non-conforming way, even if the way is better suited to his strengths, there is a great deal of righteous indignation.
faculty pulled together and elected a committee of seven of its members
to examine the prospective candidates for the principalship. Working
late into the summer of 1970 with the Superintendent and Assistant Super-
intendent Nevins, the committee helped to select the new principal,
George Schaeffer, an elementary school principal from a neighboring
community, whose counselling training had included a year at Bright
Meadows at the time of the pilot project. The faculty also asked to
meet with the Superintendent so that at the end of the year everyone on
the staff had had the opportunity to speak with him. He allayed many
people's fears by supporting the tenets of Bright Meadows and asking
only for a reexamination of the implementation.

Ironically, the year ended the era not too far from where it had
begun eight years earlier, with the faculty saying that they want the
school to reflect their ideas, their work, their feelings.
Chapter One: Part Two: The Sociological Setting

Having now established how the school changed structurally over the years, it is important also to understand how the school has functioned as a social system. Needless to say, this too has changed over the years and an attempt will be made to demonstrate significant differences.

We will look at the authority relations in the school as seen through the eyes of teachers, looking first to the administration, and the city (here we will also glance briefly at modes of affiliation) and then to the students. We will also look at the ecology of the school and see how that affects the relationships among teachers.

1. Authority Relations: The Administration

When Elizabeth Crown was principal the teams functioned fairly independently in making their own curricular decisions, some schedule and guidance decisions, and team leaders got together mainly for communications purposes. There was team pride but not competition since teams kept pretty much to themselves, partially as a result of the schedule. She with the counsel of the guidance department, kept a pretty firm hand on the nature of power in the school. "When one is in a position of an administrator and needs to seek advice, it's a tricky thing because you have to find somebody to talk to whom you know is going to be able to keep his mouth shut after you've talked to
them..." She sometimes didn't even "bother" her assistant principal with some problems. "It was a lonely job at times."

Several aspects of her theory of administration are important to look at in terms of authority relations. One, she maintained a 50-50 male-female breakdown of teachers on the faculty although she "would never hire a male who was not as good a candidate as a female, just because he was male." Two, she was conscious of the teacher turnover (about 1/3 of the faculty a year). "I created a lot of that myself by my own philosophy about leadership...(I had learned that) a leader, a true leader, can be judged on the basis of how many leaders he develops in the people working for him. I wanted to make sure that teachers had an opportunity to develop and grow in the same ways that we wanted students to. The minute you take away the barriers and the heavy hand and encourage leadership, you begin to lose people on your own faculty because they have found a new goal for themselves which leads them to something outside the school...I knew that basically a woman would be more willing to stay in the school without a role of leadership than a man so I guess I made a conscious effort with the young men to try to find roles for them which would put them in leadership positions whereas I did not always do so with the young women."

While Miss Crown didn't observe classes in order to evaluate teachers, she tried to get "teachers to the point where they would trust me enough to say, such and such a teacher needs help. At this point I would try to manipulate things in the background so that the weak teacher would be receiving help without my going into the classroom
and being more of a threat to someone who was already shaky." "I had great confidence in teachers and felt perfectly willing to trust them with all kinds of things and never felt that just because I didn't have the answer myself that I shouldn't propose a problem to be solved. This is where I differ from an awful lot of administrators, who feel if they don't have answers themselves, they don't involve teachers...Often times I know I was accused by some members of the staff as manipulating the staff to get certain responses. I don't think this was ever true...maybe it was true once or twice. The way I knew what was going on in the school is that I would be available for people to talk to in the lounge at lunchtime and not just in my office."

It is also important to realize that the atmosphere in the school which is very democratic or unhierarchical, which is to say that no one on the staff can demand obedience or respect simply because he has the title or the position to do it\(^{34}\) (although certainly there were people on the staff who had and have unofficial power either derived from personal charisma or from association with the principal) stems from Miss Crown's philosophy. "I believe that everyone on the staff is equally important in the life of kids. I believe a custodian can be just as important as a teacher...sometimes more so."\(^{35}\)

\(^{34}\)Department chairman and team leaders teach all classes in addition to their titular responsibilities. Only coaching is paid above the regular salary.

\(^{35}\)Four of the Bright Meadows custodians have gone on to be head custodians in other schools. It would seem that her theory of leadership applies to them also.
There were several questions she feels she left unanswered when she retired. One was the issue of differentiated staffing. The school was getting so large and so diversified that people needed to start to look at how to organize their work because not everyone could do all things equally well, nor did they want to. The other question was the changing nature of the team. The teams had grown from simple organizational expedients to structures that demanded power and autonomy. As she says, "How does the principal of a school operate when the school is subdivided into teams of teachers who have responsibilities for making decisions of all kinds? When does the principal step in and say no, or how does the principal get the team leaders together, not only to communicate and share, but to make common decisions for the good of the entire school? This I had not worked out before I left."

When Jerry Gross became principal he had to face those questions as well as some others. He felt at the time that his appointment was "his test." "Either I could make it on my own or I would always need consultants."

After his first year, however, he started to look for people to advise him. He turned to his enlarged administrative staff (now there were two assistant principals) and to the Title III team. For instance he asked them to evaluate teachers. In terms of administrative theory, he felt that he should give the teaching teams their independence and with that the attendant problems, but he feels a great

36 He did not have the same presence and distance that Miss Crown had maintained. Most of the staff referred to her as Miss Crown but to him as Jerry.
Deal of frustration grew in the school because the teams "developed expectations of total autonomy so that their goals and purposes deviated from those of the administration and frequently from those of the school. How you limit the autonomy of the teams so that energies are not being expended for empty purposes, was something I thought of dealing with early in the year, but other matters came up." As a result of this oversight there was competition among teams to establish the "best Bright Meadows learning climate" and much teacher energy was directed to extra-classroom and extra-team politicizing among the faculty. He describes the staff he hired as "freer souls" than the staff of five years before. He hired many more women than Miss Crown had. He also never fired anyone (unlike Miss Crown) because he "never felt strongly enough about it (the fact that a teacher was hurting children and taking the place of someone who could do the job better) or had the guts to do something about it." He shared with Miss Crown the feeling that the school should provide teachers with the opportunity to "maximize themselves" by growing professionally but for him it was hard to do because he felt he sacrificed efficiency and he never got things done quite the way he would have done them. As a result, while he wanted to delegate authority, in fact he never gave the person full responsibility to see the job through. He expanded the administration (to finally include six people) but he made the lines of authority no clearer. 37 The Evaluation

37 Repeated comments in the interviews, when people were asked whether the administration was a factor in their liking to teach at Bright Meadows, were "Does the administration include the Title III people?" and "I'm not really sure what some members of the administration do or are supposed to do."
Committee floundered in his first year because he was not sure about how he wanted to run the school and so when he faced his first serious inter-faculty dispute, he gave way to the loudest voices. In the middle of his third year he actually tried to delegate power to the team leaders (who were unhappy because they had been elected by the teams under different criteria) but then by virtue of allowing more time to departments, ended up by relinquishing that power to the department chairmen.

One might summarize by saying that during Miss Crown's day one knew where the authority was to be found; with Mr. Gross it seemed as if authority was being parcelled out to specific people and groups, as if he were delegating more, but in fact it was not at all clear where the authority lay.

These differences in style of leadership greatly affected the nature of the internal climate for teachers because the style determined the direction of faculty energies. Miss Crown ran the school: teachers felt they had her support for their actions and decisions and therefore

38 While there was dissention among faculty members while Miss Crown was principal, and some teachers left in anger, sometimes at her, sometimes at one of her advisors, sometimes at the program, sometimes at the gap between the goals and the reality, there is a clear sense among the faculty that she was strong, that she had a vision, and that she knew how to get things done. A few of the men teachers commented that they had had feelings about working for a woman, but that in fact, she had been an excellent principal to work for; she always counselled the men about their careers at Bright Meadows and beyond. With women her authority relations were more complex. While her few social friends were women from Bright Meadows (and interestingly women without men) in her age bracket, and while she did single out a few ambitious young women for careful attention, she often did not confront the women on the faculty about emotional issues but relied on more indirect means like team pressure. One person left in anger during Mr. Gross' tenure. He seemed less powerful, less clear about goals, less sure of how to get things done.
felt in control; the school ran itself during Mr. Gross time; teachers
felt unsupported and without direction from the administration and
turned to other groups for security.

2. Authority Relations: The City

Until 1967, in keeping with the traditions of Centerville, the
school was left to make its own decisions. Nonetheless, the original
principal used the resources of the city administration to the advantage
of Bright Meadows. She was aggressive in getting for the school a large
portion of the foundation money that came to the city. 39 She was able
to increase her staff in a way that no other principal in the city was
doing; she managed to bring to the school a great deal of money in
"notable service" awards for her teachers. 40

While teachers in Centerville were not militant, 41 they have always
been interested in maintaining a high level of income and this was the
primary function of the Centerville Teachers Association. For most
other professional issues, teachers settled individually or as schools
with their principals. Miss Crown, however, encouraged teachers to
belong to the CTA and even made it possible for Bright Meadows staff

---

41 This is changing. In the spring of 1970 the Centerville Teachers' Association organized a "silent vigil," the first of its kind, in Centerville in front of the School Committee Meeting. At least 1/3 of the Bright Meadows faculty attended. While the issue was primarily salary, Bright Meadows teachers, in discussion, claimed to be going on the principle of demonstrating support for the professional organization and its president (a Bright Meadows teacher).
members to become officers in the CTA by giving them some released time. But on the whole Bright Meadows teachers have felt no active impulse toward the CTA. It would seem that they feel, as Zeigler (1967) maintains, that "teachers associations function as agents for the preservation of the status quo." It is also interesting to see that those Bright Meadows teachers who joined city-wide curriculum committees (and a number did make that commitment) did so out of personal-advancement and desire-to-learn motives, rather than any sort of political pressure from the rest of the city. Miss Crown would back up any teacher who put loyalty to Bright Meadows before responsibility to the city.

After 1969 the situation was quite different. The new superintendent(s) were under pressure from the community through the School Committee to equalize the schools. One city-wide change that had great implications for Bright Meadows was the appearance of city-wide subject matter coordinators for the junior high schools. These middle-management personnel were not merely consultants (as all such personnel had been previously) but started to make and influence policy. This, of course, was seen by Mr. Gross as a threat to the autonomy of the school. In addition, after the 1966 decision of the School Committee, the school was under constant surveillance, and as a result quite often on the defensive.

---

As Mr. Cross put it, "There were times in this school when the administration was almost useless because it was dealing with things it had no experience dealing with. As the university did not know what to do with its first rioter, so we did not know what to do with the first dissenter...Being attacked limits your effectiveness and your energies. You develop styles of operating which are not good. You're reacting rather than leading. Very frequently you're not operating rationally. And not only the administration is affected by this but also the faculty."

While Miss Crown had tried to shield teachers from community criticism which she felt was destructive to their primary jobs of dealing with children (it seems as if she internalized Zeigler's conclusion that it is the schools themselves that inhibit teachers\(^{43}\) and tried to prove Bright Meadows to the contrary), Mr. Cross was unable to, even if he had wanted to, because the community's reaction had become a political issue. There is no question that teachers felt the pressure of community dissention and that the school suffered from it. The school lost a considerable number of teaching positions; movement of students was carefully supervised and in some cases greatly restricted; centers were played down; and some courses which teachers had devised and researched were not offered, e.g. sex education, because of fear of reprisals from the community. From being a fairly autonomous school, Bright Meadows in the years 1967-70 moved to being a school that was consciously dependent on outside approval, of all kinds.

\(^{43}\)Zeigler, op. cit., p. 143.
3. Modes of Affiliation

Each principal in Centerville selects his own staff. Occasionally the Central Office will recommend someone to the school, and the principal may feel morally committed to hiring the person, but that is rare. As a result, teachers are hired specifically for Bright Meadows, sometimes because some friend or mentor sent them to apply, or they heard or read about the school. This creates a family feeling within the staff, and strong identification and loyalty to the school, the kind of we-feeling which Willard Waller talks about.\(^4\) It enables people to work with each other for longer periods of time, under stress and sometimes with little that is tangible to show for their efforts. The teams because they spend so much time together in school find themselves often carrying their school associations outside to social situations.

4. Authority Relations: Students

While the nine hundred students represent primarily three groups: the majority of middle and upper middle class Jews; a minority of lower class, primarily Italian Catholics; and a small group of Negro inner city youths who are bussed out as part of a large urban-suburban program in which Bright Meadows participates, the faculty of seventy is purposely quite diverse in background (they come from Spain, Africa,


Often on the day before a vacation when there is that let-down feeling, faculty members will not run off to their separate commitments, but will sit around talking with each other for hours. Many people make it a habit to play volleyball on Friday afternoons and then party together until Friday night. The building never empties at 3:10.
California, Canada, Centerville; all the major religions are represented; they come from Ivy League schools, University of California, little-known schools in the middle west) except for age (the faculty is fairly young; average age is 33) and most are from the middle class.

There is some friction among the three groups of students. There is also some tension between some of the students, principally the lower class children and the Negro children, (although it is not limited only to members of those groups) and the school, that is to say, the teachers who represent to these children values which are not theirs, both in terms of behavior and achievement. And there is some disagreement among the faculty about how to deal with the issue of alienation and dis- sention among the students in the school. 45

As a result, the population, both children to children and teachers to children, creates some problems for teachers. There is a constant threat to the social harmony of the school. In a school that purports to meet the needs of the individual child, there are many children whose needs are not being met. The issue is how much freedom to allow the children. Teachers struggle with solutions to the dilemma. They are constantly aware of the problem, in classes, in the halls, in their meetings and have, over the years, attempted a variety of programs specifically designed to confront the issue of divergent values (craft courses, skills programs, indoctrination programs, career development programs). No one is happy with any of the proposals to date, and the problem remains part of the Bright Meadows environment.

45 See Appendix I.
5. The Ecology: Culture and Associations

One of the first things a teacher who comes to Bright Meadows has to learn is how to speak. The vocabulary is not small: House, team, SSE, FAA, center, UT, pulling cards, blocks, agency, study plans, FAC, House advisor, subject advisor. While some of the meanings of these terms exist in other schools, the novice at Bright Meadows feels a certain degree of culture shock on meeting the language and, of course, the population.

The mythology of the school defines the ideals that have had difficulty in being sustained. One myth is the role of the House advisor which according to Mr. Gross, is that "he is going to make a microcosm become a real society. Another is that because kids are free there are no limits to be placed on their behavior, that somehow a teacher is a failure if he has to limit his children in their operation. There is the myth that somehow or other the school is going to solve all the problems of all the children, that the philosophy and ideas are so sound that they are unimpeachable or untouchable. That the job is so immense and requires so much hard work that you can never really do it well."

Other myths include the belief that to be a real Bright Meadows teacher you have to participate in school governance by attending the many meetings which are always being held; and the myth that teachers at Bright Meadows do in fact control their own professional destiny; and the myth that Bright Meadows teachers are brighter, more competent and more creative than most teachers, even in Centerville. There is a curious mixture of wishful thinking, insight and disillusionment in
these myths. And as with all myths some are truer than others and some people believe them more than other people, but everyone who comes to Bright Meadows has to confront them. That is part of the socializing process of the school.

While the school building is a long box-like structure which might lend itself to the kind of isolation which Dreeben describes, a teacher has to work very hard to exist in that kind of seclusion. One small detail illustrates this. Each room has not only a door leading to the outside hallway, but also a door leading to each of the contiguous rooms. The annex, built in 1961, was designed so that rooms could be expanded by the use of movable walls. Over the years there was constant talk of putting up partitions so that some of the middle-sized rooms could be used as seminar rooms, or putting in carpets so that several groups of students and their teachers could all be in the same room at the same time. No carpets came and the partitions which were experimented with never were successful but such groupings occurred anyway. Several teachers used the halls as classrooms, letting their activities spill out. Teams have, on occasion, had different schedules and since there are no bells there is constant movement in the building at all times.

However, even more important than the physical setting is the psychological setting. The fact that teachers are assigned to teams and that they talk all the time with each other about children, courses, their frustrations, the myths, each other, etc., means that they cannot function

alone. They even teach together and observe each other. Ideologically the teams are very important because they socialize now teachers. New teachers acquire the particular slant or approach to the school of the team they join; sometimes this may create a separation from other teams or groups in the school but never a total isolation. In addition teachers tend to select each other on the basis of shared interests — whether these groupings be the kind one finds anywhere such as those determined by sex, age, avocation, or whether they are more Bright Meadows — specific such as those who put team loyalty above all else; those who put department loyalty above all; the romantics who think love is enough; the moderates who think that some love and some structure are both necessary for students to learn; the reactionaries, who think that structure is all; those who think all teachers should be House advisors and those who think only teachers who want to should be House advisors; those who want a Broadway-type school production in the spring and those who don't, etc.

Teachers do have a primary group they are placed in but there is a great deal of mobility in terms of other relationships.

6. Conclusions

As a society Bright Meadows depends very much upon the nature of its leader, partly because it has so many people who are themselves leaders and who are in charge of the large numbers of subsocieties of the school that there is a great deal of oscillation among them unless there is clear direction from an "overseeing intelligence." Yet there is an ambiance, established by the first principal and upheld by the mythology
and the literature which allows teachers to feel very much in control of what happens in the school and which makes teachers feel as if what they are doing is important and different and that they are constantly learning and changing.
Chapter Two: A Context for the Study of Bright Meadows Teachers

1. Setting the School in Perspective

Even in 1971, with all the educational ferment in our society, and with a new administration in the school, Bright Meadows is not an ordinary school. It is famous.\(^1\) Although it is part of a public school system, it sometimes acts like a private school.\(^2\) It has stated goals for its students and an organization and a program designed to implement these goals. It is an institution where everyone, teachers, students, staff, is regarded as an unique and distinctive individual. In all these respects it is not the kind of school one often encounters in his travels along the blackboard trail. Yet, it is not a new school, in the sense of a school which stands apart from all that has been thought and/or tried before. Probably the most discouraging aspect of studying the history of education is the discovery that in education there is really nothing new, as was pointed out in Ecclesiastes. At most another attempt, a new arrangement, a particular untried constellation, but most educational "experiments" are ventures in "rediscovering the wheel."

\(^1\)A parent said recently at a parent-teacher's curriculum meeting, "No one has no feelings about Bright Meadows."

\(^2\)Strictly speaking Bright Meadows is a "corporation school" as posited by Joseph Grannis in his article, "The School As A Model of Society." Robert Skidelsky in English Progressive Schools points out that six of the seven progressive schools he discusses are fee-charging, i.e. private, institutions.
Bright Meadows stands squarely in the tradition of the progressive education movement. As described by Cremin in *The Transformation of the Schools*, the movement had three major components. First, it was concerned with "applying in the classroom the pedagogical principles derived from the scientific research in psychology and social sciences...tailoring instruction more and more to the different kinds and classes of children who were in the schools."\(^3\) As can be seen in the *Red Book* assumptions, Bright Meadows innovators were acquainted with the current work of a number of psychologists and educational reformers: Erikson and Friedenberg on adolescence; Maslow on self-actualization; Trump on grouping; Bruner on the structure of the discipline; White on competence. Teachers were encouraged to try new approaches to teaching based on whatever theories they were studying. The school participated in a number of university-based research programs, for example, SUPRAD, ESI field testing and in an experimental counselling program at the nearby Cooker Clinic for Identification of Potential Dropouts. A number of studies were performed in the school to measure the effectiveness of the program, one done by David McClelland of Harvard, and the information was always fed back to the faculty in order to help them intervene more intelligently in the development of students.

A second aspect of progressive education was "the broadening of the program and function of the school to include direct concern for

\(^3\)Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the Schools*, Preface.
health, vocation and the quality of family and community life. While Bright Meadows is in a very college-oriented community and tries to play down the college emphasis at the junior high school level, it can be said to fit this category because of some of its other practices. For example, in terms of health, in 1966-67 it started to serve breakfast to those children who were unable to secure it at home and therefore were suffering a mid-morning blackout. With regard to family life, the school started to counsel the parents of seriously disturbed children. This, of course, is in addition to the normal school/parent (parents nights, conferences, etc.) and school/community (dances, PTA activities, committees, etc.) relations.

And finally "progressivism implied the radical faith that culture could be democratized without being vulgarized, the faith that everyone could share not only the benefits of the new sciences but in the pursuit of the arts as well." Bright Meadows administrators certainly believed that and provided a strong program in science and fine and applied arts which all students were encouraged to partake of. Miss Crown was concerned that the school be a place where students could explore all aspects of life.

---

4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Life in this case was defined by what the school and its staff could provide to the students—sometimes by going outside the school walls and sometimes by bringing the outside world to the school. The staff was hired so that as much exploration was possible through them: people with variegated backgrounds, with many talents, with flexibility to try new areas.
If, however, one were looking for a spiritual father for Bright Meadows, one would turn to John Dewey. Dewey's concern that children's activities in the school not be irrelevant to the life around them and the world they were planning to enter, his concern that children learn in school the way they learn outside of school, that is, by discovery and inquiry, his concern that the child, rather than the teacher or the textbook, determine the nature of learning in the school, are all mirrored in the Red Book. The Red Book describes a role for the student, the teacher and the school, which captures the Deweyan solicitude that "education is not an affair of 'telling and being told' but an active and constructive process." It also reflects, in Cremin's words, the Deweyan idea that "schools should inculcate habits that would enable individuals to control their surroundings rather than merely adapt to them."

Bright Meadows also belongs to the long line of schools, stretching from Aristotle's lyceum to Neill's Summerhill and including Tolstoy's Yasnaya Polyana, which have consciously attempted variations on what was considered traditional or conventional. If one does not realize that Tolstoy is describing a small private enterprise (40 students and 4 teachers) on his estate in 1865, an experimental school where he wanted children to be happy and free to learn what they wanted to, one might think one is reading some contemporary Bright Meadows document.

---

7 John Dewey, Democracy and Education, p. 38.

8 Cremin, op. cit., p. 123.
"In presenting a description of the Yasnaya Polyana school, I do not mean to offer a model of what is needed and is good for a school, but simply to furnish an actual description of the school... The school has evolved freely from the principles introduced into it by teachers and pupils... I am convinced... that the best police and administration of a school consists in giving full liberty to the pupils to study... I have not compelled boys to study the ABC when they do not want to do so... The teachers keep diaries of their occupations, which they communicate to each other on Sundays, and in conformity with which they arrange their plans for the following week. These plans are not carried out each week but are modified in conformity with the needs of the pupils... I then supposed that for the children to learn to read they had to like reading and in order to like reading it was necessary that the reading matter be intelligible and interesting... Only that method of instruction is correct with which the pupils are satisfied... For the teacher who has adapted himself to the liberty of the school, each pupil represents a separate character, putting forth separate demands, which only freedom of choice can satisfy."

We have in Tolstoy's words a number of assumptions and practices which are characteristic of Bright Meadows: that is, that it is a demonstration school, not a paragon; that teachers and students have had a hand in shaping its evolving nature; that freedom is essential for

---

9 Yasnaya Polyana translated means Bright Meadows and because of the uncanny similarities with the goals and impulses of the school in this study, the Tolstoy name has been adopted as the pseudonym in this study.


11 Ibid. p. 258.

12 Ibid. p. 261.

13 Ibid. p. 212.

14 Ibid. p. 264.

15 Ibid. p. 269.
both teachers and pupils; that planning and evaluation are on-going and necessary for the proper functioning of the institution; that students should like to study and will do so when they are given choices about what and when they study; and that children should be treated as individuals.

Most 'progressive' and/or 'experimental' schools have been at the elementary level. John and Evelyn Dewey in their book, *Schools of Tomorrow*, which intends to "show what actually happens when schools start out to put into practice, each in his own way, some of the theories that have been pointed to as the soundest and best since Plato"\(^{16}\) speak principally of elementary schools. Only two of the dozen or so schools mentioned by the Deweys actually attempt to implement the theories at the secondary level. More recently, Robert Skidelsky in *English Progressive Schools* turns to this concern. "No one would dispute the claim that the progressive ideal has triumphed or is triumphing, at the primary and junior level. The question which interested me was: what are its chances of success at the senior level."\(^{17}\)

It is this paucity of practical application of what little theoretical knowledge there is about learning at the secondary level,\(^ {18}\) and

---


\(^{17}\) Skidelsky, op. cit., p. 14. Bruce Joyce and Berj Harootunian in *The Structure of Teaching* (p. 186 ff.) describe a few secondary schools that experimented and the ideas are very similar to those of Bright Meadows.

\(^{18}\) It is interesting that in Holt's book *How Children Learn*, he talks about a three year old, rather than a thirteen year old.
the long held public view that junior high school is a "wasteland" which undoubtedly are responsible for both the freedom Bright Meadows had to be different and for the subsequent fame and infamy which accrued to it.

2. Establishing a Context for this Study.

Since this study examines how teachers feel about the "unconventional" school they work in, and how they feel about themselves as people and as teachers in this school, there are several areas of literature which are relevant: the sociology of teaching (and teaching as a profession and schools as social systems); teacher characteristics; teacher expectations and attitudes (toward children, peers, the institution; and toward change).

A. The Sociology of Teaching (Teaching as a profession and schools as social systems)

Waller (1932) established the precedent of looking at the school as a social institution. He posited that schools are social entities because they:

(1) have a definite population

(2) have a clearly defined political structure, arising from the mode of social interaction characteristic of the school, and influenced by the numerous minor processes of interaction.

(3) represent the nexus of a compact network of social relationships.

(4) are pervaded by a we-feeling

(5) have a culture that is definitely their own. 19

Dealing with the typical school, his object is to "wonder systematically" about the lives of the people in that setting. Much of what he finally specifically decides is dated, at least for Bright Meadows. For example, the issue of the moral character of teachers: no one is concerned if a Bright Meadows teacher smokes in front of children; the isolation of teachers from the community: many Bright Meadows teachers live in Centerville. He claims that schools are the "refuge of unsalable men and unmarriageable women" and that teaching is a "sheltered occupation" with people who have the quality of not wanting to do battle in the front rank...introverted." These simply are observations which are not true of Bright Meadows teachers.

Waller's contribution to this study is the more general one that he looks at a school as a social system. It is also interesting and encouraging to realize that forty years later, his recommendations for improving education are in fact active concerns of the Bright Meadows faculty. He recommends differentiated staffing, psychiatric care for teachers, freedom for teachers in what and how they teach, teacher training that involves more clinical practice, non-teachers being used in the schools, teachers going out into the community, and finally teachers caring about students as people and not just simply as recipients of information.

Teaching as a profession is the subject of Lieberman's (1956) and Dreeben's (1970) analyses. Their observations on professionalism are important for this study because, while the issue of professionalism is at the very root of why Bright Meadows teachers feel on the whole quite
positive toward the school, the issue is so much a part of the fabric of
the school that very few people mention it as such.  

Lieberman lists the eight elements which he considers to be fac-
tors describing true professions, that they:

(1) provide a specific social service  
(2) emphasize the intellectual techniques in providing it  
(3) require a prolonged period of preparation  
(4) afford broad autonomy both for practitioners and the
occupation as a whole  
(5) expect practitioners to accept personal responsibility
for their judgment and actions  
(6) emphasize the service rendered rather than received  
(7) govern and control conduct of members, and  
(8) formulate and expect adherence to a code of ethics

Dreeben, who prefers to look at teaching as an occupation, (the
distinction is irrelevant) adds:

(9) the control over entry to the occupation  
(10) the responsibility for the generation and advancement
of knowledge to the practice of teaching

to Lieberman's list.

Lieberman argues that teaching is not a true profession because it
violates the third, fourth, fifth, seventh and eighth criteria on his
list. He insists that education is in need of "radical changes in its
power structure" because, he argues, administrators undermine teach-
ers' rights as practitioners to make professional judgments. He

---

20. It is in fact illuminating to see which people do mention it: some of the older people who have had experiences against which to mea-
sure Bright Meadows and some of the younger people who have heard about
how other schools treat teachers and are afraid that they will not be
treated as professionals if they leave.


22. Ibid., p. 28 ff.

maintains teachers should be able to determine what subjects are taught and what instructional materials should be used. He also suggests a "personnel hierarchy" and teams of teachers analogous to the medical model. He seems, in fact, to be suggesting the kind of responsibility that Bright Meadows teachers already have, as described in Chapter One.

Dreeben's perspective is more functional, that is, he looks at the kinds of characteristics which teaching shares with other occupations: that it is a client-serving occupation; that it is public employment; that it is essentially a mobility-blocked occupation (in order to advance in teaching one must, at present, abandon teaching); that it is bureaucratized; that it is a woman's occupation; and finally that it is an occupation with intangible products.

Again, by looking at what obtains in general, one can see that Bright Meadows teachers are not the average sample in the average situation. As has already been pointed out, the school gives teachers the opportunity to advance by providing some leadership positions within the school, while they still teach; the bureaucracy is minimized consciously; and because of the large number of men of the faculty, the sense that teaching is a woman's occupation simply does not exist. Rather than the feminization of men, which Zeigler (1967) argues occurs in schools, there is more of a masculinization of women.\(^{24}\)

The same non-conformity of Bright Meadows teachers is found when

\(^{24}\) Zeigler, op. cit., p. 12.
one looks, as Dreeben does, at the ecology of the school (i.e. the
environment and what it does to teachers), the authority relationships
in the school, and the modes of affiliation. Dreeben reasons that in
order for teachers to become professional, they need the prestige that
will come from understanding the technology of teaching. "Teaching will
not be a profession to which people will devote their working lives until
we discover what the tasks of the job are, how to do them and understand
why we do them." 25 Many Bright Meadows teachers are already devoting
their working lives to their jobs.

If we look at one of Dreeben's recommendations for professional-
ization, which is that teachers should learn some rudiments of research
techniques and write up their strategies and findings to add to the
knowledge in the field, we again see the degree of professionalization
at the school. Teachers, even before the Title III grant for dissemi-
nation, were taking days (called professional days) to write up their
practices. 26

As Waller, Lieberman and Dreeben describe professionalism in
teaching, the Bright Meadows climate allows, in fact, encourages

25 Dreeben, op. cit., p. 207.

26 Not only does the school encourage this, but also the CTA by
providing those teachers whose proposals for projects are accepted,
with a week in the spring of each year in which to work on some edu-
cational issue in which they have gotten involved. In 1966 six local
school districts, including Centerville, organized a consortium which
gave small grants to teachers to establish innovative practices in their
school. At least one Bright Meadows teacher has taken advantage of the
latter; quite a few have received the CTA 'week'. 
teachers to attain it to a degree that appears to be rare in other schools.

Elizabeth Leacock's findings (1969) are significant here because they support an important assumption made by the first principal which was that if a school was designed to make students feel good about themselves and if the school at the same time made teachers feel good about themselves, then the students would benefit directly from the school's design and also from the teacher's positive attitudes toward their work. While Leacock concentrates on the teacher's structuring of the child's involvement in learning, and she talks about elementary schools, she states that "each school is a society within itself, with a dominant system of values, a pervasive ideology, and a characteristic network of interrelations between teachers and children, teachers and administrators, school people and parents, school people and other professionals, school people and the official and unofficial representatives of the community."27 Like Philip Jackson (1968) she found that the teacher's role is paradoxical or ambiguous for the teacher is both a part of the institution with all of its values and also a person with his own expectations and individuality. But, she concludes, "the quality of schooling, ideologically defined, has a differential effect on development."28

B. Teacher Characteristics/Expectations/Attitudes

27 Elizabeth Leacock, Teaching and Learning in City Schools, p. XIV.
28 Ibid., p. XV.
One of the few large-scale, in-depth studies of teacher characteristics is David Ryan's (1960) massive (6000 teachers in a large city school system) attempt to describe, compare and appraise characteristics of teachers. This study presents data that bears out what many people already thought about teachers. Ryan justified his use of the same measures for both primary and secondary school teachers with his observation that while teachers behave differently in different settings, primary and secondary school teachers do not appear to differ greatly in kind. This assumption is important for the Bright Meadows study because it supports our use of elementary school-based research for discussion of secondary schools, since there is a scarcity of research on secondary schools.

He found that:

(1) Elementary school teachers' attitudes toward pupils, administrators and other teachers, are more favorable than the same attitudes held by secondary school teachers.

(2) The attitudes of teachers judged by principals to be superior in teaching performance were significantly and distinctly more favorable toward pupils and administrators than those teachers judged to be poor.

(3) Experience and age are not highly associated with teaching attitudes but older secondary teachers are more favorable to administrators and less to students.\(^\text{29}\)

\(^{29}\) The first part of this conclusion was verified in the Bright Meadows study.
(4) Women teachers in secondary schools are more favorable to pupils than men. Men in the elementary schools are more favorable to students than women.

(5) Teachers whose classes were observed to be warmer, more understanding and stimulating were positive toward students and administrators.

(6) Actual student behavior in class (based upon observers' assessments) did not appear to be related to attitudes held by teachers.\textsuperscript{30}

(7) Secondary school teachers tend to be more traditional or learning-centered in the classroom while elementary school teachers tend to be more permissive.\textsuperscript{31} Within the secondary school teachers' group, English and social studies teachers displayed more permissive attitudes while science teachers tended to be more traditional.\textsuperscript{32}

(8) Teachers judged to be warmer in behavior in the classroom tended to express more permissive educational viewpoints.

(9) The verbal understanding score obtained by secondary school teachers was significantly higher than that of elementary level teachers.

(10) Men teachers at both levels were markedly more stable emotionally than women but men teachers at the secondary level were less verbal,

\textsuperscript{30}This is an extremely important finding, and with Philip Jackson's comments about needing to speak with teachers in addition to observing them to understand their attitudes, underpin this investigator's decision not to observe the total faculty, but to observe only the teachers selected for the profiles.

\textsuperscript{31}It is this characteristic that Bright Meadows tried to contravene.

\textsuperscript{32}A finding which was certainly true in the early days of Bright Meadows when the question of individualization was first raised.
less warm, less businesslike and less positive to students.
(11) Elementary teachers who were judged warm, manifested superior emotional adjustment.
(12) On the secondary level single teachers were more businesslike, democratic and permissive and verbal but less emotionally stable.

The importance of Ryan's study is that it reinforces many of the stereotypical notions we have of teachers. This is valuable in that one can then measure how typical a specific case is. (Of course, there is the danger, as in all generalized surveys, that they can become self-fulfilling prophecies.) It allows us to set Bright Meadows teachers in a broader context and demonstrates that on the whole Bright Meadows teachers are hired to be different and encouraged to be different from the stereotypes. Even if they enter the school with these characteristics, the school's climate operates to change them.

Philip Jackson (1968) interviewed "50 outstanding elementary teachers" to examine several aspects of a teacher's work. He contends that while observation of classrooms is important "occupational attitudes, the feelings of satisfaction and disappointment accompanying success and failure, the reasoning that lies behind action--these and many other aspects of a craft are scarcely visible except through conversations with a person who has experienced them. And it is not only what the practitioner says that is revealing. His way of saying it and even the things he leaves unsaid often contain clues to the nature of the experience. Consequently talk is necessary, particularly talk about the
professional aspects of life in the classroom."^33

Jackson's conclusions which are relevant here are that: "the outstanding elementary teacher does not often turn to objective measurements of school achievement for evidence of his effectiveness and as a source of professional satisfaction;"^34 today's teachers may exercise their authority more casually than did their predecessors, and they may unbend increasingly with their experiences, but there are real limits to how far they can move in this direction...the desire for informality was never sufficiently strong to interfere with institutional definitions of responsibility, authority and tradition;"^35 with reference to autonomy, "no one indicated the desire to construct his own educational program from scratch. All seemed quite willing to accept guidelines set down by the curriculum committees and textbook manufacturers. But inside these guidelines they wanted room for spontaneity and exercise of professional judgment...freedom within limits;"^36 and with regard to individuality, "the primary unit of the elementary school teacher's concern and the major source of his satisfaction remains the individual and his development."^37 Where Jackson's teachers differ from Bright Meadows teachers is in their unwillingness to "start from scratch."

^34 Ibid., p. 124.
^35 Ibid., p. 129.
^36 Ibid., p. 133.
^37 Ibid., p. 143.
Many Bright Meadows teachers often express the wish to design their own school, a 'prescription school', and of course, some of the older teachers have had that experience and would be willing to repeat it. Bright Meadows teachers, at least some of them, are also often willing to argue beyond the institutional limits of authority and tradition, although the irony in Bright Meadows' case is that the tradition is unconventional and the authority fairly open ended. Bright Meadows attracts teachers who are, unlike Waller's stereotype, willing to do battle in the front lines.

In the area of teacher attitudes, two other genres of literature have some bearing on this study. One is the personal account written by teachers about their experiences in schools. Started by the success of Kozol, Kohl and Holt, the current spate includes such books as Don't Smile Until Christmas in which six teachers in a variety of schools, urban and suburban, recount the events of their first year of teaching and their feelings about these events; Teachers Talk in which a number of teachers, in conformance with several prescribed questions put to them by the sociologist who comments on their writing, present some of the problems they faced as neophytes in the city schools of New York; An Empty Spoon in which a young woman who spent two years in a Philadelphia ghetto high school relates her experiences. These books, and others, have been published in the last year, and mark, in my opinion, the acknowledgment by the public that teachers, without resorting to some sort of a persona as in a novel, should be sharing their experiences with the rest of the community because schooling is no longer seen as
the private reserve of schoolmen (although the enterprise only too, often, as these accounts seem to indicate, does rest on teachers' shoulders.)

While the quality of these books varies, and that depends on the insight and sophistication of the teachers and the commentators, (for example, the teachers in Teachers Talk are quite naive and unable to generalize from incidents and unable to bring to bear on the incidents any knowledge of social science, but the commentator is extremely competent in using the material to discuss general issues of education elucidated by social science; in Don't Smile Until Christmas, the reverse is true), the books do demonstrate that certainly first year teachers face similar problems and have similar experiences, regardless of the school. There is an universality to the issues teachers have: culture shock; the problem of authority or discipline or control; the real curriculum vs. the hidden one; the conflict of the facade and the real person (or how to be a person with other people). There are other issues of course, as suggested by Arthur Jersild (1955). After interviewing about 1000 teachers, he found that "the idea that the school should promote self-understanding is, in theory at least, a very acceptable one." He also claims that the teachers he studied were favorable to the idea.

---

38 It is interesting how rarely the larger political issues arise in these discussions and when they do, as in Teachers Talk when there is a threatened boycott, the teachers disavow any relationship to political problems.

to the idea that, if self-understanding on the part of students were to be part of the educational program, then teachers would have to face personal issues in their own lives in a manner that differs from the usual academic work, i.e. through therapy or discussion of personal and emotional issues.

In any case, for the purposes of this study, these accounts are revealing because Bright Meadows teachers, new and experienced, share some of these concerns. One difference is that Bright Meadows teachers talk about these issues a great deal; they don't have to be asked to delve into their psyches for such unexamined or undiscussed data.

These accounts are also important because the people who wrote them no longer feel the need to use fiction to speak their minds about education, in the time-honored tradition.\textsuperscript{40} Nor are they satisfied with the anonymity of the survey, another time-honored instrument, which often tells us such things as the "fact" that teachers favor team teaching as an innovation,\textsuperscript{41} but very little else that is useful.

A few studies have been done on the effect of change on teachers. Gross, Giaquinta and Bernstein (1968) interviewed teachers to see the effect in the school of a planned organizational change. The investigators stressed the importance of the introduction of the innovation and then found that even with initial acceptance or enthusiasm by teachers of

\textsuperscript{40} I. K. Zimmerman, \textit{Sixty Years of English Education Or, The View from the Novels}, (unpublished paper, Harvard University Graduate School of Education, 1968).

\textsuperscript{41} Gallup Poll, \textit{Administrators and Teachers' Reactions to Educational Innovations}. 
the innovation, this was not enough to ensure the realization of the practice. If teachers confront frustrations and serious difficulties in attempting to carry out the innovation and these problems are not dealt with, the teachers' positive attitudes toward the innovation will be cancelled out and the innovation will be abandoned as it was in the case in this study. What saved Bright Meadows from being an example of this generalization is that enough people who were involved in the original planning for the project remained over the years to encourage teachers to try to live up to the goals despite the difficulties. Still, many of the ideas of Bright Meadows have met with less than complete success for the reason given by Gross, Giaquinta and Bernstein.

The Dundee Team Teaching Project in Greenwich, Conn. (1965) reports similar results in an elementary school's attempt to adopt team teaching. While most of the study deals with students' performance and perception, the Teachers College observers point out that "schools initiating team teaching programs should, as one of their first steps, distinguish clearly between specific duties and responsibilities of members in each classification in the hierarchy." At the end of the two year project a number of teachers left (some to graduate study). The evaluators concluded from interviews with teachers that staffing is important in an experimental program and the most highly qualified personnel should be recruited, even if one has to go outside the system. The problems which developed which had to do with staff relations, did

42 Dundee Team Teaching Project, p. 20.
so because the selection procedures for faculty were not what they should have been, and because roles had not been clearly defined. (They also comment that of course it is difficult to define roles clearly in unknown situations.) Both of these studies point to the conclusion that announcing and organizing for change are not sufficient. Teachers need to be taught what and how to practice whatever the new technology is.

In what has become a modern classic, Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) found that a "change in the teachers' expectations (and these were dedicated elementary school teachers they were dealing with) regarding the intellectual performance of a number of randomly selected children who were alleged to be special did actually lead to a change in the intellectual performance of these randomly selected children. If teachers believe children to be good, and able to make the right decisions, as the Red Book suggests they are, then the school becomes a place where children grow to meet this expectation.

Still a different kind of research on teacher attitudes is now being done. The Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins has begun to look at the area of individual teacher attitudes and actions as influenced by the informal social relationships among teachers. In *The Faculty Peers* (1968) James Fennessey reports that he conducted a pilot study of an integrated mid-Atlantic rural elementary school in order to test out his procedures and designs. His intention is to understand better the impact of different influence structures upon the opinions held by teachers and students in the public schools. The sources of influence he used are:
(1) individual background factors (teachers' personal attitudes as distinct from those of other teachers in the school).
(2) selective recruitment factors (which reflect differences between schools in the kind of teachers who work in each).
(3) global school factors (characteristics of the school program, the building, students, etc.)
(4) work situations and social factors (the position of individuals in formal and informal social systems of the school).

These influences, says Fennessey, operate on a teacher's actions or his opinions or almost any aspect of his personal and professional individuality.

In another study from the same Center, Greenberger and Sorenson (1969) looked at a junior high school staff and examined the relationship between sex, age and departmental affiliation and whom teachers seek for advice, whom teachers liked and whom they admired for their teaching skills. The findings revealed that there were strong organizational ties along sex lines for males who overchose in all of these categories members of their own sex. (The authors felt that this reflected the strong sex-role ideology of American society which frowns upon women working outside the home). The department affiliations showed particular correspondence with advice and liking, while skills seemed to cross departmental lines. As for age, this showed the weakest relationship with the three variables. There was a tendency to choose people in one's own age group for these categories. Both of these studies are the first, according to Fennessey, in which the examination of the impact of
the primary work group has been applied to teachers in the public schools.

The Bright Meadows study rightly belongs in this genre, i.e. studies of teachers in their natural habitats. While both of the studies find some resonance in the Bright Meadows situation, the Bright Meadows is not a replication of either.

With this review we have established that there are studies that have something to say to the way one looks at Bright Meadows teachers. First, we have learned that teacher expectations and attitudes do in fact effect the quality of schooling which children get. Second, that while there are generalized pictures of teachers available, especially for typical schools, we need to know more about teachers in "unconventional schools." It may turn out that in some cases the pictures are very similar, but the differences will also be instructive. Third, that while many of the issues that teachers worry about have a universal quality about them, there may be some important variations among the ways faculties deal with these issues. And, we add speculatively, the setting or climate which can be established in a particular school may be able to influence the resolution of some of these issues.

We have also seen that the theoretical structures or the assumptions we are working with are so broad that individual schools and/or specific groups of teachers do not necessarily fit the outlines they describe. We also see that some of the theoretical structures we have to use, because we still have no new ones that fit the reality of today, need desperately to be superseded.

We now move to the methods employed in this study of Bright Meadows teachers.
Chapter Three: Research Methods

1. Raison D'Etre

The purpose of this study is to look at a group of teachers in one particular untraditional school and to observe and survey their responses, feelings, reactions to the ideology, the environment and the events which constitute the school as a social institution.

The study was designed to look specifically at:

(1) What teachers perceive to be the elements of a supportive school environment in which they can grow and develop as professionals; what frustrations they encounter in the school; how they think they deal with unfamiliar situations, threats to their esteem from role changes and from pressure from the community.

(2) How teachers perceive the goals of the school (in terms of competence and security) and how these affect them, professionally and personally (in terms of career patterns and attitudes).

(3) How teachers perceive and how they deal with the way in which they are socialized into the school.

2. The Interview Schedule

The data has been gathered by means of a series of interviews, using a schedule. The interview schedule (three versions were employed for the three large and different samples)\(^1\) was designed to get answers

\(^1\)See Appendix III for the three versions.
to the questions above in an open-ended manner. That is, the question was asked and the interviewee was encouraged to talk himself out; even with the questions (such as number 15 on Interview Schedule One and number 5 on Interview Schedule Two) where a yes or no would have been sufficient, the interviewee was told to say more if he wanted to.

The schedule moves from the fairly impersonal and non-threatening statement of the understanding of the school's goals to the close individual feelings and reactions of the particular person being interviewed. It ends on a series of questions which allow the interviewee to regain distance and objectivity. The schedule was designed after the investigator looked at the Purdue Teacher Questionnaire and spoke with a number of people in Centerville who had used questionnaires in their work. A few preliminary interviews were made to test out the validity of the questions.

Lead Questions 7, 11, 14, 16, 17, and 26, and Followup 8, 9, 10, and 15 on Interview Schedule One (and questions 3, 5, 6, 7, and 10 on Interview Schedule Two) were directed toward finding out what teachers perceive to be the elements of a supportive, creative school environment and how they think they deal with unfamiliar situations, threats to their esteem and pressures from the community, as well as what they see as frustrations. (Not all the followup questions were asked of each interviewee.)

2Despite this precaution to allow the interviewee to debrief while still in the interview, most interviewees stayed for five to fifteen minutes after the tape recorder had been turned off to talk and ask questions and make comments.
Lead Questions 1, 12, 14, and 23, and Followup 24 and 25 in Interview Schedule One (and questions 1, 3, 4 and 9 on Interview Schedule Two) were fashioned to get at teachers' perceptions of the school's goals and their effects on teachers.

Followup questions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 in Interview Schedule One (and question 2 on Interview Schedule Two) were used to get at people's ideas about the unconventionality of the school, and therefore also the socialization process.

Lead Question 21 and Followup 22 on Interview Schedule One (and question 8 on Interview Schedule Two) were used to elicit information required for grouping the interviews for analysis, although later not used for that purpose. Followup question 27 on Interview Schedule One (and question 10 on Interview Schedule Two) was originally intended to get some impressionistic data to be used in an examination of teachers' perceptions of the significance of events as related to the teachers' position in the school. This did not materialize, however, and the idea was abandoned because it was found that most teachers simply did not have clear enough memories of specific events. Instead the data which accumulated was used in writing chapter one.

Interview Schedule One was used for the faculty teaching at the school presently; Interview Schedule Two was used for former Bright Meadows faculty. And Interview Schedule Three was used for the ten non-teaching staff members in the school. (A modified version of that was used for the two city administrators.)

---

3 See Chapter One: Part One.
3. The Question of Innovation

The question of how successful an innovation, or how innovatory, or to what extent Bright Meadows has succeeded in implementing its non-traditional philosophy is not a question to be dealt with objectively in this study. Nor will this study deal with an objective measurement of how good a school Bright Meadows is, or has been, or how it compares with other schools either in Centerville or in the urban and suburban areas near it. One reason for this is that so far there has been no reliable evaluation of Bright Meadows' efforts. The State Department Study (1968)\(^4\) demonstrated that there was no significant difference in the academic performance of students from Bright Meadows and the other junior high schools in Centerville. But no one has actually measured the other goals which the school purports to be working toward. No one has measured whether Bright Meadows students develop more agency than other students, or than they might in a less "innovative" environment; no one has measured whether students develop more creativity or are more motivated at Bright Meadows.\(^5\) The only goal which has been touched upon in formal evaluation is scholarship and that not very satisfactorily. Therefore since we have no measures of its "innovativeness", Bright Meadows will be regarded as an unorthodox school rather than an innovative school.

---

\(^4\) A Study of Achievement Indicators of Meadowbrook & Other Schools, June, 1968.

\(^5\) There is, of course, a great deal of "anecdotal" evidence, but that will not be dealt with here.
Teachers who have taught elsewhere say that Bright Meadows is unique. Visitors say that Bright Meadows is unlike the vast number of schools they have been to or worked in. That Bright Meadows was selected as one of 36 Demonstration Schools by the Kettering Foundation and that it received an OE Title III award all lend credence to that judgment. In addition, in the second chapter when we placed Bright Meadows in a broad historical and literary context, we pointed to ways in which Bright Meadows is less conventional, more unusual than most schools, that is, that it is unorthodox.

4. Research Design

The research design selected was the interview study since 1) it permits the exploration of the relationships among factors in an institution and 2) it makes advisably possible the wide use of materials and various data-gathering methods including, as it did in this study, observation, both formal and informal, and use of public and private documents. Because the interview study in this case is centered in only one school, it has the two serious drawbacks of the case study method pointed out by Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein (1968) and those are "that an investigator can neither prove the validity of his conclusions nor generalize the findings to other institutions on the basis of a single (case) study. Second, there is the danger of an erroneous interpretation of the data due to the investigator's biases or his analytical techniques."

---

However, since there seem to be relatively few and perhaps no truly phenomenological studies of the responses and feelings of a group of teachers to the particular school in which they teach, especially to schools which are unorthodox, a descriptive study of teachers in such a school seems in order and even valuable.

The particular school chosen, that is Bright Meadows, was selected because the investigator has been in the employ of the school since the summer of 1963, first as an English-Social Studies teacher in the Continuous Learning part of the school (later becoming concurrently English Department Chairman) and in 1968-70 as one member of the three-person Title III team. When the investigator approached the school's principal Jerry Gross and asked permission to study the school, she was told that it would be very much to the advantage of the school to be documented even further than it has already been, and was told that she would receive all the moral support necessary.

5. Establishing the Investigator's Role

The investigator had a number of factors working in her favor. As a former teacher she knew and understood the problems of teaching in Bright Meadows and was very well acquainted with most of the faculty, (both presently in the school as well as those who were no longer there), from having worked on teams, committees and workshops, etc. with them as well as having formed close friendship ties with some. As a very active member of the school's faculty her currency as someone who was "concerned and committed" was not in question, even when in the last two years of
her employment she was more readily identified with the administration than she had been previously as a teacher. One teacher who was asked by friends about the investigator's "guarantee of confidentiality" reported her reply to have been "I trust her...and wouldn't offend her by asking." Teachers were quite outspoken in their criticisms of the school and faculty, although less of other teachers, and some even used the interview for rather personal revelations, almost of the quality of a session with a counselor.

On the other hand, the investigator's long association with the school and her constant involvement in the course of school affairs, raised the question of her ability to be objective in her observations and her interpretations. This is not a new issue in social science. Even participant observers whose association with the culture which they are studying is not of long duration find that there is always the question of verification of observation, reality, and meaning. In that case the error may be due to too little understanding; in this case, the error may be due to too much understanding. Still the problem for an observer who had no experience with the school would have been, if not the same in quality then similar in quantity. It has been the chagrin of many people at Bright Meadows, upon reading something written about the school by an "outsider;" that it has missed the point. ⁷ Severyn T. Bruyn in his book The Human Perspective in Sociology quotes Buford Junker's description of the four kinds of roles which the participant observer may

⁷The article written by Jonathon Kozol is a good example.
assume according to the design and purpose of his study. (In this case the study resulted from the investigator's role in the school.) The one which best describes the investigator of this study during the year in which the interviews were being conducted is Observer as Participant:

This is the role in which the observer's activities as such are made publically known at the outset, are more or less publically sponsored by the people in the situation studied, and are intentionally not kept "under wraps." The role may provide access to a wide range of information and even secrets may be given to the fieldworker when he becomes known for keeping them, as well as for guarding confidential information. In this role the social scientist might conceivably achieve maximum freedom to gather information.

While several teachers did ask the investigator whether it was not going to be difficult to write about the school, which was such an important event in all their lives, this fellow feeling did not inhibit what they reported. The investigator considered limiting her activities as a participant in the school for the duration of the study but found that that was impossible since members of the faculty sought her out for opinion and advice and many asked questions. The investigator always satisfied their curiosity, directly after the interview about the nature of the thesis. As a result, the investigator decided that a change in her attitude and behavior with the faculty would be more detrimental to her getting honest responses than her continuing typical behavior.

6. Collecting the Data

At the beginning of the study, the investigator

---

8 Severyn T. Bruyn, The Human Perspective in Sociology, p. 16.
put into the mailbox of every teacher, administrator and guidance counselor in the building, a printed informal note asking for their cooperation in being interviewed. Out of a sample of 68 she received 60 positive replies. All said they would be willing to be interviewed. Of the remaining eight, seven did not respond at all and never mentioned the study to the investigator. Two of the 60 were never interviewed because it was impossible to find a time that was convenient. These two were a young man science teacher who has been science department chairman who has been on the verge of leaving the school for private business and personal family reasons for a number of years; and a young woman who had just moved from a position as aide in the English Center to take over a mid-year opening in the home economics department.

Of the eight who did not wish to be interviewed, one, an older single woman, teacher of foreign language who had come with the original group from Troop, apologized that the operation she had just undergone prevented her from being interviewed. Five others who did not respond could be grouped together because strong emotional issues were claiming their psychic energy. One was a young woman, just married, teacher of foreign language in her first year at the school; the young female reading teacher had just been divorced; another, a middle-aged man, teacher of science had just come to Bright Meadows from another Centerville school as a mid-year replacement; two fine and applied arts teachers who had been outspokenly angry at the school were a young woman

\[9\] See Appendix III.
home economics teacher and a man, art teacher, who had just completed a divorce. The remaining two could be grouped together because they were not feeling a part of the school. These are two older men, one the last of the three shop teachers to be hired in the school and the other, the audio-visual person who had been in the system since the 30's and is ready to retire.

The next problem was to set up the interview calendar since the faculty at Bright Meadows is exceedingly busy. The only concern the investigator had was to schedule the subjects for a block of time in which they could run through the entire interview schedule at one sitting (she felt that the reactions and feelings would be more spontaneous and consistent if the subject did not go home and reconsider his answers). As a result the order in which people were interviewed was determined by their "free" time. Only one teacher misunderstood the directions and had to be interviewed on two successive days. Most teachers were interviewed at 3:15 after a hard day's work. A few interviews were conducted at 7 a.m. (some Bright Meadows teachers arrive at school at that hour although meetings don't start until 8:00 and students do not have to be in the building until 8:50). Quite a number of teachers expressed eagerness to be interviewed after talking with some of their colleagues about the experience, and sought the investigator out to set up an appointment. Many said at the close of the interview that they had enjoyed the opportunity to think about their experiences and to pull their ideas together. As one of the original pilot project members said, "I've been meaning for a long time to sit down and write, just
spend some time going back over things as I could remember them...I think it's (the interview) a good thing and I'll undoubtedly leave here and for the next couple of days I'll be thinking, trying to analyze certain things—which I think will be very good for me."

Some interviews were conducted during the body of the day when a teacher had two "free blocks" contiguously, giving him an hour and a half of time for the interview. Most interviews took about an hour and a half, although a number of people who have either been in the school for many years or are completely involved in the operation of the school, took longer. The longest interview lasted four hours and was conducted one evening at the home of a teacher who had left Bright Meadows to return to graduate school for a doctorate in administration. He had always been loquacious and the time away from Bright Meadows had given him the opportunity to get his thoughts in order.

All but two of the interviews (these were with two guidance counselors who wished to be interviewed in their own offices) were conducted in the investigator's office, a green-walled nine-foot square room, which was always slightly messy because in addition to being the office of the investigator (one of the three Title III offices) it was the repository for cartons of IEM materials used by the original director of research who was now the assistant principal, Ernest Fitch. One wall of shelves was taken up entirely by Fitch's materials except for the books the investigator brought to school in an attempt to start a professional library and teacher resource center. That was the direction which the investigator faced. The interviewee faced the window and the
investigator's desk with more materials but could look beyond the desk at a quiet grassy courtyard in the back of the school. The two people sat in the center of the room at a square of tables which were used as conference tables by teachers when seminars occurred in the room.

The room is not soundproof although the PA system was disconnected after the first few interviews. But the sound of children shouting and scurrying down the corridors during and after school hours, and the constant sound of canned music\textsuperscript{10} which formed part of the corridor environment of Bright Meadows penetrated the doors of the office. This disturbed the teachers far less than it did the investigator since for them this was one of the rare places in the building where they could be private and sit without interruptions. "Do Not Disturb" signs were placed on both doors and they were violated only three times in the course of all the interviews.

An important consideration throughout this study is the effect of time. The year during which the interviews were done was a critical one for it marked the end of an era.\textsuperscript{11} It would have been informative to interview people before and after the significant events of the year

\textsuperscript{10}The secretaries in the main office and sometimes the custodians select the music, which often tends to be popular music. As a result there are many skirmishes between some teachers who prefer silence, and other teachers who opt for classical music, and the clerical and custodial staff. Since the latter usually win because they are close to the controls, teachers often remark, and not always in jest when times are stressful, that they know who the really important people in the school are.

\textsuperscript{11}See Chapter One.
(preferably when they first arrived in the school, at some midpoint in their career there and as they were leaving) but, of course, that was impossible.

If one considers all the data together, however, one can get an accurate general picture of the total attitudes of all members of the institution toward that institution, even though, of course, people's attitudes are not static. The analogy of a telephone switchboard is useful in picturing the problem. The telephone switchboard represents the whole school staff's commitment to and ideas about the school. (Let us say that commitment is the horizontal dimension and ideas or opinions or thoughts is the vertical dimension.) The operator is time and each teacher is represented by a plug. A teacher may be plugged into one or another socket in the board depending upon what is happening to him and how he is feeling at a particular moment. But at any given time it is possible to describe the complete and extant gamut of teachers' positions by describing the entire switchboard and/or all individual teacher's statements.

7. Interview Methods

Although some sort of personality inventory would have been useful to the study as an adjunct to the interviews, it was decided with the advice of the principal that such a paper and pencil test would be an imposition of an already overworked faculty.

As a result the data had to be gathered primarily through the formal interview, although also through informal discussions and observation of meetings and classes. After discussing with several practitioners
the advantages of taping versus taking notes, the investigator decided to tape the interviews because 1) she discovered that eye contact with the interviewee was essential. Teachers became uncomfortable when the investigator averted her eyes. This excluded taking notes. 2) The use of tape recorders is a widespread practice at Bright Meadows and only one person (a newly hired guidance counselor) objected. A few people who were not used to tape recorders were aware of the machine but after a few minutes were able to disregard it. 3) The machine used was of particularly good quality and so there was no worry about mechanical failure. Only one interview had to be retaped and that was due to the investigator's forgetfulness rather than the machine's failure. 4) Using a tape recorder was more efficient and could reduce the amount of time required for the interview. 5) It was felt that with the tape it would be possible to go back and verify and validate data.

The interviews stretched over a six month period.

While the faculty at Bright Meadows was being interviewed, the investigator, using the personnel files of the Central Administration Office, traced the addresses of as many ex-Bright Meadows teachers and administrators as possible and sent them a more formal letter requesting their cooperation\(^{11}\) and a list of questions (Interview Schedule Two) which they could deal with. Out of a total number of 149 people who worked at Bright Meadows since 1961 and were no longer there at the time of study, it was possible to find some sort of address for 106.

\(^{11}\)See Appendix III.
Not all of these addresses were reliable. At least twenty envelopes were returned to sender and it is impossible to guess how many others were never delivered. Of the 106, 33 people responded. Ten others (nine women and one man) replied by letter that they would answer the questionnaire, but, in fact, hadn't by the time the data was analysed.

Of the 33, several people who were in the area asked the investigator to visit them and tape them in person, which she did. She even visited a few out-of-state people who indicated they wanted to be interviewed in their city of residence. A few people answered the questions on tape and sent the tape to the investigator and some answered them on paper. Only one person responded that she would not be willing to say anything because she was writing a book about her experiences at Bright Meadows.

In order to comply with the original guarantee of confidentiality one precaution has been taken. All names of the people connected with the school and the school system have been changed.

8. Analysis of the Data

After all of the interviews were transcribed, the investigator took the protocols and the letters which she had received and established a code for categorizing the answers given by teachers to the schedule/questionnaire. The code was established by reading through twenty random but different answers to each of the questions on the schedule/questionnaire. Where there was doubt in the investigator's mind about the shades

---

*See an example of the code in Appendix IV.*
of meaning of people's comments (there was, and always is, when an-
alyzing protocols the problem of people using the same words to mean
different things and different words to mean the same things), she
sought validation from a disinterested observer, a physicist, with
some acquaintance with the school.

After the code was completed the investigator read through all
92 cases and coded them herself. A fraction of the code was used to
categorize the non-respondents in order to determine if there was a
significant bias to the respondent sample.

Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Codebook
analysis, each question was run through for frequency distributions
using a number of different subsamples as well as the total sample.
The subsamples were determined by what the investigator considered
might be significant variables affecting attitudes and feelings. These
subsamples included: sex, teaching status at the school, years of ex-
perience at the school, team membership, whether the school was a per-
son's first teaching experience, position in school, subject taught,
mode of affiliation to school. The only variable that consistently
produced significant deviations from the patterns established in the
total respondent group was sex.

It was thought to do some correlations among variables but when
it became clear that the subsamples were very small and variables were
so numerous, that idea was abandoned because it would probably not pro-
duce any results with any statistical significance or even validity.

---

13 Nie, Bent and Hull, *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*,
p. 4.
Analyses of the data are given in three ways. One is total frequency which means the actual number of people who responded to the question that way or belong in a certain bracket. In addition, two different kinds of frequencies are used. Unless otherwise indicated adjusted frequency is used. This means that missing data have been taken into account and the percentage represents the proportion of people who actually answered the question. Where missing data constitute a sizeable fraction of the sample or where multiple answers to questions require it, relative frequencies are used and indicated as such. Relative frequencies indicate what proportion of the total sample is made up of the missing data.

9. Describing the Samples

Of the 73 people who comprise the non-respondent sample, 48 (or 65.8%) were women and 25 (34.2%) were men as compared with 47 women (or 51.1%) and 45 men (48.9%) in the total respondent sample of 92 cases. Most of the non-respondents, that is, 65.7% were married while at Bright Meadows, as compared with 78.8% of the total respondent sample.  

Actually the two samples are more similar with regard to the variable of Marital Status than the percentages would indicate. When this variable was being coded for the total sample (although not for the non-respondent sample since information was not available for the latter) the traditional categories were used except in the case of Married. Here it was thought to be more important, not whether someone was legally tied to another person, but rather whether a teacher had responsibilities, emotional, or obligatory or financial to another person. It is, of course, impossible to say whether a person has more kinship with his spouse than with someone he lives with who is not legally bound to him. In each case one must look at the specific person's makeup, and such
The non-respondents and the total respondents are very similar in terms of subject speciality, certainly in the academic areas as Table 2 demonstrates. Where there is a difference for example in the Fine and Applied Arts areas, it would indicate a greater turnover in those areas in earlier years. It is unfortunate that that is an area of significant difference because the largest number of non-respondents among the faculty at present at Bright Meadows comes from the same group. As a result, although the investigator feels quite certain that she has included the gamut of Fine and Applied Arts teachers' viewpoints and that therefore they are not underrepresented in this study, the sample she is drawing from is not as inclusive as other samples. The other two areas of great difference among the samples are the Administration in the School, and this is because most of the administration was still active and close to the school; and the Counselling staff where there has been little turnover and what there has been has been toward positions of administration within the school. In both the latter cases, for all practical purposes, the total category still exists in the school and therefore is being weighted in favor of presence in the study.

an examination while extremely important especially today with the breakup of the family, is beyond the scope of this thesis. The attempt was made here merely to suggest the issue rather than to deal with it. The issue is to what extent does Bright Meadows fulfill many of a teacher's emotional and other kinship needs (see the profiles of Jane Baldwin and Shelley Grohman in Chapter Five) and to what extent is the school one of many sources of conflict in a teacher's life? (See Ed Reardon's profile in Chapter Five.)
Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
<th>Total Respondent Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies English</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine and Applied Arts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration in School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 describes the undergraduate education of both the non-respondents and the total respondents. The two interesting factors to notice are that very few of the faculty went to undergraduate teacher colleges; and the diversity of the undergraduate experiences of the groups.

From Table 4 we learn that fewer of the non-respondents were involved or had been engaged in some sort of graduate work while at Bright Meadows. Table 5 indicates that quite a number more of the total respondents earned degrees above the bachelor's level. This is probably a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
<th>Total Respondent Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency (percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Coed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisex Urban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed Urban</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisex Suburban</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed Suburban</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisex Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed Urban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy League</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten Colleges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Graduate Work While at Bright Meadows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
<th>Total Respondent Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy League</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten State Universities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten Colleges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten Private Universities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet begun</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took some courses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Highest Degree When Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
<th>Total Respondent Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflection both of the times, which stresses higher degrees in education and also of time, which means that teachers who had been working on master's degrees over the years had, by the time of the interviews, received them. One should note in Table 5 that of the total respondent sample, seven people whose highest degree is included in that list, finished their degree after leaving Bright Meadows. Of the non-respondents all the degrees listed were held while the person was at Bright Meadows. (We do not know what further degrees the non-respondents went on to earn.)

While members of the Bright Meadows faculty have tried other occupations such as business, business related to education, government work, industry, and some have served in the Peace Corps, the armed services, etc. 42 (or 57.5%) of the non-respondents had, while they were at Bright Meadows, only taught; 48 (or 53.3%) of the total respondent sample have never tried to work in any other occupation or profession. The interesting observation here is the converse one, which is that nearly half of the Bright Meadows faculty has tried other jobs. For 34 (or 46.6%) of the non-respondents Bright Meadows was their first teaching experience. This is very similar to the total sample of respondents, 37 (40.2%) for whom Bright Meadows was the first teaching experience.

Table 6 indicates that most people stay at Bright Meadows from two to four years, and that the total respondent sample includes more people who are veterans of the school. The latter effect is again a function of time. It is also interesting to notice that of the first year teachers 12 of the 18 are women; of the two to four year teachers 25 out of the 41 are women; of the five to eight year teachers 25 out of
the 41 are women; of the five to eight year teachers 9 of the 12 are men; of the nine to twelve year teachers 7 of the 9 are men; and of the thirteen to fourteen year teachers 4 out of the 7 are men. All of which seems to indicate that men, as a rule, stay longer at the school.

Table 6. Years at Bright Meadows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
<th>Total Respondent Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Age Upon Entering Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
<th>Total Respondent Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 demonstrates the youth of the faculty.
From the official reasons cited in the records, it would seem that few people left Bright Meadows because of some kind of disagreement with the school (5 people or 6.9%). The same figure is true of the people in the total respondent sample who left. This may be too small a count but the exact number is difficult to estimate, unless there is a letter of resignation in the folder. Otherwise if there is a simple reason, such as moving to take another position, as well as a more complicated motive, such as disagreement with a policy, only the former will be included in the folder.\(^{15}\) Other reasons given for leaving in the non-respondent sample are: 20 people or 27.8% went to teach elsewhere; 19 women or 26.4% relocated with their husbands; 8 people or 11.1% went into further study; 6 people or 8.4% left for such personal reasons as health; 5 women or 6.9% cited pregnancy; 4 people or 5.6% changed professions; ten people retired; and three people's contracts were terminated.

In conclusion, there are three areas where the two samples are not congruent. More Fine and Applied Arts teachers did not respond than did; the Administration and Counselling are almost totally represented in the total respondent sample; non-respondents seem to be "less educated" than the respondents. Not only were reasons given to explain the differences in those areas, but also these variables were found not to be significant in differentiating among attitudes and feelings. The

\(^{15}\) My personal estimate is that not more than 15% of the people in either sample who left did so because of some argument with what was happening in the school.
third area where there is a non-respondent bias is in sex. That sample includes more women than men. While sex does emerge as a significant variable in determining certain attitudes, it will be demonstrated later that in terms of Bright Meadows' effect on teachers, the sex difference washes out in many important ways.
Chapter Four: The Data Analyzed

In one sense it is unfortunate that this study was undertaken in what turned out to be a year of crisis. At a few points in the course of the interviews it looked very much as if it was going to be impossible to get any idea of differences among people: they were interpreting questions so similarly; they were all feeling so much under seige; they were questioning whether the school would survive.\(^1\) There is nothing like a perceived or actual threat to elicit whatever underlying consensus exists among a group of people. Certainly that factor is at work in this study, and should be remembered as we look at some of the results.

In order to recognize the differences which do exist, in a clear, that is, quantitatively measurable, manner, a statistical analysis was performed on the data.\(^2\) It should be borne in mind, however, that in the initial design of the schedule such an analysis was not intended. As a result, although the trends and patterns can be clearly perceived, and are valid, the percentages are to be viewed as indications rather than absolute values because of the openendedness of the questions and the fact that not every person answered every question.

This chapter deals with the total respondent sample and any

\(^1\)See Chapter Five: Jim Sever's profile

\(^2\)For details see Chapter Three: Sections Two and Eight
subsampling where the findings are relevant. Before proceeding to look at questions of attitudes and feelings, we must look at a few more descriptive background items which were not examined in the previous chapter because there was no comparable non-respondent information.

1. Background Factors

The respondents are split among the kinds of student teaching experiences they have had. About 20% had no student teaching. About 40% had undergraduate student teaching and about 25% had graduate student teaching. An additional 11% were in a graduate internship program. This variation supports a contention made earlier and this is that the faculty is hired to be heterogeneous. It also suggests that people are selected as individuals, on personal bases.³

³While there was no way to measure teachers' SES, the investigator did a rough assessment based on speech, background, appearance, and chance remarks overheard and came up with the following spread, which again indicates the heterogeneity of background: while the faculty is middle class, it is not only middle class.

Table 8, SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rural</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Middle Rural</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Middle Urban</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Urban</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle Rural</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle Urban</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As many members of the total respondent sample consider their formal teacher training inadequate and/or inappropriate for teaching at Bright Meadows, as consider it adequate and/or appropriate. Ten (or 10.9%) teachers did their student teaching at Bright Meadows which might help to account for the number of people who felt adequately prepared. However, people did make comments such as "No one can really be prepared to teach at Bright Meadows, at least not the way teacher training is these days. So I guess I'm as well prepared as I can be, "or "I'm adequately prepared for Bright Meadows because of my total life. I can't talk only about my formal teacher training."

In describing the goals of the school, 67.0% of the faculty used their own words rather than any or all of the four terms (agency, motivation, creativity and scholarship) which the school has adopted as official shorthand to describe what it is trying to do. This supports the contention that socialization occurs through teams rather than formally as a school. However, the key phrases around which one can group the vast number of different ways of expressing the goals of the school which teachers used are shown in Table 9.

An overwhelming number of people (70 people or 76.1% relative frequency) commented that the school was different from other schools, if not in total program at least in some part or in some goals. Some stated they* knew this because of other teaching experience they had had.

---

4 Some openended questions allowed multiple responses from interviewees. Where such is the case, it will be indicated by an asterisk.
and some because of what they read, where they had visited and people they had spoken with. They felt the value of the goal lay principally in two assumptions, that because of the goals: students could achieve a great deal of self-fulfillment in the school and in the future (42 people of 45.5%) and that students could learn to relate well to each other in the school and in the future (27 people or 29.3%). A number of people, however, commented that the real value of the goals lay in "the fact that it gave the school a direction," "that it was good for public relations" and that "they attracted certain kinds of people as teachers and that was good."

Table 9. Goals of the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Phrases</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing Intellectual Training</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting Along Openly With People</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Students Positive Self-Image</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing for Students' Individual Growth</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Students to be Self-Directive</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminating Competition Among Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Students Responsibility</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for their own Acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Students Choice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students Decision-Making</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking Away From System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While about half of the respondents (45% relative frequency) believe the goal of the school is being achieved, at least in some
respects and with some children, there are a few (12% relative frequency) who feel the goal is not achievable by definition and/or misunderstood by the people who are attempting to implement it. In terms of whether the goal was achieved in the past some (28% relative frequency) feel that it probably was. Quite a number of people didn't answer and about 12% (relative frequency) felt that the goals had not been achieved. This spread of opinion supports a statement made by a teacher, who left the school about five years ago and is now teaching in Hong Kong, who felt that although the school had an ideology, it had no history for the people who are working there.

Obstacles to the achievement of the goals*, or imperfections in the school cited by the respondent sample are detailed in Table 10.

Table 10. Obstacles to Goal Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles/Imperfections</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness for Teachers/</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Responsibility Among Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Appropriate Curricula/Materials for Certain Groups of Students</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Leadership in School</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Consistency</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Load</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Inservice Training</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Position Vis a Vis Community</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question was one where differences among men and women were visible. Table 11 breaks down the categories in Table 10 in terms of men and women.

Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles/Imperfections</th>
<th>Men Absolute and Relative Frequency</th>
<th>Women Absolute and Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness for Teachers/</td>
<td>16 (35.6%)</td>
<td>26 (55.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Responsibility Among Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Appropriate Curricula/Materials</td>
<td>21 (46.7%)</td>
<td>15 (31.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Leadership in School</td>
<td>21 (46.7%)</td>
<td>13 (27.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Consistency</td>
<td>11 (24.4%)</td>
<td>21 (44.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Load</td>
<td>20 (44.5%)</td>
<td>12 (25.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Inservice Training</td>
<td>13 (28.9%)</td>
<td>18 (38.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Position Vis a Vis Community</td>
<td>16 (35.6%)</td>
<td>9 (19.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most often mentioned obstacle or imperfection, the permissiveness for teachers and/or the lack of responsibility among teachers seems to be a reflection of the critical times during which the interviews were conducted and seems also to be related to the lack of leadership in the school. (It is fair to say that the leadership in question is that of the last few years since most of the non-respondents had been at Bright Meadows between two and four years). Teachers were angry at the state of siege and therefore took the anger out on each other, and some of them were trying to fill what appeared to be a power vacuum. This led to people acting very independently to establish authority which then
got translated into a lack of cohesion among the faculty. The priorities get normalized with all the other cited obstacles, and demonstrate that the staff feels the need for help in dealing with the goals.

It is interesting to see which obstacles women emphasize and which men emphasize. Women, it would seem are slightly more concerned with consistency and responsibility in the school while men seem to be more invested in leadership. They also seem more concerned with role definition, i.e. the work load, materials being available to teach from, how the community affects their job. These are, of course, just trends and as will be seen in Chapter Five, individuals, both men and women, do not always fit the patterns.

*One problem mentioned by 16 people (17.4% relative frequency) was the problem of internal politics, which they felt, got in the way of the school achieving its goals. Of those, 11 people are no longer at the school; of those, 11 were men and 5 were women. One hypothesis for the sex split is that the problem occurred during the first administration when a woman was principal, and it was the men, the leaders, with whom she had most of her confrontations.

Respondents felt that Bright Meadows' goals for students do affect them: by getting them extremely involved in the school (35 people or 38.8% relative frequency); giving them a sense of control over their professional fate (16 people or 17.4% relative frequency); giving them generally positive feelings (31 or 33.7% relative frequency). Some, however, felt the goals made them feel insecure and inadequate (14 people or 15.2% relative frequency); frustrated (20 people or 21.7% relative
frequency). Of the 10 people who mentioned guilt as a consequence of the goals, 6 were Social Studies and English teachers. As one SSE teacher put it, "you're sort of very free and so you end up internalizing some of the collective burden of the school." Another small difference which is interesting is that of the 16 people who mentioned sense of control as an effect of the goals, 10 were men and 6 were women.

In deciding what Bright Meadows does best\(^5\) the respondents grouped themselves around three achievements: giving teachers freedom (14 people or 34.2\% relative frequency); establishing good relationships between students and teachers (12 people or 29.3\% relative frequency); and creating a positive environment (10 people or 24.4\% relative frequency). The apparent contradiction between "giving teachers freedom" as a good thing and "permissiveness" as a bad thing for teachers is explained by the discussion above where it was pointed out that the peculiar timing of the interviews tended to bring out conflicts among teachers which normally are not that central in the school.

Another interesting finding is that approximately as many people got to Bright Meadows because they "stumbled" on it as because they were recommended to it by friends (of this group of 17, 12 were men) or by someone at the university. Table 12 shows the exact breakdown.

\(^5\)Unfortunately this question was only asked of 41 people because it only arose in a discussion after the interviews had been started. The investigator thought it was a valuable question and decided to ask it of the remaining people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruited at University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited by Friend</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read in Paper/or Heard About</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended by University Person</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Office of University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stumbled</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary from Other Centerville School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited from Other Centerville School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 40% of the faculty plan to do further study in education and about 10% are presently in a degree program. Over the years 8 teachers have left the school either for other jobs or to study and have returned to work at Bright Meadows. Three of those left again for other jobs in education.

Only 52.3% of the people in the school have not held official positions of leadership. The people who have been in one position of official leadership often hold other positions; once a person is marked or marks himself as a leader, he often runs the gamut of official positions. The
fact that more men than women have held positions of leadership is easily explained by the administration's policy. When the total respondent sample was broken down by position in the school, it was found that the team leader subsample of 16 people contained 10 Social Studies and English teachers but that it contained no first year teachers; that only two of them "stumbled" on Bright Meadows; that 9 of them were planning to go into administration or some other higher position in public education; and half of them felt that the school had not failed them. These attitudes reflect a deviation from the pattern for the total respondent sample. On the whole, however, position in the school does not tend to make for significant difference in attitudes from the rest of the faculty, presumably because involvement in school affairs is not restricted to people in official leadership positions.

When asked if they like teaching at Bright Meadows, the respondents replied largely in the affirmative (58 people or 70.7%); very few in the negative (4 people or 4.9%); but a number were ambivalent (19 or 23.2%). Table 13 details the factors which figure in people's liking to teach at Bright Meadows. (They are given in absolute and relative frequencies.)

Several conclusions emerge clearly from Table 13. Bright Meadows teachers are not indifferent about the school. They either have strong positive or negative feelings or they have mixed emotions. Some teachers, however, are and have always been indifferent about some of

6See Table 14 for this information.
Table 13. Factors in Teaching at Bright Meadows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Factors</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Ambivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of goals</td>
<td>70 (76.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of goals</td>
<td>29 (42.4%)</td>
<td>11 (12.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (17.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components of teaching role</td>
<td>60 (65.2%)</td>
<td>6 (6.5%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching role in fact</td>
<td>28 (30.4%)</td>
<td>17 (18.5%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>16 (17.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of new skills</td>
<td>64 (64.5%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for leadership</td>
<td>55 (59.8%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person himself taking leadership Not ready</td>
<td>29 (31.5%)</td>
<td>10 (10.9%)</td>
<td>15 (16.3%)</td>
<td>4 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Curriculum development</td>
<td>60 (65.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>5 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person himself developing Curriculum</td>
<td>46 (50.5%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for future positions in Educ.</td>
<td>36 (39.1%)</td>
<td>11 (12.0%)</td>
<td>11 (12.0%)</td>
<td>6 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for other careers</td>
<td>16 (17.4%)</td>
<td>11 (12.0%)</td>
<td>11 (12.0%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the staff</td>
<td>57 (68.0%)</td>
<td>9 (9.8%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>9 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrateam staff relations</td>
<td>58 (63.0%)</td>
<td>9 (9.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (7.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interteam staff relations</td>
<td>47 (51.1%)</td>
<td>14 (15.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of administration (people qua people)</td>
<td>47 (51.5%)</td>
<td>14 (15.7%)</td>
<td>6 (6.5%)</td>
<td>4 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Factors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of administration in jobs</td>
<td>19(20.7%)</td>
<td>29(31.5%)</td>
<td>7(7.6%)</td>
<td>15(16.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-administration relations, personally</td>
<td>39(42.4%)</td>
<td>12(13.0%)</td>
<td>2(2.2%)</td>
<td>11(12.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-administration relations generally</td>
<td>19(30.7%)</td>
<td>20(21.7%)</td>
<td>3(3.3%)</td>
<td>19(20.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responsibilities/demands on teacher</td>
<td>18(19.6%)</td>
<td>34(37.0%)</td>
<td>3(3.3%)</td>
<td>9(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of students as individuals</td>
<td>53(57.6%)</td>
<td>3(3.3%)</td>
<td>2(2.2%)</td>
<td>3(3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of students as group</td>
<td>32(34.8%)</td>
<td>16(17.4%)</td>
<td>3(3.3%)</td>
<td>14(15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of community as individuals</td>
<td>43(46.7%)</td>
<td>4(4.3%)</td>
<td>6(6.5%)</td>
<td>5(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of community as whole</td>
<td>25(27.2%)</td>
<td>18(19.6%)</td>
<td>7(7.6%)</td>
<td>16(17.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with students</td>
<td>56(60.9%)</td>
<td>1(1.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with community</td>
<td>38(41.3%)</td>
<td>3(3.3%)</td>
<td>3(3.3%)</td>
<td>6(6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of resources: people</td>
<td>38(41.5%)</td>
<td>13(14.1%)</td>
<td>1(1.1%)</td>
<td>6(6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of resources: things</td>
<td>25(27.2%)</td>
<td>30(32.6%)</td>
<td>1(1.1%)</td>
<td>9(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of school: time</td>
<td>8(8.7%)</td>
<td>27(29.3%)</td>
<td>5(5.4%)</td>
<td>9(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of school: space</td>
<td>13(14.1%)</td>
<td>27(29.3%)</td>
<td>5(5.4%)</td>
<td>7(7.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline of students</td>
<td>14(25.7%)</td>
<td>40(43.5%)</td>
<td>2(2.2%)</td>
<td>8(8.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the aspects of the school which for others are of supreme importance. For example, a number of people are indifferent about taking advantage of the opportunity for leadership, of taking advantage of the fact that the school self-consciously tries to prepare people for other careers in education. A smaller number of people are indifferent about the nature of the students and the community, feeling that students are students and one has to teach some place and one place is as good as any other. A similar number of people feel that both the schedule and the building are a given which they are not particularly affected by. A last indifference which needs to be commented upon is the fact that a small number of people do not care about the way the administration operates. Although it cannot be seen in the table the people who are indifferent to one of these items are often indifferent to the rest; this indifference represents essentially a small alienated or disinterested subgroup of the faculty, which one might expect to find on any faculty or in any institution where there are some people who did not particularly elect to engage in the activity of the institution.

Another conclusion that can be easily reached from Table13 is that people on the whole know why they feel positively about the school. They tend to be more positive about ideals or generalized statements (e.g. the general description of the components of the teaching role) than they are when they personally have to do the task or when it is in actual practice. (This is probably a natural human phenomenon.) For example, while they approve of the opportunity for leadership not all take advantage of it or think it is important for them; while they
approve of the opportunity for curriculum development in general they are less sure about doing it themselves, they look for more support or more time; while they like the student and parent community as individuals they are not too happy with the kinds of values and conflicts of values which the total groups represent.

When the respondents are negative they are negative about specific aspects of the school, for example the schedule and the building, which are items they can point to very clearly. They are also negative about the administration which is again a clear object upon which to vent anger and the usual scapegoat in schools. What is interesting here is that there is a spread of feeling about how the administration does its job rather than a clear overwhelming negative sense. that one might expect. The most negative feeling of all is about discipline of students and that represents the frustration teachers feel about not being able to do enough for children. Teachers also clearly feel they have too much to do and not enough help to do it.

What also finally emerges is that people are cognizant of what constitutes the environment at the school which makes them feel good about it and that they have strong feelings about the climate, and those strong feelings are principally positive with reference to things which are specific to Bright Meadows, that is the nature of goals (i.e. the enterprise is noble); the variety of roles involved in teaching (i.e. teaching is not boring); the opportunity to learn (i.e. the job encourages growth, not stagnation); the opportunity for leadership (i.e. people with ideas can do something about them; the opportunity to
create curriculum (i.e. the chance to control what one does as a professional); the quality of the staff and its relations (i.e. there are good people to work with); and the nature of students as individuals (i.e. children are important and one can enjoy working with them). Discipline and schedule and space and administration are to be found in other schools. The other kinds of opportunities and relationships are perhaps unique to Bright Meadows.

With reference to Table 13, some interesting sex differences need to be looked at. The four people who said they did not like teaching at Bright Meadows were all women. The three people who said they set a limit on their involvement in the multiple teacher roles they have were women. Twice as many men (19) as women (10) were taken with the notion of leadership as it applied to them personally, and three times as many women (11) as men (4) were indifferent. Twice as many men (24) as women (12) like teaching at Bright Meadows because it is a training ground for future positions in education, and two and a half times as many women (8) as men (3) were indifferent to this element of the environment.

Twenty-seven women were ambivalent and/or negative to the community as a whole while only five men were. An unsubstantiatable hypothesis about this disproportionate opinion is that it is mostly the mothers who come to conferences about their children, especially during the day when most parent conferences are held (although interestingly enough a special effort is made to hold conferences at 7:30 in the morning or 5:30 in the evening in order to get fathers to come as well).
So when teachers are reacting to the community they are more often than not reacting to the women, and women teachers probably have stronger feelings about other women than do the men teachers.

It would seem from the discussion of Table 13, that the significant difference between men and women in terms of how they feel about Bright Meadows has to do not with how they feel about working in the school, but rather how they feel about how the school can advance their careers. This is corroborated by the fact that when the respondents were asked whether Bright Meadows had affected their careers, 31 people or 33.7% relative frequency said no, either because they had had no career plans or because their career plan had been to remain teachers (which they were planning to do), or had never been to remain teachers (which they were planning to do), and Bright Meadows merely verified those facts for them. Of the 31, 17 were women.

Only one person said she wanted to get out of education altogether. The remaining 36 people or 40.1% relative frequency (that is, 23 men and 13 women) said that Bright Meadows had influenced their careers. Some were still not too sure of what they wanted to do, but some wanted to go into administration, some into guidance and some into curriculum development, essentially the three areas that Bright Meadows organizes itself to let teachers experiment with. Table 14 shows the replies which people gave when the more specific question: What do you expect to be doing in five years? was asked.

The patterns in Table 14 serve to amplify what was suggested by the discussion of Table 13. More women plan to stay in teaching;
more men plan to move out of the classroom (although a few women do discover that they want to move on). Women seem to be freer to try other careers, although men are more interested in teaching at the university level.

Table 14. What do you expect to be doing in five years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public education in some capacity other than teaching or admin.</td>
<td>20 (13 men, 7 women)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher in public school</td>
<td>18 (6 men, 12 women)</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator in public school</td>
<td>7 (4 men, 3 women)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other profession</td>
<td>4 (1 man, 3 women)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher in university</td>
<td>6 (5 men, 1 woman)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not work</td>
<td>4 (4 women, 1 man)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>1 (1 man)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get higher degree</td>
<td>1 (1 woman)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9 (5 men, 4 women)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The most often cited reasons for Bright Meadows as a successful experience for teachers are: the fact that teachers enjoy working with their colleagues in the way in which they work with them. Of the 45 people who mentioned this (48.8% relative frequency) 26 were women and
19 were men. Freedom as teachers was mentioned by 33 people (35.8% relative frequency) and equally by men and women. Thirty-one people (33.8% relative frequency) mentioned the fact that they have grown professionally and personally as the reason why Bright Meadows has been a successful experience for them. This aspect seemed to be stressed by men; 18 of whom cited growth as opposed to 13 women.

* A gloss on this feeling is how people perceive they have changed. Table 15 shows that.

Table 15. How have you changed since coming to Bright Meadows?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency of both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More open, honest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned to talk with kids</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned much as a teacher</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired confidence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural maturation independent of institution</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but don't know exactly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired more interests</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became less involved</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The most often cited reason for Bright Meadows as a failure for teachers are the fact that the school did not live up to their
expectations (20 people mentioned this or 21.8% relative frequency) and the fact that they feel overworked (18 people mentioned this or 19.6% relative frequency). These reflections match with the results shown in Table 13.

*The changes in the school that people have felt to be important are that it has become more structured and formalized and regressed from the original state (51 people mention this or 55.5% relative frequency) and that specific people who have left have altered the school significantly, which is to say that it is a people school (16 people mentioned this or 17.4% relative frequency). This last is actually a more significant factor than it appears to be because one must take into account the turnover factor. The 16 people represent those who have stayed throughout the years and who can in fact talk about the importance of specific people in the program because they have some historical perspective.

In summary, Bright Meadows does have a climate which is supportive, and teachers are aware of its components as well as the problems which the school creates by virtue of its goals. They are aware that while the school is still different from most schools, it has pulled back and that they themselves tend to talk more about experimentation and dealing with unknowns than they in fact always do.

But the goals of the school are important to teachers because they make them feel good about what they are doing and make them feel that they are competent and are being prepared to move ahead in education.
Finally, socialization seems not to be formal, on a school wide basis, but rather informal, through associations both imposed (team) and self-selected (friendships). Perhaps the school would do well to think more about formal socialization and include in that specific training for attaining the goals.  

7 In recent years the trend for summer curriculum development activities has been in the direction of city-wide workshops under the supervision of the coordinators. In the early years of the CL program there was money available for curriculum work for Bright Meadows teachers in the school itself, for the school's specific children. While a small number of teachers referred to a need for such time away from the normal routine for developing materials for the reason that a teacher cannot do all the jobs which he is delegated or which devolve upon him, none mentioned a reason which is very significant in the mind of the investigator. The investigator spent her first (and numerous subsequent) summers working on curriculum for the school with a number of colleagues and found it to be the single most important manner in which she was socialized. That is, because she met and talked with at great length and spent a great deal of time with the members of the original pilot project discussing curriculum, schools, ideas in general, while away from the pressures of a first year of teaching, and the whole process was so informal—no one was consciously thinking about what she ought to be aware of, etc.—that on the first day she did not have the usual syndrome. Unfortunately, because the investigator came to the school at an opportune moment (she was the only first year teacher in CL, the program was still small, etc.,) she is an unique case and it is difficult to generalize about whether this would be a good practice. One's hunch is that it would be.
Chapter Five: The Twelve Profiles

1. Introduction

We have looked at the general patterns of teachers' feelings about the school and their perceptions of the impact the school has had on them. The problem of looking only at survey results is that the flavor of the particular people themselves, people who bring unique combinations of personality and social variables to their experience, is lost.

Since Bright Meadows is a school that prizes, certainly ideologically, the nature of the individual, it would be an injustice to the faculty not to look at a few teachers in depth. To this end, this chapter contains twelve profiles of teachers, each one selected to meet specific criteria, and the entire group chosen to represent the continua of sex, age, experience, subject matter, position in school, team membership.

Because each profile is based primarily on statements made by the person during the interview, in response to specific questions (which were the ones on the schedule and therefore contain the bias of the schedule which was teacher-oriented rather than student-oriented) there is a certain stylistic consistency to the profiles. They include the teacher's perception of the school's goals and shortcomings, his thoughts on education, his educational background and his personal career plans. In addition, based on the investigator's observations, there is some
description of the teacher's classes and of the teacher himself. The intention is to let the teacher speak for himself, but the investigator also comments at the end of each profile on the specific issues brought up by each person; and also on the entire group in the last section of the chapter.

2. Selection Criteria: The Ideal Teacher

From the analysis of responses to the question about the ideal Bright Meadows teacher, four people clearly emerged above all others. Ed Reardon, a math-science teacher in his early thirties, team leader, coach, with some teaching experience before Bright Meadows, was the person most often mentioned as the embodiment of the characteristics essential to the ideal Bright Meadows teacher. He was cited by 27 people (out of a possible 65). The next three people were cited equally by 16 people (out of a possible 65). They are Greg Martin, a married man in his early thirties, teacher of English and social studies, team leader, department chairman, faculty advisor for student government, member of the parent-faculty committee on evaluation, whose first teaching experience Bright Meadows was; Jane Baldwin, a single woman in her mid-twenties, teacher of English and social studies, department chairman and leader of a faculty action subcommittee, who trained at Bright Meadows and then remained there. (All three people just mentioned were elected to the committee to select the new principal.) The third person is Lawrence Andrews, also a married man in his early thirties, team leader, department chairman, teacher of English and social studies who taught for a year at the
high school in Centerville before he came to Bright Meadows. Lawrence
was also mentioned by two people who thought he was not suited to teaching at Bright Meadows. These four people are included in the profile chapter because they represent what the staff considers the best of itself. It is interesting to note that 47 people (out of 65; and an additional 9 who are no longer at the school) were mentioned by someone as possessing at least some of the qualities of the ideal Bright Meadows teacher.¹

3. A Profile of the Ideal Bright Meadows Teacher

At this point we will look at what Bright Meadows teachers say about the ideal teacher. A number of cavils were entered before a majority of Bright Meadows teachers were willing to describe what they consider to be the ideal Bright Meadows teacher, or the qualities necessary for an ideal Bright Meadows teacher. Some said that an ideal Bright Meadows teacher would be an ideal teacher anywhere; others

¹Of the Alpha team, six members chose people on their own team as possessing qualities of the ideal teacher. Two people were not interviewed; one person mentioned another on the team negatively. Of Beta, nine people mentioned other members of the team positively; two were not interviewed; three were mentioned negatively. Of Gamma eleven were mentioned positively by members of their own team; six were mentioned negatively. Of Sigma, ten were mentioned positively; one was not interviewed and two were mentioned negatively. These figures emphasize what was observable about the different teams. Alpha does not have a strong self-image; Beta has the one outstanding negative person but on the whole is a well-organized smoothly functioning team; Gamma has the single outstanding positive person, but also a lot of strong people and the team has been going through an infight to get itself organized. Finally Sigma is extremely happy with itself and presents a fairly monolithic front.
said that they would not want a single model upon which the entire faculty would be patterned because they valued the diversity of styles and types found at Bright Meadows, and felt students benefited from this variety. Still others mentioned names and said that they would like an amalgamation of certain qualities of the people they mentioned, although some hastened to add that they had never observed these people teach. Four people, three women and one man, felt they were the ideal Bright Meadows teachers.

One young woman who came to Bright Meadows with what she herself considered to be a poor set of credentials and an undistinguished teaching career said that the beauty of Bright Meadows was that "most people there were chosen strictly on a personal (basis)...Somebody wanted them to teach there. People were picked as individuals...It made me feel great." On the other side of the continuum, one of the men, no longer at Bright Meadows, commented extensively that "one of the debilitating effects of working in that place is trying to live up to a standard that's somewhere out there, dimly perceived, as to what the Bright Meadows teacher ideally was, essentially non-directive, individually oriented, not group oriented, who didn't really give a damn about the subject matter. What was important was the psychological development of the youngsters; (there was a battle between the teachers who considered themselves essentially intellectuals and the administration which was essentially anti-intellectual). Somebody who wasn't disturbed by noise and confusion, etc. Someone who wouldn't lose his cool when confronted with a youngster, who wouldn't shove a youngster out into the corridor
or certainly wouldn't use physical violence, or any of these things. I think there was a certain dogma about the Bright Meadows teacher and I think that most of us at one time or another, depending on the day or week, were really angry about that, because I think the administration used this mythical ideal in a very coercive and punitive fashion. Certain teachers were appointed to committees and others weren't. Certain teachers were allowed access to the inner sanctum at will. Others were not. A lot also depended on your sex, too. So I wouldn't even care to tackle the assignment."

While the young woman is talking about the hiring function (what is one looking for when one recruits for Bright Meadows?) and the older man is discussing the maintenance function (is there a mold into which people must fit once they are on the faculty?) which may differ, almost everyone on the faculty agrees that it takes a certain kind of person to come and stay at Bright Meadows for two to four years.

The quality most often mentioned as the attribute which the ideal Bright Meadows teacher has is his concern for children, not just as students, but as people who have interests, needs, problems, successes, failures, competencies, etc. Closely allied to this quality is the fact that the teacher is himself in touch with who he is and behaves in a way that is always congruent with himself, and is able to deal with his own feelings about what is happening around him and to him. This involves the teacher's being sensitive to other people, adults and children. The ideal teacher believes in limits without being authoritarian, which is to say that he structures the experiences he provides
for students, because he likes, respects and trusts students, especially students of the junior high school level, which is a level he realizes has very special developmental needs. He is competent in his subject, but open to new ideas and he is flexible and creative. To do and to be all of this, of course, he must have enormous amounts of energy, both physical and psychic. These were the qualities mentioned by at least 18 people (out of a possible 92) and have been listed in descending order of mention.

Additionally, also in descending order of mention, the ideal teacher has other often cited characteristics. He is constantly growing, changing and developing. He is intelligent (a number of people felt that Bright Meadows requires a teacher with more than the average intelligence level) with a wide knowledge of other fields (not be, as one young man pointed out, most teachers even at Bright Meadows were, "in-grown" and "boring") and talents and interests outside the school; perhaps to provide the detachment with which to view what is happening at the school, an ingredient some people thought to be essential. He is calm and patient, can take a lot of pressure, is dedicated to the goals of the school (not just to his team or department). He must be able to listen to children and understand what they are really saying with the words they use; then translate from his own mind to their level and their mode of operation what they need to be doing; in a sense, a facilitator of students' learning who does not mind being used by students for their own needs. Such a person of course, commands the respect of those around him.
A few people felt that it was important to be organized and to be young but yet to have had some other kind of teaching experience since many people felt that "discipline" i.e. the inability to set limits, often frustrates ideal but untried Bright Meadows teachers. One person (the president of the CTA) felt that the ideal Bright Meadows teacher was politically liberal, while a few others felt that the single quality that the ideal Bright Meadows teacher needed was "chutzpah" translated by some as "guts", by others as "risktaking."

4. Selection Criteria: The Gamut

Also included in this chapter is Jane Ells, who was cited by 8 people (out of a possible 65; on the whole the faculty was less willing to mention people they thought were not ideal; only 19 people were mentioned as possessing undesirable qualities and these people were only mentioned very few times; two people who were no longer at Bright Meadows were also placed in this category) as least suited to teaching at Bright Meadows. She is a single woman in her fifties, teacher of English, who has had no positions of official leadership in the school. She has taught in eight other schools but has been at Bright Meadows since it opened.

John Lovejoy was selected for the chapter because he is the only fulltime teacher who is left in the classroom who was in the original pilot project. He is a married man in his mid-forties who teaches math, who has been department chairman and who taught elsewhere before Bright Meadows. He was, interestingly enough, cited only once as someone possessing the traits of the ideal Bright Meadows teacher.
Another person who came to the school when it opened is Sam Cross, a teacher of English and social studies, single, in his fifties, who has tried his hand at other jobs, including politics, before coming to Bright Meadows. He has been department chairman and he has been faculty advisor for student government. He was selected for the profile chapter because he asked to enter the experimental program and was rejected for it, coming into it only when the entire school changed over. He received citations for being both an ideal teacher and also for being unsuited to teaching at Bright Meadows. (The last three people are also able to comment extensively on the vicissitudes of the school over the last decade.)

Sandra Morris was selected because she is a married woman in her fifties, a teacher of English and social studies with experience in both urban and suburban schools, who sought out Bright Meadows as the school to teach in because it seemed to espouse her ideals of what a school should be. She can tell us what it feels like to be "home." Most other people who come to Bright Meadows because of its goals have not taught anywhere else.

Gladys Baum was included for a variety of reasons. She is a Bright Meadows parent whose two children graduated from Bright Meadows while she was teaching there. She has probably the least formal education of anyone on the faculty (two years of college) and at first did not like the school at all. Now in her late forties, a teacher of typing, she was the first fine and applied arts teacher to request to be on a team and have a house.
Shelley Grohman was selected because she has probably the highest raw intelligence score of any member of the faculty (the high school for gifted girls she attended requires at least an IQ of 135). She is in her mid-twenties, married, a teacher of English and social studies. She has been department chairman, a member of the parent-faculty committee on evaluation, a member of the committee to select the new principal and she is the first woman who actively sought and was elected to the position of team leader.

Jim Sever is included because he represents the group of teachers, both men and women who are marking time, either before marriage, children or as in his case, to avoid the draft and before further education. While at Bright Meadows he taxed the resources of the institution because of his lack of specific teacher training and his indecisiveness about the person he was. He is a married man in his early twenties, teacher of English and social studies straight out of a master in educational philosophy program.

Finally, Bill Evelyn, a married man in his fifties, teacher of English and social studies, who has done everything toward a doctorate but the dissertation, who was team leader, was included because he is basically a type who cannot remain long in an institutional setting.

The dozen teachers in this chapter give a good picture of the personality types, the ideological types and the issues represented by individual teachers at Bright Meadows.

5. Ed Reardon

The single person mentioned most often as the ideal Bright Meadows
teacher is Ed Reardon, a calm, soft-spoken, slim, dark-haired, self-assured teacher of science and math. A Canadian by birth and education (he has a bachelor of science from a Jesuit university and a bachelor of education from another Canadian university) he was attracted to the Centerville area because of its proximity to a Jesuit university where he wanted to and then proceeded to get a Masters in Guidance.

Ed, himself, describes an ideal Bright Meadows teacher as someone "who is more concerned about the individual as a person than as a student...The ideal teacher is one who is concerned about the kid's growth as an individual, and, if he's growing as he should, the academics will come. I guess I would like to see the ideal teacher therefore as one who is involved not just in the classroom and the House; but...concerned about outside activities...student council, dramatics, in the gym, in the student's friends and what he does on weekends...The ideal teacher doesn't have to be particularly intelligent, but he has to have common sense."

When asked about the goal of the school, he said, "I'm not sure that anyone really understands the goal...(For me) the goal is to try to get the child to realize what learning is, himself, rather than out of a book or through the teacher, for him to begin to look at the things around him and question those things which he has (which) he thinks are good and the way that we can best develop his study habits toward learning." This is different from most schools because..."other schools are more concerned about teaching content rather than developing an individual..."
But standing in the way of achieving that goal, he feels is the fact that there is "no uniformity, in terms of operating, by teachers... Kids have to know what is the standard and what is right, or what the school expects. If half your teachers say we don't expect that and the other half say we do expect it, then the kid is caught up in an ambiguity and there's no one who can sit down and say, 'All right, you really went wrong, but let's look at the results of that. It isn't that wrong but it is wrong in terms of what the society says' so I think we begin to build up in the kids values which are wrong...They learn that no one cares." Sandra Morris, in her interview when she talks about other teachers, says about Ed,..."he has some good relationships with certain kinds of kids who feel he is someone they can trust. I know one kid who's closer to Ed than he is to his own father. Maybe he seeks a guy like Ed out because Ed gives him just exactly what his father doesn't which is that Ed puts limits on him... So that when he does things that are clearly bad like stealing and things of that nature...Ed can say, 'You're stupid; you're destroying yourself' and it comes across, 'I like you enough kid and I'm concerned enough about you so I can tell you what I think you're doing that is bad.'"

Ed says that he has no interest in curriculum development. He is willing to teach anything he is given to teach. When he makes up courses himself, he admits, they are not very good. When he and some of his team members were experimenting with an "open schedule", that is, an open area and an extended period of time where three teachers
worked (Ed, Jim Sever and another SSE teacher) with a large group of students who selected a wide variety of topics they would study as individuals, he said that for a few of the topics the students had chosen, he couldn't find the right books or materials and they ended up memorizing organic chemistry formulas from a high school review text. On the whole the students and he agreed that although the idea was good, the "open schedule" program was not successful because the materials were not clearly organized or available. Ed felt that the important thing about the program was that when the three teachers argued for trying it, their team and the administration agreed to let them without asking too many questions.

"I try to be more concerned about the individual. But you're always questioning, because most times I still use the same method with all kids, which is, of course, wrong, but that's the way I am and its very difficult to change. The only way I can really change is not so much my way of presentation and my approach to students, but it's the kind of content that I try to get them involved in and getting them to look at it in different ways. But I can't really change the way I am, therefore my approach to all kids is basically the same."

His classes (e.g. Genetics, Plants & Animals, Organic Chemistry, Problem Solving) are usually fairly large (35 students), and very much controlled by him as the center of attention (the exception was the "open schedule"). He stands at the front of the room, with the students in a half circle in front of him. He uses the blackboard to illustrate his lecture and asks questions to make sure students
understand, without making them feel failures if they don't understand, or answers questions when students raise their hands. Despite his traditional form the students enjoy him as a person and enjoy the way he deals with them as a teacher.

One of the students in his House, a bright, but dependent ninth grade girl, says, "He's great. He's so fair. I like him because he cares if we learn. He explains everything explicitly. He lets the kids do the arguing among themselves and give the answers themselves and only talks to put in clarifications. He's so honest. He's like the Wizard of Oz at Bright Meadows. He knows everything. He always says before he tells anyone what to do, 'I think.'"

In his presentation of materials, he dips often into his knowledge of sports. He has been a coach throughout his teaching career and really finds fulfillment in that. He considers that perhaps "we should ask the people who teach best to do much more teaching and those who can work with kids to spend less of their time in the classroom in the content area and work more with individuals."

As a team leader, he is even-tempered and fairly task oriented. "I certainly have learned (since I've come to Bright Meadows) how to listen to people rather than always be the one who is talking." He reports the discussions of the team leaders and the directives of the administration and will give his opinion when asked. But he sees his role as one of moving the meetings and clarifying issues if the team members seem not to be understanding each other. He does not see himself as a policy maker for the team.
Because he is willing to subvert his own feelings to the will of the group, he has become very disillusioned with the work of committees in the school, feeling "that they are given a charge, but at no time do most people think they can carry it through...a vote is (said to be) final but it never is final...people have spent a lot of time, a lot of energy, doing a lot of things and the end result is some people may do it and some people may not, because no one has ever said this is something that we must do because we've agreed to do it."

In terms of the future, he is ambivalent. He wants to go into administration, something he's had the opportunity to learn and try at Bright Meadows (he often fills in as the trouble shooter when one of the administration is out of the building) and which he is finding he is good at. But he likes working with students and so he wonders about leaving the classroom. But he thinks he will try to become an administrator and see whether that's his future. (He has been offered an assistant principalship in the area.)

In the meantime he concludes, "I guess what my wife said, this being more my wife's comment than mine, it ends up as if you're really married to the school, rather than just a place to work at, and I guess I agree with her, but I think it's good and she thinks it's bad. I wouldn't want a job where I just went from 8 to 3 and then came home and forgot about it."
6. Commentary

The fact that Ed Reardon was selected as the "ideal" Bright Meadows teacher indicates not surprisingly that most teachers see the school as a place where children grow emotionally and spiritually rather than intellectually. Ed is very much in touch with himself as a person, but less as a thinker. He is quite inconsistent about curriculum and about how he teaches children content. He is, as he admits, not particularly intellectual or even creative.

On the other hand he is very clear about how he wants to deal with people, both adults and children. He is very calm, fair, and incontrol in a school where there are often crises, and this clearly sets him apart.

He is a person who has had leadership thrust upon him, to a large extent because he is a 'cool male', but he appears not all that eager to handle it. He seems to prefer to carry out decisions rather than to make them (he is largely responsible for the demise of the Evaluation Committee). Here he seems to reflect what many people will not admit which is that decision-making, theoretically beautiful, is actually very threatening.

His selection as the ideal teacher is quite understandable in view of the definition of the ideal teacher. Yet it is also paradoxical, for as he says there are people who should be in the classroom less than others and he is one of them. He is definitely someone who should be in a fluid institution like Bright Meadows because he represents an enlightened solidness, and he is really very good with children as people.
But he is not a person whose primary responsibility should be developing intellectual habits in children, (the definition the investigator has of a teacher).

7. Greg Martin

Greg Martin is a young, slight, soft-spoken man with a Texas accent and an even temper, wry wit and unerring sense of what's appropriate to say to an individual, a group and the total faculty. Greg is one of a small group of teachers at Bright Meadows who has taken a year away from the school. In fact his only other teaching experience has been in a school in Bolivia to which he went between his second and third year at Bright Meadows. For him, the goal of Bright Meadows is for students "to make wise choices about their academic life in school and their social life, and having made those choices, live up to them by assuming the responsibilities that go with them, thus giving them a healthy self-concept; also that they acquire the skills and knowledge that they'll need for the next step in their education as well as what's important to them right now."

"Comparing Bright Meadows with other schools, I'd have to say that although we've done some very stupid things, and made lots of mistakes, I still think it's a pretty good place, interesting place, very provocative. I never find it dull; frustrating of course, but I find it very exciting."

The ideal Bright Meadows teacher, for Greg, has to be "very, very strong, emotionally, intellectually, physically. The staff has to work so hard to create courses and, not having a place that you can call your
own, everything in constant flux, decisions being made and new decisions made plus the regular demands made on a teacher in dealing with adolescent and pre-adolescent... They also have to be smart, know something about what's appropriate to teach, what kind of expectations they reasonably should have for junior high kids, in terms of emotions and their skill development." Generally he is impressed with the staff. "I've heard people say the staff stinks, etc., but the only problem with our staff is they have been frittering away their energies in rather nonproductive frustrating activities." For example, he feels that the administrative responsibilities of the team, "would be a great relief for teachers to be spared. Now this would mean they would be subject to some decisions they didn't like, but to know that you don't have to worry about that would be a great relief. And you could perhaps worry more about why it is that so and so hasn't learned anything in your class for two years. Perhaps that would be a more appropriate thing to be worrying about."

He's had to deal over the years with a number of individuals on his team who have tried his interpersonal-relation-skills to the limit. But the people on the staff he really worries about are "the romantics... who look upon the natural goodness of the child and say just provide this child with the opportunity and he'll do great things. At this particular age I feel the demands on adolescents are so great, in terms of emotional and physical and mental needs that few of them can cope with that kind of freedom." He's concerned that students actually
learn things. "I find that when they do perform and when they do well, and they should do well if they're doing something that's appropriate to them, they get great satisfaction and a great self-concept."

He feels Bright Meadows can destroy some teachers. "I can identify people on the staff who I think had potential of being gifted teachers, who were crushed by the experience... There's a tremendous amount of demand placed on teachers and the system has been set up to encourage people to overextend themselves. It hasn't been simply, you can do it if you want to. There's a mystique or something in the building that encourages people if you're really committed and concerned, to get in there and drown... I came very close to it at the end of my second year... I learned a lesson, I think, in realizing that I couldn't do everything. That was the year I was team leader, department chairman, head of the Evaluation Committee subcommittee (we were meeting every week) head of student government and then at the end of the term we worked on Centers and I was going to Bolivia. I was going to oblivion, that's where I was really going to... Nevertheless I've been happy... it has provided for me a great opportunity for growth and development... The school brings together teachers where they have an opportunity to be people and to work together." This professionalization of teachers carries over positively into the classroom he feels.

His courses tend to be taught along traditional lines with himself as the center of direction. When teaching alone he tends to offer tried and tested courses that have been done before, for example, Animal Farm, Lord of the Flies, The Hobbit. When team teaching, which he does
occasionally, he will risk more and try out some new ideas. One of the courses he taught with a woman on his team a few years ago on alienation was written up in the New York Times and referred to by a professor of education in a lecture at a local university.

The general pattern for his classes is for him to assign tasks, such as reading, to the entire class, while he confers with individual students at their desks or his. He will often allow a small group of students to go to the Center to pursue some project or he will break up the class into small groups and give them topics to deal with. When leading a large group discussion, he very often rewards students' answers before throwing out the next question. He states his expectations very clearly and conducts quite well-organized classes. As a result he often attracts much larger classes than he thinks advisable.

There are a number of areas where he thinks Bright Meadows needs to do some work. Teachers need more in-service training "instead of do your own thing:" "I think the ability to teach has a great deal to do with what is taught and I think we could use some help in getting teachers to be more effective so that children can learn skills and the knowledge that is important to them." Students need more choices "within a particular area and fewer big fake general choices." Individualization is becoming more and more difficult as class size goes up. He would like a schedule that would take into account the emotional relationships of teachers to students. "Teachers have a thousand separate emotional exchanges during the day in which they want to be supportive, kind, helpful and mildly balanced."
His own education took place in southern schools and he's only gone as far as getting a bachelor's degree although he's taken other courses. Originally he went into urban renewal thinking he would help people. Then he visited a friend who taught at Bright Meadows and was offered a job there. Married and with two children, he is always plagued with financial problems. "Expenses have gone up and income has not matched them. Even though I work very hard, I do think it might be appropriate for schools to, at some point, pay people in relation to what they do. For instance, if you spend a great deal of time coaching, you get paid extra money for it; if you spend a great deal of your time meeting with the principal, assistant principal and key people in the building writing up a proposal, you get hot pastrami sandwiches."

He's watched a large number of other men leave the school to go into positions of higher status and pay, usually into administration, and he's feeling ambivalent. "I do begin to think in terms of leaving what is a great pleasure because of these other considerations which are very horrible, like justice, envy, money, you know awful things, but the system is such that you are encouraged to do that. You have to go back and read Ecclesiastes occasionally or something to keep yourself, to make yourself realize what's truly important, but the system is such that it's always on you, particularly if you are a man and people come up to you all the time and say in affect--get out of teaching."

8. Commentary

Greg Martin suffers from a problem endemic to education. The only
way that he can see to advance financially, especially, is to leave teaching which he both likes and is competent at. The reasons that he has stayed so long are ironic counterpoints to each other: that he does not possess the necessary credentials for advancement and that he's had the opportunities to do the kinds of tasks (e.g. informal leadership, curriculum development, formal policy making) that prove to him that he's competent without the credentials. This ironic situation is a reflection of the attempts that have been made by Bright Meadows to reverse the trend in education, which is to get people who show promise, immediately and completely out of the classroom. Needless to say, one school cannot hope to reverse the national and historical trend. So Greg worries about how to get more money but not have to go the traditional route.

In the meantime, he is a very political creature. Despite his boyish and seemingly naive exterior, he is a bit of a Machiavellian. What appears effortless and "spur of the moment" has often been calculated to achieve the results he wants without much surface tension or trauma, in fact, often with a laugh. He is, on the whole, equally concerned with what he does in the classroom and what he does in the larger arena of the total school, and he has managed to maintain this nice balance throughout the years.
9. Jane Baldwin

Jane Baldwin is a very large young woman with a New York private girls' school and private girls' college background. Bright Meadows is the first school she ever taught in. This is the school where she practice taught while getting her masters at a local large university, and where she remained. "I sometimes have a hard time being objective about this place."

Her understanding of the school's goals is that the students are given "the opportunity to make some responsible decisions in their lives, decisions that they see as being their own, not someone else's, in terms of their learning and in terms of their social adjustment... and to increase their positive self-concepts." In fact, however, she thinks that since many "decisions can't be carried through"that what students are learning, which is not a bad thing, is that "there are adults who are on their side, and who are working for their interests and their needs...I question whether some adults go too far in doing this and not draw any limits on their (students') behavior."

She thinks the goal would work more successfully in a private school where "it's a voluntary commitment where the parents are behind it and support it at home and where it's not a question of physical plant and number of both adults and kids"...and it would work better if the staff were more consistent in its treatment of students. She also questions whether the average child is ready for so much responsibility. "I'm not saying that you shouldn't train him to be ready but I'm not sure that this is the point in his life when you train him. There are too
many other things on his mind...I think you have to focus on the ones that are important to him in his perception."

At the same time she considers, "Some of the kids are very bright as opposed to my peers when I was young, and I sometimes question whether they're challenged enough...I see them wanting a lot more than we're giving them in terms of academics...I can't do it effectively when I'm dealing with such a range of spectrum of kids...I almost wish I had an opportunity to take a group of really high powered kids alone and work with them (academically). These kids are very perceptive and they can see through a teacher in a minute, a teacher who's not being honest with them."

In her description of the ideal teacher, she also points to what she considers some of the problems in the school. "Single...because teaching in this place is so time and emotion consuming. A teacher who has had some other teaching experience so that he can handle the discipline. For a good many teachers and young people here discipline becomes an obstacle to achieving and obtaining the goals...Someone who knows there are limits and doesn't get overwhelmed by the philosophy to the point where he distorts it and takes it to a dream world kind of level...Someone who can roll with the tide...who trusts kids, respects kids, somebody who's open ended enough so he doesn't have to feel that he's always right, somebody who can be authoritative without being authoritarian, somebody who can come down to the students' level in terms of identifying with what they're going through, somebody who understands them in relation to the whole society they live in, someone who knows how to be non-
directive but directive at the same time, somebody who can be warm and supportive without being mushy and without being melodramatic and romantic about the whole business...an adult who lives up to the goals of Bright Meadows himself so he can be a model for the kids in terms of his own sense of responsibility and his own actions. You really have to have patience and a good sense of humor. I don't think anybody who considers himself an intellect would be happy here. I'm not sure he could get away from the book theory of kids and the altar of ideas to deal with kids emotions and the other things they are interested in." (sic)

She likes teaching at Bright Meadows. "I'd like it a lot better if people did what they said they were going to and followed through on what they said they were going to...I think if I weren't capable of rolling with the tide, I wouldn't like it but somehow a lot of things here don't get to me, don't bother me." A good example of how flexible Jane is, was her reaction to an emergency which occurred in the spring. A chaperone could not, at the last moment, go to Montreal with a bus-load of ninth grade students, and Jane immediately volunteered to give up the next three days of her life to go with these students, many of whom were not even on her team.

She is also a natural leader. This was acknowledged by her election to the principal selection committee. She has a great deal of informal influence. For example, she has gathered around her a large number of young men on the faculty who look to her for direction. She has gotten involved in a number of new ventures: sex education, drugs
education, black studies, and other people have followed her lead. This past year she has become interested in formal leadership. She is department chairman in social studies and set up an inservice seminar program (with the English department chairman, Shelley Grohman) and she chaired the subcommittee which proposed a consulting teacher program for the coming year.

The latter two activities grew partly from some feelings she had about the kind of support she got at Bright Meadows as a new teacher. "Sometimes I think that maybe people (other staff and administration) should have been more critical or have steered or directed me and spoken out instead of letting me operate in a vacuum or just the way I want to do it, and in that sense I think they could have made me grow more... I like wrestling with making my own decisions and I like the opportunity to do that, but I also like to know if the decision I made was right or wrong or could have been better... I do think there are people around here with a lot more experience who obviously should know better... I would expect where there's such a young staff, for the older people to take more of a directive role with such young teachers, inexperienced teachers... I think Bright Meadows, sometimes makes you feel too good about yourself." The programs also grew out of her concern that none of the "fundamental (curriculum) questions get answered. It's just the surface" that gets treated in the constant change of the institution. Yet she feels that she has grown. "I came here as a very academic oriented person and I swung to the other end of the pendulum. I'm just now
getting back into a balance."

Her classes tend to be discussion classes based on reading. She encourages students to answer her questions any way they can and as a result often has trouble structuring the discussion so that it can be free and yet go somewhere. Despite her criticism that too many teachers don't think through what they teach, she herself tends to take risks in kinds of courses she offers. For example, she taught a drugs course designed to involve some very "turned off" students, but she and her team teacher hadn't had much time to plan it. She also taught, with three other teachers, an experimental activity-oriented communication workshop which required a tremendous amount of time on all their parts for it to be successful and the teachers often did not have that kind of time. The other kind of risk she takes is in the kind of relationships she sets up with students. She has gone to the defense of many Metco youngsters and youngsters from the less affluent sections of the city, the Heights, putting herself on the line emotionally under the pretext of doing it intellectually. When she taught the Black Studies Course to the Metco group, she was constantly in pain because the students challenged her good faith. In the end she said, "I feel somewhat hypocritical teaching kids about poverty and about race relations when I have not...really experienced it myself thoroughly enough not to be talking out of books." She feels the need to get closer to the "pulse of things...I can live through them. I'm probably not going to be able to experience the suffering first hand but
I certainly can get more involved than I have been...I did some tutoring in Kent and that's, well,...revealing but I wouldn't say I grew a lot as a teacher through it."

Despite the pressures under which the school is operating (community disfavor, administrative confusion, constant teacher turnover, etc.), "I'm restless with myself more than with the school...I think you have to be pretty sure of yourself to be a teacher in this open environment, and sure of your values and sure of your expectations of adults and kids." She feels herself pulled in three directions: she'd like to go back to school; or get involved in politics; or "some kind of a community development program in terms of a more urban-oriented experience." "I sometimes get bored with myself. I get bored with teachers because they are so ingrown in a sense...When I'm in my 40's I think I'd like to do dean work at some college." In fact, she thinks next year she'll teach in Bogota.

10. Commentary

Jane is an extreme example of a Bright Meadows phenomenon, which is, that many members of the faculty live, sleep and eat the school. Her friends are from Bright Meadows; she spends her evenings working and meeting in Bright Meadows issues. In fact, ninety percent of her energy is engaged in the school.

At the same time she is extremely critical about the school. She is open and enthusiastic and honest and that means that whatever she thinks she says. Interestingly, because her good faith and hard
work are so clear, this has not offended anyone on the staff.

There is also a sense, and she herself pointed to it, that she acquired too much influence too soon. After a year of teaching she was already, unpolished and undisciplined, guiding other people into making policy decisions. While the results of her work have been very positive, and this is due to the fact that she herself was aware of her inadequacies and sought and received advice from members of the administration, such a quick rise to authority in an institution has its problems. It is a very important factor in encouraging growth in the faculty, but it, if used indiscriminately, can result in a great deal of waste and confusion or the institution as well as the individual.

In Jane Baldwin's case, the institution did not suffer, but there is a question about whether Jane herself will ever be able to concentrate on her teaching skills after she has experienced the heady effects of being in charge of adults.
11. Lawrence Andrews

A young man in his late twenties, with a private school, small men's college and large university graduate school background, Lawrence Andrews sees the goal of Bright Meadows for students as summarized in the term agency, which "means being your own agent in making your own arrangements and also deciding where it is that you want to go. I think in terms of the kinds of things a travel agent does in helping a client to get to a place that he wants to go. Agency behavior constitutes acting in such a way as to promote your own education...I would contrast...it to a more passive approach to education where you allow other people to make decisions for you...and you just sort of get led along." He feels agency is an important concept in a school because it means that "for the students there is less of a gap between the real world and the world of school."

He feels frustrated that there is not more hardware in Bright Meadows but he says that that is not the ultimate solution to getting closer to achieving the goal, the ultimate solution is "the kinds of relationships that you have."

An ideal Bright Meadows teacher for him is someone who is "clever, (has) many talents, is a superb human being with no vanities, attractive physically, resourceful. One of the most important abilities is to be able to keep your head when everyone else is losing theirs." A teacher must be "sure of himself" and "get as great an experience of life in order to help kids find the way themselves." He feels that the team orientation at Bright Meadows allows everyone at the school to be well
suited to teaching there. "I think that once you take somebody outside the team situation and isolate him and assign him to a group of students more or less at random, then you can talk about people not being suited... Take Corinne for example. She has some very superb qualities and some very real weaknesses and I don't think there is very much that she can do about the fact that she does not have a very commanding presence and the fact that the bad little boys don't listen to her. I think if we took her and assigned her a heterogeneous seventh grade classroom that she would leave in a month but she's making an absolutely splendid contribution to the team and to the school. She's somebody who in a conventional school would not be well suited for teaching and yet here, I think she's happy and I know she's doing an excellent job." He has over the years recommended many friends to come and teach at Bright Meadows, and a number of them have been hired.

Lawrence has been very distressed by the reaction in the community to Bright Meadows and what he feels to be the resulting "curtailment of the school's autonomy." "I think that personally I'm very receptive and open to criticism and I think I've learned from criticism often but I resent somebody telling me what to do...I sense that things are not entirely within my control. Matters of policy are further (away) than being somewhere I can influence them and that bothers me...When I first came here I didn't understand the importance... of having people share in the management of the enterprise that they're concerned with." He feels disappointed when he feels "the kind of lack of faith...that sometimes gets expressed by the community, by individuals in the community and by
the kind of changes that we've been obliged to make by the school committee and by the superintendent. I dislike the students and the community as a group. There are many individual students that I'm crazy about—really like. And I think actually almost any student in the school as an individual on a one to one basis is fine, but the group identities they make for themselves make them quite unattractive."

He feels he's learned a great deal at Bright Meadows. "One of the first things that I had to learn how to do was to talk to kids and to listen. I think that my outlook on the discipline of English has changed...Perhaps my goals for students may not have changed that much but certainly my notion of the proper way of achieving them has."

Before he came to Bright Meadows he taught a year in the high school and a year abroad but didn't like the kind of "remote person" he felt he had to be, the kind of role he had to take with kids.

Although his classes vary according to the subject, he tends to be very loose about classroom organization, having a very high tolerance for movement and noise. He enjoys team teaching because it allows him to get very involved with one student and not have to worry about the rest since there is another adult present. He is flamboyant in class. For example, in his The Odyssey class he had a group of totally disparate students, who selected the course more because they wanted to be with him than because they were interested in the poem. The day he was observed the books had not yet arrived and he had not anticipated the delay. So he embarked upon a very amusing, entertaining and very modern version of the background story to The Odyssey. He popped up and
thought the problems through). Very close to the end of the class he seemed to abdicate even his nondirective role and to withdraw from the problem of bringing closure to the children's experience (the trial was left unsettled).

Nonetheless students like him and feel that he likes them very much because he listens to them and champions many of their causes. For example, the school production is always controversial among the faculty, for it becomes an educational issue, an issue of priorities. He directed Oliver over some protest and came out in his tuxedo for a bow, which endeared him to the students. He is an advocate of students' rights to

2The observer wondered about the degree to which the hidden curriculum was more effective than the actual curriculum. Were the students learning that accurate preparation and research and substantive content were not important, but just the broad amusing outlines?
determine their own curriculum.

On the other hand, he and Sam Cross were the two teachers who were selected by a large number of people as both suited and unsuited to teaching at Bright Meadows. There is enough controversy surrounding him for him not to have the confidence of as much of the staff as he would like. He was sorely disappointed when he was not elected to the principal selection committee.

As English department chairman he has worked very closely with the citywide English coordinator and has even spoken at an NCTE conference on "laissez faire" English. That plus his experience as team leader have placed him in "great personal discomfort if not actual agony" because he feels he should be "moving." "I think very few people should teach for more than five years...I think that teaching takes a lot out of you...I have a tendency toward inertia and I'm afraid that if I stayed in teaching the inertia would increase...I can't feel comfortable with the notion of remaining a classroom teacher...I'm afraid it's a kind of status thing...that somehow it's not elegant enough to be a classroom teacher...it certainly isn't very well paid." He suspects that after watching and being involved in administration at Bright Meadows, he now understands the difference a good administrator makes and he could conceive of going into administration which he hadn't thought about four or five years ago.

12. Commentary

Lawrence is theatrical. Everything he does is directed toward creating an effect upon his audience: the way he moves, writes, talks.
He sometimes gives the impression that he sees himself as the 'great male hope' for education. He appears more interested in control (he has spoken to the investigator privately of his need for success), that is, the power or influence he can exert in the running of the school, than in the rigor or management of his classes.

While there are few teachers at Bright Meadows and perhaps at any school who are not concerned with the kind of image they project, Lawrence's concern, because of the leadership roles he has held and because of his interest in the total school, becomes a school matter, not just a personal or even a team matter. He will often raise issues which, if they do not then move in the direction he has anticipated, he will abandon, leaving others to carry through the responsibility. Or he will argue a point that may obstruct a meeting on the pretext that it is professionally significant to the faculty when in fact it is really personally important. Needless to say, every human being engages in that kind of personally-necessary argument once in a while. That is the reason why, especially at Bright Meadows, it is important to maintain groups of people intact long enough so that they can begin to understand each others' biases and foibles and work around them. Lawrence, because he uses the school as an arena and because he has a degree of charisma, is someone who makes the habit an issue. He represents an excess which Bright Meadows allows because it believes in the inviolability of the individual--teacher or student.

13. Jane Ells

Jane Ells is quite proud of the reputation she has acquired over
the years, that she is someone not to confront or 'cross' because she does what she wants to do in her own way at her own pace. An older woman, living alone and suddenly relieved of the responsibility of watching over an aging father, she is also the person most often referred to as someone who should perhaps not be at the school.

When asked about the goals of the school, she replied, "To get the student to want to be a student on his own, to learn to know himself as a student and as a human being, to become educated, to grow through three turbulent years. Maybe I'm stating my own goals rather than the goals of the school. Maybe I function more for my own goals; maybe I'm too ornery and run my own ship...I'm just an individual or a renegade," She does not think these goals are different from the goals of the eight other schools she has taught in. "These goals are everything. They're life and education...self-fulfillment and love."

Her criticism of the school is tempered by two facts: that "it's the first time I ever helped to start a school and there's a nostalgia and a sentimentality" and that "whatever imperfections we have at Bright Meadows exist in many, many other places besides here right now. In other schools certainly and in the world in a larger sense, (I think there is)...a lack of kindness and thoughtfulness and appreciation and respect for property...a lack of sufficient planning ahead for each next step certainly and adequate preparation for each new step, although I'm not sure it's possible to make adequate preparations. I know what I think is our greatest imperfection. An intellectual dishonesty... not quite hypocrisy. It's something which has existed in Centerville for a
long, long time. I've always said jokingly, something over 20 years now, we have an active public relations board. I think we've been a little too anxious to be known than to ... labor in the vineyard." She thinks the school tolerates "what seems like excessive personal ambition on the part of the staff for the sake of it...It isn't that I want everyone to stay in the classroom or be dull or boring and I don't think those are equivanents really...We have to do our daily jobs which is to teach our kids..."

She has stayed as long as she has, despite the fact that she gets extremely "weary" (she notices that even 21 year old men look haggard, why should she expect anything different?), because "there is an opportunity for you to fulfill yourself scholarly [sic], academically and talently [sic]. I think perhaps the greatest advantage to me personally or to me as a professional, is that now I can concentrate, because of my team and everything, I can give all my attention to English..."

And the fact that she is teaching what she wants, she feels is better for the students. She feels the school is not petty and is appreciative of that. She's been lucky that the staff has honored her need to have her own room (she feels the "physical upsets of Bright Meadows' life are a hazard for someone of my nature") by appointing as her roommates teachers who share her concern about the physical environment; as a result her room is one of the few in the building which is neat, clean and looks as if someone cares about it.

While she feels she's changed as a person (she's more irritable now when people aren't using what she considers to be common sense, and she
has disregarded the use of tactful euphemisms), she does not feel she
has changed as a teacher. "I always listened to and considered the
newest whatever it was floating around at the time. I was always easy
with the kids as long as there was a certain pattern that seemed to
make sense to me. I always allowed for the one who had to shout and
holler, knowing sometimes I do. Subject matter. I think I always liked
studying and trying to share it with other people and all." Although a
depression child who was lucky to go to State Teachers College, she has
continued to study, with a masters in history from a nearby university,
and a sabbatical year in Hawaii and a year of exchange teaching in Cali-
ifornia. For the last three years she has offered two courses which are
based on material developed in the last five years at universities in
this area. One deals with writing and the other with the new grammars.
Her classes are always orderly, children sitting quietly in a circle of
chairs around the room, working on study guides and other written ma-
terials. She sits at her desk correcting a child's work and sending him
back to do more, that is to say, dealing with each child as an individual.
Her courses are good for and taken by children who need quiet, who
need clear instructions and very structured work, who cannot handle
large risks and abstract ideas.

According to her the ideal Bright Meadows teacher needs "guts and
energy, just plain strength." The other things are a sense of humor,
some detachment to see into the future and not let temporary items
bother you, a respect for those people or ideas or thoughts or proced-
ures that are sort of foreign to you.
One of the greatest differences for her in teaching at Bright Meadows today, as opposed to ten years ago, is "the lack of ability to control your own situation. So much is dependent on someone else's doing something, of someone else having his offerings ready, of so many adults handling your students...a need for preparation perhaps of more new things more quickly...I think perhaps there's a greater need to get along with the other adults who are working in the school more successfully...Tensions can rise more easily." In the early days of Bright Meadows, the small staff ran the school in Quaker meeting style. She desperately wants a do-nothing year but because she is close to retirement age, doesn't feel she can afford to leave yet.

15. Commentary

Jane Ellis has a quality which is somewhat unusual at Bright Meadows. She thinks that being in the classroom is the most important thing a person can do in a school and she acts upon that principle. She resents all other intrusions on her time.

The problem which she creates, which in a school where there are no teams and very little choice would probably not be noticed, is that she is basically inflexible and will not compromise in a situation that calls for sharing. In a school which values comradeship among teachers and open-ended discussions about governance, she stands as someone who won't engage. She avoids confrontation and therefore it is difficult to deal with issues of conflict with her. As a result she often places a burden on the rest of the team for the consequences of her acts. For example, if she offers the same course term after term the number of students who
elect it will decrease. This increases the number of students who will choose courses offered by other teachers and thus the burden is placed on other teachers to create new courses.

16. John Lovejoy

The only teacher at present in Bright Meadows, still in the classroom, who was in the original pilot project is John Lovejoy, a slim, salt and pepper haired, medium-statured man who teaches mathematics. Soft-spoken (he has never been heard to raise his voice) he feels himself inarticulate and often defers to the younger members of the staff (he thinks Bright Meadows has the youngest staff in Centerville—except for elementary schools) to comment on the events of the school. Only when he feels something extremely strongly does he speak up (usually at great length and in a monotonous stream) in front of the large group and then apologizes for not making himself clear.

He considers the goal of the school to be to teach children to "make right decisions, quality decisions and to have the ability to think for themselves, and yet to be human enough, I would hope, to accept and weigh the opinions of others." He feels that this goal has been lost and that teachers are using the idea of individualizing as "an excuse to allow things which they...(can't) or...(don't) take the time to control...the most outstanding being the rights of others." He says that the goal was being achieved "when were called CL" but that all got lost in the battle between CL and TriDelt and the public relations. "I did feel at that time that at least as far as kids honestly seeing what was happening to them and with teachers who also could see
what was happening, what they were doing that was wrong as teachers, what methods were wrong, the kids seeing what was wrong with themselves and with teachers. We had a far greater exchange and communication..."
Partly he realized that since the school became all CL, he hasn't been very involved and therefore not "contributing as much as...in the past...
Yet there are a lot of things that have happened here that I feel I've helped plant seeds. But I would like to know more about what's going on, (to have) more of a direct contact with everything that's happening and I...feel that unless you are involved it takes the edge off what you are willing to give."

He feels that today it is even harder to achieve the goals because "of the way the world is...no particular morals, it seems, are acceptable. Today we have a far wider range of attitudes among teachers, in terms of what the school should be doing. I don't see a continuity in the faculty as we had before...no interdependence." John argues that Bright Meadows cannot move without considering the society to which it relates. "An individual who is not rooted in something is like a leaf in the wind, no purpose, nothing."

The outstanding thing for him at Bright Meadows is the way teachers and students relate, "the freedom of being able to express yourself with kids." "This is probably the first school I've ever been at where I didn't constantly hear teachers cussing in the teacher's lounge...Everybody here seems far more intent on how we can help the students learn better...as individuals..." "The majority of teachers here are intelligent, understanding people who aren't petty."
In describing the ideal Bright Meadows teacher he emphasized that this must be "an understanding human being...with enough confidence in himself to allow things to happen...A good guidance worker, social worker, priest, rabbi, minister, a real combination...yet someone with a lot of common sense... Obviously he's got to know his subject field, but I put that second." According to John, an ideal Bright Meadows teacher has to also be sensitive to other teachers' drives and problems... particularly when you get new members of the faculty and you know they're under a certain pressure..."

Yet sometimes he gets "to feeling just a little guilty because I stayed a teacher...but why should a teacher feel he has to go into administration in order to feel proud in the eyes of other people? My problem right now of course is not having done much of anything in the field of administration, which I'm not particularly concerned about except as a prestige factor, I don't know how long it would take to get there...You reach a certain point of the salary scale and you can't really afford to step out..." Besides he would really much rather go into guidance. He feels he "would probably be as good a guidance counselor as ever existed...I probably do more guidance than anything else..."

He feels that many Bright Meadows teachers are not prepared some of the days when they go into the classroom. He feels that a teacher ought to be able to work on curriculum during the summer where "he could sit down without kids around, organize and develop things that he's got, and feel that this is his work." His classrooms generally fall into a pattern which he's been using since the pilot project. The desks are
arranged in small clusters with children working on independent topics but able to talk with each other and help each other. He sits at the desk and calls children up individually, or they line up waiting to see him. The door is open and the low hum is allowed to waft out into the hall. Occasionally he gives a lecture using the blackboard and he allows children to go to the math center for special activities. One student when asked how he liked working alone replied, "In math it's good because you have the book that tells you what to do..." John has been math department chairman several years and he likes that. "This faculty does have the opportunity to really lay things out, make decisions, take part in decisions."

He feels Bright Meadows has allowed him to keep up with his field, to stay alert and to be more confused than another school might have.

17. Commentary

John is a pleasant, quiet, patient man who remains removed most of the time. As a teacher he seems undistinguished. The remark made by the student that his way of operating classes is all right because in math you have a book is illuminating for it points to the fact that he may not be a large factor in the learning process.

Working with him is not hard (even when he is opposed to an issue as he was often in the sex education curriculum group he volunteered to work on), because he is equanimous and often defers. The pervading feeling one gets from talking with him these days is that the world is passing him by. He uses the word "hurt" and "inferiority complex" when he talks about how people used "to come to ask me what was going on and I find now
I am not asked."

He says he could leave Centerville and become an administrator in a smaller system but that doesn't really appeal to him. Guidance is more appealing (although one has the feeling that his performance there would not be different from teaching). But probably the most appealing of all alternatives would be another pilot project in which he could feel engaged and important, in which he would not have to compete with more outspoken and intelligent people.

18. Sam Cross

Sam Cross is a large man with a large voice. He speaks well and sings well, and when either kind of rhetoric is required he is able to provide it, convincingly. A bachelor, he divides his concern between Bright Meadows and a camp he owns in New Hampshire and to which he has brought many a Bright Meadows student.

An idealist by his own admission, he has become cynical and disappointed as he has watched changes at Bright Meadows. "We've regressed terribly...I think the official doctrine...of making it possible for kids to learn best by themselves without the help of a teacher has been pretty much forgotten...The goal was to establish a program of instruction that was to meet the student where he was...tailoring instruction as much as possible on an individual basis to take him as far as he can go...completely openeded...But these are tender, delicate philosophies and issues" and need to be reexamined constantly which, Sam feels, the school has not been doing. The goal is important because it makes the "difference between a relevant and an irrelevant education."
We haven't kept abreast of the changes that have taken place outside. Education is going to have to externalize itself...to have the school walls broken down symbolically...get rid of the real and insinuated restrictions that have been placed to make something convenient. If we remain within the school walls and ignore what's going on outside we are going to lose kids." To this end, Sam has always been interested in student government and was for many years the motivating force behind it. He was also the instigator of an assembly program for the death of Martin Luther King, and he organized the first moratorium for peace on an enormous school wide scale enlisting the help of everyone in the building; as well as an ecology teach-in. Such activities, significant and timely and extravagant, have always been of great importance to Sam. He feels that students learn more from them than from what goes on in their normal classes. "We've got to make school harmonious with the total needs and experiences of the kids."

As far as the ideal Bright Meadows teacher, he feels this person ought to be someone "who likes kids and is sensitive to kids and to people and likes being with them..." He thinks he is well suited to teaching at Bright Meadows "because I'm in control of what I think I want to do and want to be and I'm continuing to reexamine and I have given myself this ideal of being as good a teacher as I can and this calls for constant reappraisal and changing of directions and techniques."

Sam has tried other fields. He worked in industry and in government, he ran for election and sold insurance. "When I came to Bright Meadows I was sure I had found what I wanted to do." The school has given him
"the freedom to grow and to create, to be something, to become some-
thing, and I'm still in that process."

Sam has been with the school since it started. He was in the Suprad program, but not in the original pilot project. "I don't know—I think there may have been a feeling, and it may have been justified, but I'm not sure, that I came on too strong, and that too strong a voice would have a blanketing effect on the free exchange of ideas. I don't know. The reason given when I asked Elizabeth was that she needed some stability and strength in the other half of the school. I finally in the last year the school was split took some initiative in leading a kind of rebellion against the separate schools and I was convinced that unless something were going to happen I wasn't going to remain here because I couldn't see a split school continuing." He was sorry to see Elizabeth Crown leave because "she had a skill in handling people, groups of people that I haven't seen since." She left a void, but he feels that she probably could not have withstood the kind of community pressure that would have been applied. "So I'm not sorry she left because she's much happier now than she would have been had she remained here." But he is very unhappy with the present administration. "I have had a feeling that the administration of authority and the delega-
gation of authority have not been understood...Authority isn't given and then forgotten. It's a sharing kind of thing and if a teacher has a responsibility for controlling a certain function or a certain aspect of an educational program, he ought to have an awareness that he's work-
in conjunction with and collaboration with the person who gave it
initially to him and this ought to be constantly a factor that exists in the relationship between the two people concerned...Accountability is a two way street." "I've had some experiences which were not happy... There were...occasions when it seemed to me that as a professional person I was not brought into the reasons for decisions having been made." For example once when Sam stepped in to help a young teacher who was having difficulty with some students on their team, and the students complained that he had no right to make them stay after school, the principal did not back him up and he was relieved of the entire issue. "I measure what a man believes by what he does." He feels that there is a great deal of false pride in the school. "We're really deceiving ourselves and we're saying something that we're not doing." He too is very conscious that "we are not reaching some kids at all."

Sam is verbally committed to teaching what students say they want to study. He was in favor of a course on the 'occult', a course on weaving, a course on vocabulary because the students asked for it. When he teaches these student-requested courses, as well as when he teaches courses he feels ought to be offered, such as Current Events, Government, Boys to Men, he does it in a very traditional manner. He gives out work sheets, nightly assignments and purveys information as well as acts the arbiter of correct answers. What stands him in good stead in the classroom is his experience as a teacher (he repeats many of his old courses) and his remarkable control of language. His energies are really no longer directed toward the classroom. In terms of the future, he would very soon like a sabbatical. For fifteen years he's never had a
vacation. "My life has been one round of summer and winter employment." If he takes a year off he would either like to study law ("it might be fun to get a law degree or to take law courses and see if I could do some curriculum development in this area" since it is important for junior high students to understand the law and its relationship to people), or to work out a program where his camp and the school combine forces to create a total educational environment for students.

19. Commentary

Sam is potentially a dangerous person on the faculty because he is a fine rhetorician who often does not act upon his own words. He thus confuses people and issues while appearing to be clear and cogent. For example, while preaching freedom and love as the way to teach children, he is a very strict authoritarian in his classroom and in his House. He is a talker rather than a doer and such men eventually lose their legitimacy.

Another danger is that he sometimes uses students. When he cannot convince the faculty that something he wants to do is worth doing (for example establishing a student lounge before some ground rules were set), he will use students he's established relationships with to state his position as if it were their own (he encouraged the president of the student government to accuse the faculty of not wanting to open the lounge because they did not really believe in freedom for students). The Bright Meadows faculty cannot bear being accused of not being humane and such tactics do work. But one wonders what students learn from such an experience and as a result what kind of a teacher Sam really is.
20. Sandra Morris

Sandra Morris is a slim, greyish haired, fifty year old mother of three children, and wife of a university professor, whose teaching experiences include ghetto and suburban schools and range over the last thirty years. Very proud of her good "liberal" education and her humanistic perception of life (she is an SSE teacher with a background in music), she is extremely aware of the socio-economic dichotomies of the Bright Meadows student population. This tripartite division and the school's consistent failure to successfully deal with the problem despite many well-intentioned attempts, she sees as one of the school's major problems. "The most we will admit, of course this is old hat, is that children have different academic or intellectual abilities so that we attempt to create intellectual experiences which are leveled so they are appropriate for the intelligence, in so far as we can determine it, and the achievement of kids, which is more easily determined, and that's about the extent that we consider individual difference. But individual difference goes beyond what the mind can do. It has to do with what the emotional climate of the child is and what his social backgrounds are and what his value system is and all the rest." But she feels that this problem as well as all the others which plague the school must be put into a larger context. "I almost have the feeling that the rapidity of social change is so great that each year the problem of educating these kids becomes more acute, simply because outside influences are becoming more acute and it's really frightening to see how rapidly the society is deteriorating."
Still, for her Bright Meadows is the school she's been yearning for all of these years. "It was like coming home to the promised land...The idea of going anyplace else is absolutely chilling. I could leave Bright Meadows, because it's taken twenty years off my life (sheer physical exhaustion), but maybe...it's added twenty years...But I certainly can't conceive of going anyplace else because as imperfect as we are and God knows we are, other schools are just quagmires of stultification and out-moded conservatism and convention and tradition."

As far as she is concerned there is really one broad goal for Bright Meadows and that is "that by the end of the third year a kid has gained a great deal in terms of his own perception of himself as an individual and has a more realistic idea of the kind of person he is, the direction he wants to go in, the strengths he has, the limitations he has, and has developed the ability to make intelligent decisions in terms of all these criteria." And this is important because "if this society is going to survive...it has got to have people who have positive self-images" and "if the individuals are truly fulfilled they will be aware of their relationship to the total environment." Fully developed individuals will be socially-conscious and concerned people.

She feels slightly alone in Bright Meadows. "I'm not at all convinced that even the majority of the people in this school think the way I do. I really think that I have a genuine feeling of what Bright Meadows is trying to do and not only an intellectual understanding of it but also an affective understanding too, and I think there are very few people who really see it and feel it the way I do, and some of that has
to do with the fact that very few people are as old as I am, which can or cannot be an advantage in some cases, it’s a liability in teaching, but I don’t consider it a liability in mine...But I am not at all convinced that the ideas that I espouse and the way that I try to live in this school are in any way accepted or believed in or lived by the people that I work with." She feels especially that subjects like math and language are taught unhumanistically. "I have to say that the heart of all this so-called Bright Meadows philosophy lies pretty much with the people who teach English and social studies." The other area she is concerned about is the area of limits. "I believe that regulations must be humane but nevertheless must exist and must be observed...Some people would remove limits completely, which is complete misconception of what this school is about."

Candidly and with a wry smile she says that an ideal Bright Meadows teacher "would be one who agrees with me." He must be aware that junior high school children are in a "rite de passage" period, that they are between childhood and adulthood physically, emotionally, socially and intellectually; he must realize that these children need limits. "We certainly need a teacher who can live consistently with these ideas. I think you need people here who are extremely flexible, who are open to ideas but who at the same time are not fadists, cultists or fetishists...He has to be constantly in a state of growth and change and development, but this has to be reasoned and sober and well-calculated. It can’t be quixotic or whimsical or capricious...He has to care." But it’s hard to judge which people are measuring up to her
criteria, "Very often people talk a great deal differently from the way they act." For example she feels that a lot of the young teachers come with a "lot of good raw brain but not very much intellectual maturity and wisdom yet...and they have complete and utter chaos in their classrooms, the inability to establish a climate where any kind of communication can take place, and without communication you certainly have nothing, let alone learning." Yet she is happy to see so many competent young men going into teaching because she feels that "this is too matriarchal a society."

As a teacher she tends to run fairly teacher-controlled activities. She often team teaches because she feels that having more than one adult in the room is good for students. They can see two different styles at work and the interplay between them. She is very soft-spoken and her love of language, which you can almost feel as you listen to her speak, is transmitted to the students through the way in which she gives directions, carefully wording answers to questions and relates anecdotes and incidents. She uses personal experiences as a way of illustrating points and involving students in her enthusiasms. She thinks very hard about what she is teaching. She and three other members of her team, for instance, spent two days every week during July, on their own time, devising a course which they would teach based on "Learning Theory and Application." Despite the fact that the classes she teaches are controlled she varies her style. One class which she team taught with a young man was a class where students selected books they wanted to read. The format was for the teachers to call the class to order, give a few
minimal suggestions and answer questions. Then each teacher saw children individually by going around to them at their desks while each child was reading his own book. In a writing class which she taught alone, she began the class returning some papers, making positive comments about the quality of those papers, reading one child's paper and explaining why she liked it, and comparing the feeling portrayed in the paper with an experience she had. Then she asked for some comments from students and outlined the next step which was a writing exercise to be done in class. She uses small groups, films and games a good deal.

On the whole she feels that she is in control of her own destiny as a teacher. "A teacher can't feel like a human being..." until that happens. She came to Bright Meadows five years ago because she heard about it from Adeline Stuart on one of the latter's dissemination trips and has been very involved in the issues of the school ever since. She is an outspoken critic of the administration ("an awful lot of things happen in this school by default") and she was a prime mover in the various attempts to resuscitate the Evaluation Committee ("its death was a great disaster"). She gets discouraged occasionally by such things as the order to give grades ("We as teachers should have stood up and said we won't do it..."). "I guess the thing that most frustrates people who really care about this school is all the possibilities that are implicit in the structure and yet somehow or other never get realized because there are so many other demands and more immediate priorities." But as she says, "This is the place that practices those things I had preached for so many years."
21. Commentary

Many visitors comment on how young the staff is. The implication in their question is that the school cannot tolerate older teachers, and that older teachers cannot survive in the school because of the pace. Sandra Morris proves that this is not the case. She herself comments on how much Bright Meadows has taken out of her but with the same breath she says it also renewed her because she finally found a home. And she proves that an older teacher cannot merely exist but can be at the very center of action and thought of the school—in that way she's different from the two older and experienced teachers in this chapter: Jane Ellis has withdrawn from everything except the minimum classroom activity; Sam Cross has withdrawn from the classroom and is now concerned mainly with the rhetoric; Sandra Morris is still actively involved in both.

As a person she tends to become very emotionally attached to issues and ideas (for example, she argues arduously about the separation between affective and cognitive education) and will sometimes belabor them without noticing the effect that has on her audience. It is this trait that prevents her from being even an informal leader in the school, which is unfortunate because she is extremely bright and well-educated and sensitive and very able to delineate problems.

22. Gladys Baum

Gladys Baum is a typing teacher, the first "elective or fine and applied arts" teacher to request and receive a House and become a member of a team. She has also been team leader of the FAA teachers. A resident in the Bright Meadows community, she has had two children who have
attended the school, both while she was teaching there.

A thin, dark-haired woman with a loud and penetrating voice, even when she speaks sotto voce, she is not easily overlooked. "The biggest thing I've always tried to work on, I haven't accomplished it completely yet, is my ability to work with other people in a little better, more congenial, discreet kind of way...although I suppose I will never, never lose my more positive way of saying things...I do hope that I have learned...to be able to say things sometimes without cutting through somebody as badly as I did five years ago."

Her ties to the school have become stronger over the years. "I hated Bright Meadows when I first came, as a parent...I thought it was the God damnest bunch of foolishness in this whole world...Now I've become fanatically involved with the damn thing...I fell into the best thing that ever happened to me..." Some of her increased involvement is due to her switch from being simply a typing teacher to being also a House advisor and a team member. "Then my whole life just became Bright Meadows." At the same time, she also feels a great sense of loss since one of her bonds to the school was the original principal. "There was a time earlier when the program was newer that I felt we were reaching the goals far more satisfactorily than we are now as the program is getting older...I feel the loss of Elizabeth Crown was a tremendous loss to the program because there are not that many of us left who were in the Elizabeth Crown regime and we, none of us, have the ability to say the kinds of things that Elizabeth could say in the way that Elizabeth could say them, that just always kept you fresh and
alive, so as a result those of us who are the leftovers begin to feel terribly frustrated sometimes, because we're trying to carry the message to new people and we're most unsuccessful, and we can't do it. At least I can't, you know perhaps somebody can, but I can't and so I get that frustrated feeling because I cannot explain to them the kinds of feelings that I have that I developed through Elizabeth. To me it's not alive and new the way it was five years ago."

"We used to have an unscheduled time that I used to have to back kids away from the door because I only had 32 machines. Now I'm lucky if in conference time I get three kids to come and use the machines... I know they must want to use the machines, because all of a sudden you don't just stop using them. I don't think kids can get out of classes enough now...So I don't know where these kids are...It breaks my heart."

The goal of the school, as she sees it and "hopes for", is to "create in children the wonderful gift of enjoying learning for the sake of enjoying learning...(and) to instill in the child the ability to take a lot of responsibility for his own direction and purpose." It's different from most schools because "schools in general don't put enough emphasis on the individual as a human being."

Gladys is extremely critical of the faculty. She feels there is a lack of discipline within the faculty..."Expecting of children far more than we are willing to do ourselves..." On the other hand it isn't entirely the faculty's fault. "The faculty is left pretty much to their own devices to work the kinds of things that we feel will give the children a 'meaningful experience,' I'm getting so tired of those words."
You get them teaching the kinds of things they enjoy teaching and not the kinds of things the kids want to be exposed to." She feels part of the problem is that "if you're going to develop any kind of creativity or agency in a child I believe you've got to have a teacher who himself is creative and has a great deal of agency...(and) I don't think we have an extraordinary staff..." In addition "there is not time unfortunately for teacher training, especially new teacher training so what happens? The school year is spent in teacher training and the kids get the short end of the stick." "To work at Bright Meadows lots of things can happen to you. If you become totally involved and committed to what we're trying to do here you can work 24 hours a day, creating, thinking, evaluating, throwing out, piecing together, putting together. On the other hand, being a Bright Meadows teacher could be the best thing that ever happened to anybody who wants to sit around on his rump and take it easy... There are lots of little ins and outs that teachers can take advantage of, under the guise of modern education, and...team teaching can be one of two things. It can mean that either two teachers are working together for children or it can mean on the other hand, "You take the children on Monday while I sit in the lounge. I'll take them on Tuesday while you sit in the lounge and we'll both sit in the lounge on Wednesday and send them all to the library for independent study."

Gladys has spent a good deal of time working on ways to enable teachers to deal better with curriculum. She established a file with a constantly updated catalogue of all the materials created and used at Bright Meadows over the last eight or so years. And she set up a
"Student Service Corps" which provides student typists to teachers who need such things as stencils prepared, and student operators of the mimeo, ditto and collating machines. "I don't know...I would hate to think that we would have to go back to the old stereotyped kinds of things like textbook learning, yet maybe this is our answer. Maybe we should dip more into the curriculum resources (the files) we have here in the building, and use that as a jumping off point instead of trying to develop something brand new and absolutely way out." She is very critical of what she considers to be "hodge-podge with no, I don't like to use the word, structure" in too many SSE courses. "You see, although we want to develop agency within the child and a responsibility, sometimes we leave the kid too much to his own devices with nothing to kind of sink his teeth into to give him a starting off point."

Her own classes are run on an individualized basis, with students working independently at typewriters and asking for help by raising their hands or coming to her desk. Amidst the steady clatter of keys on the board, one can also hear the sounds of ditto, mimeo and collating machines which both teachers and students are using while classes are in progress. All teachers have access to the typing room at all times. As a result her own teaching is always on display and her room is in constant noisy but orderly use.

For her the ideal Bright Meadows teacher is a "person who likes kids as people and not as a piece of machinery, who can involve himself with teaching experiences other than that which he was trained for and three, you've got to be a dreamer, you cannot ever be stagnant to be a
good Bright Meadows teacher...and you've got to be able to forget that you're a teacher...you're there to be an adult to just guide kids." As far as teachers with each other are concerned, "we do mix well...this is very unique at Bright Meadows. We can scream at each other, we can love each other, we can cry with each other, we can fight with each other. I'm not saying we listen to each other as much as we should."

Hew own background includes two years of college and a year and a half of teaching in an urban high school. Then she stayed home to have her family. She decided to return to teaching because one day, "I was through with baking cakes and playing mah jong." She feels that a teacher at Bright Meadows needs only to "be a person who understands what we're trying to do here, who enjoys kids and who understands what kids can be." She herself doesn't read much. "I wish I had more time to do more reading. I do lots of listening. I do lots of seeing."

She was very proud of winning a Title III award; she participated in putting the proposal together. But she wonders, "It's inconceivable to me that we're the best there is."

23. Commentary

Gladys is an extremely hard worker and extremely dependable. If she thinks something is important, because it is important to Bright Meadows, she will let nothing stop her from doing it and coming as close to perfection as possible. Often, and probably unconsciously, she uses herself as a model for how other teachers at Bright Meadows ought to be. While she is a good model for responsibility and self-criticism and devotion to the school, she is somewhat limited in her understanding
curriculum and teaching in general. Not everyone and every subject can, or should be, quite so organized as her applied art. She has been trained to be a very good teacher of organization and order. But she is not open-minded. Without a strong personal loyalty such as the one she felt for Miss Crown, it is doubtful that she would have been as able to go beyond her subject (something she says she thinks is necessary in a Bright Meadows teacher) as she has in fact done.

She is a good example of the effect of a principal with a good deal of EPL. Now, without someone she can attach her devotion to, she is becoming outspokenly critical and harking back to more traditional methods. This is not to say that all of her criticisms are wrong, nor is it to say that she is a poor teacher. She is a very good teacher. But she may be a little limited in her understanding of how to educate the total child.

Shelley Grohman

At a Parent's Night while Shelley Grohman was explaining to the assembled parents of her team the concept of levels of abstraction in language as a way of teaching composition (she referred to Piaget's work and to the work of James Moffet), Ernest Fitch turned to the investigator and said, with admiration and amazement in his voice, "My God. That girl is undoubtedly the most intelligent person in this building." That fact is something that Shelley has had to contend with.

A New Yorker who went to a high school for gifted girls, an Ivy League college and another Ivy League university for her MAT, she is a young married woman with ambitions for leadership in education, definite career plans, a clear yet continuously reassessed notion of who she is
and how her actions affect people. She has suffered from other people's estimation of her as someone who is cold and ruthless. After her first year at Bright Meadows when she could "get away with being young and bright and interested" she has had to demonstrate to people who are "spooked" by her that she is not as calculating and unfeeling as they think she is. Her desire to be team leader during her third year was thwarted because members of her team felt she would have too much power. She did, however, become team leader in her fourth year after demonstrating her good faith as English Department Chairman and as a member of the principal selection committee.

Shelley Grohman thinks that maybe she is the closest to what she considers an ideal Bright Meadows teacher. "...very intelligent, has a wide knowledge of the world around him, a wide knowledge of what's available for children, in their mode, who understands the mode in which children's minds work, can translate what's on his level to theirs, and knows what kinds of tasks to set up for them so that they can do things that are satisfying to themselves...flexible in thinking...who has a sense of where a kid is through his fingertips almost and when a kid comes up to you and asks a question, asks himself, what is he really asking me?...who can make use of other adults around to make him better with kids...cheerful...honest with himself about his own feelings and able to function better with that knowledge...pretty well organized, although not necessarily, who can take a lot of pressure, doesn't need much sleep, likes kids and doesn't mind being used by them in ways that they need...fairly even and calm at least externally... a ham."
Her feelings about teaching have changed since she's been at Bright Meadows (the only school she's taught in for more than half a year). "When I began teaching, I sort of wanted to be somebody to children, sort of a personality and somebody for them to bounce off of and identify with or hate, but somebody...However, it really leaves you kind of lonely yourself, because they are not interested in me, they're interested in what I can do for them, which they should be...(Now) I'm pretty good at what I do (when I'm doing things that aren't good I know it and I know why). It isn't that taxing and it is satisfying but it isn't where I want to be...I'm feeling stuck, like I've figured out how it all works and so it isn't interesting anymore...I'd like to teach one or two classes a day, be a House advisor and the rest of the time work with adults. That would be ducky...I wouldn't have lasted in teaching (at any other school) more than a year, I'm sure."

Bright Meadows has also allowed her an opportunity to learn "a tremendous amount"... to "taste a lot of different things." One good example is that in addition to all the other "hats" she has chosen to wear, she was elected one of the CTA representatives, a job usually held by the older men on the faculty. Bright Meadows has long had a tradition of political concern and some involvement (Bright Meadows has had several CTA presidents, MTA president and an NEA vice president) and Shelley's natural curiosity and eagerness to learn led her to enter this tradition, which has also given her an exposure across the city, something she likes.

In discussing the Bright Meadows goal for students she said that she thought it was "that kids should be impelled to do things by their own
inner curiosity and desires rather than by external coercion, and that what they do should result in their feeling better about themselves and it should encourage them to want to discover things... in the future; that they should do things which are congruent with themselves, not false to themselves... You begin with children's questions instead of someone else's expectations; then their interests will dictate what they do and it will be more natural... This goal is valuable because it leads to a richer, more comfortable life, a life where people feel good about themselves and thus are more likely to reach out and touch other people."

In view of this understanding of the goals, Shelley's classes vary tremendously. She thinks the "topics of education" are less important than the activities and methods of teaching. She will teach a course on The Hobbit for example, where the students select activities from a list she has organized and follow those activities through either individually or in small groups. She will teach a course in King Lear in which she will give a few background lectures and then the students as a group will read the play out loud, taking parts. She will stop them to ask questions, or let them ask questions (she will pursue questions until the student has no further doubts about the original point) and let students answer each other. The writing course she teaches which is based on the Moffet material is the course which she is happiest in because it suits her habits of mind. The activities and assignments are clear and organized in a sequential fashion, but it is intellectually openended and it asks the students to do the creating, to provide the substantive content.
She believes in using other adults for the benefit of students. To this end she uses the guidance counselor on her team (whom she thinks very highly of) as a buffer between herself (when she feels that her state of mind might cause her to hurt a child) and that child. When she is angry or disturbed about a child or an idea she goes to the counselor and talks it out with him. To this end also, she likes to team teach with someone who attracts a different kind of child than she does so that between them they offer a variety of modes for all the children. Because in Bright Meadows there is "more of a sense of community...where people feel they can be a little straighter with each other, less formal" it is more possible to talk to and use other adults.

She was very critical of the way the school was managed. She was one of the few people who was willing to evaluate other people and to "estimate the damages" of Mr. Gross's administration of the school. For example, she felt that there were "personnel" problems. "I think this school tries to get...unusual people who have got something on the ball and are a little different, and I think there's just so much you can find out about a person when you're hiring somebody. And you're bound to make some mistakes...but I don't think the administration finds out what's going on and does what it has to do to get rid of some people or to help them." "A simple problem is that there isn't any place to work in...It's like life is one constant interruption and nobody has any respect for anybody else...We have too much good will and not enough hard knowledge about learning and teaching; we're also not self-critical enough; we don't have any kind of observation teams where people go
around and look at each other. There's a lot of freedom to do what you want except...sometimes there isn't the possibility of follow through... Everybody's responsible for everything..." which means that "somehow not always the right combinations of people get together to do a particular job...I think there should be a clearer delineation (of tasks and roles and responsibilities)...which could still be fluid in some way...Even the idea of a pro-active faculty or determining your own destiny...requires that no matter how potent individuals or collectives are in any institution there has to be some if not controlling, some guiding intelligence, something that is looking at everything and... deciding some priorities so that not everybody decides on everything and nothing gets done. I think it's kind of an immaturity of this system... our thinking that we can do so many things and do them all well. I'm not saying that you take responsibilities away from teachers and give them to some controller out there, but maybe you divide up the labor a little better."

Personally she feels her biggest problem to be the "pace problem. I'm very thorough...I like to get into something and follow it through and have it and feel it's done." She feels harried too much of the time and has to prevent herself from dealing with all issues which come her way as if they were deep and serious issues, a control task she finds enervating. Another problem she has been distressed by which has affected the whole school is the "whole political thing with the community. I think somehow at a very gut level in every teacher's mind when you think there's going to be a dissatisfied parent out there that suddenly
you reel in what you ordinarily do or you cover up or you try to look
tough or traditional; somehow you move closer to what they want, and also
you feel they are out to get you, which they aren't, but the ones who
were making the noise were. I was at some of those school committee
meetings. We couldn't teach sex education (after we worked all year on
the course)...I don't know why they ever put a school like this in this
area...(where there is) hysteria...about traditional success...except I
realize the community has changed."

Despite all of her criticisms she feels that Bright Meadows is a
place where the philosophy of the school went along with what she
thought and so it gave her a chance to find where her limits were because
the private and the public realms are congruent. "I felt before I came
here that work was something that was important, that you had to do be-
cause you had to serve society, you know, couldn't be privativistic
and hollow men...but you had to insulate your personal life to have like
a warm bath tub somewhere that you could go home to, that you could be-
long to and really be honest...I didn't leave after a year, which is
tribute to Bright Meadows."

25. Commentary

Shelley represents both a major success and a major problem in edu-
cation. She is one of a new breed of bright, career minded women who
are being attracted to education, not to teaching, as a profession. At
the soonest opportunity, she will leave the classroom where she is ex-
tremely competent. It is people like Shelley and Greg Martin and Bill
Evelyn who make one want to ask questions about the present career
structure in education, that says that in order to be important and powerful one must get out of the classroom permanently.

Shelley is very conscious of using herself and her actions as models for other people. She thinks it is good for the girl students to see that women do want and can handle positions of leadership, especially since the school has so many visible male leaders. She consciously uses the school as a place in which she can grow professionally and personally and she sees this too as a paradigm for students. She feels they ought to be using the institution in the way she does, not just learning by accident but by design.

26. Jim Sever

Jim Sever is a tall, slightly stoop-shouldered, dark young man who tends to eat his words when he speaks. Coming directly to Bright Meadows from a master's in educational foundations program in a nearby metropolitan university with no student teaching experience at all, he is a teacher of English and social studies and also recently married.

After one year of teaching, which he admits he did partly to avoid the draft, although he is now deferred for medical reasons, he is now planning to enter a Ph.D. program at a prestige university across the river. "In the beginning I saw the school as progressive and now I think of it as a nicely sugar flavored traditional school. I realize it was like that all the time and people misinterpreted it...The self image that Bright Meadows has is very destructive and permeates everything."

According to Jim "the stated goal of the school is for the kid to take responsibility for his own learning. What really happens is that,
adults take the responsibility for the kid to learn but everybody, including the kid, accepts the ideology that the kids are taking responsibility for their own learning...What confounds me is how the ideology is maintained...and how I fell right into it as a beginning teacher."

He doesn't think the goals of the school are very different from other schools, but there is a difference in "styles and attitudes. I'd rather be teaching here than in the city so there is a difference but it's not radical...This is very good for a public school given the state of our culture. This is the best a liberal reform school can go. Which is may not be good enough. During this cultural phase it's as advanced as a public school can go. You know, it's a political imperative to change the phase you're in."

He realizes that some school decisions are made because of a philosophy of education and some are made because of political consideration, and he feels that accounts to some extent for the lack of congruence between the goals and the operation of the school. But still, "the school attracts a faculty that is at least interested in doing with kids the things stated in the goals..." "There's really no incompetence here." And as far as he's concerned what the school does best is "leave me alone. There's a lack of overt authority, at least over a teacher."

It has been a "sink or swim" year for him and he feels he has compressed a lot of learning into one year, including learning about himself. At first he thought that he wouldn't be able to cope with
creating new courses, coordinating materials, dealing with teachers on
the team who didn't share his ideas of what was important. But with
some help from three or four people in the school he feels he has
handled it—that he "has overcome." "I came here thinking to test the
liberal experiment" and ended up being tested himself. Now "I have more
compassion for other people and more tolerance for intolerable situations."
But he says, "I think a really good person can't stay teaching here for-
ever. I'm really talking about social studies and English teachers
because the content of what you're teaching you have to live and if
you're in school you can't do it."

Although he himself refused to attend many of the meetings at
night, or join committees, he thinks that most "management kinds of
decisions, carrying out of decisions, implementations of decisions are
made by teachers and that's important." However, he sees a lot of guilt
around him among the teachers "because of the essential tragedy of the
school, that it can't do what it wants to."

About the quality of leadership he feels that "the basic problem
is that you don't know who the enemy is here, and that all lines of
power are so blurred that it's impossible to make distinctions and
judgments, because there are obviously some people responsible...One
thing I personally resent is being a moral authoritarian...I mean some-
times, especially at the beginning, I didn't want to go down some of
the halls because I would have had to make some sort of decisions about
a guy feeling a girl up or something...That's somehow not my role (I
don't know whose it is) as someone who has mastered some expertise, some
knowledge, to tell whether a guy should be feeling up a girl. My cer-
tification is in terms of my academic competence and not my moral
authority."

Jim taught some city-prepared, teacher-oriented social studies
courses at first. Then in the second term he joined Ed Reardon and
another teacher on his team for the "open schedule" where he worked
mostly with individual students, offering a course in Sports for the
reluctant students and a course called Woodstock to see whether students
could examine the "new revolution." He also taught a course on eco-
logy where he got children out of the building doing things to exercise
their social consciousness. He wanted to teach a psychology course at
the end of the year but was told by the administration that he could
not. He felt the reasons he was given were the wrong reasons, that is,
that psychology was not his field. He felt it was a decision determined
by political pressures and he felt it was the first time overt authority
had been used with him as a teacher.

On the whole, however, "it was very good for the first year, because
most of this first year was finding myself. I think the restrictions
now being put on me would be intolerable next year, they're starting to
burn me right now. But now I know where I am. I've gone beyond the
school I think."

27. Commentary

There are many people who contribute to an institution as much as
they take out of it. What they take out of course varies with the indi-
vidual: it can be emotional, it can be professional, it can be monetary,
etc. Some of these 'take-outs' cost the institution more than others. Jim Sever is a case where the institution paid more than it got. Not that he contributed nothing. His criticism of the school, his willingness to try some new ideas, his dialogues with teachers and with some students contributed to everyone's knowledge. But the school gave him the time of three or four experts and he stayed only one year. The investment was in excess of the gain. He is not the only person to have done this. Many young teachers come not knowing whether they will want to teach and their first year is a test in a number of ways. Some young teachers come knowing that they are staying long enough only to decide how to take the next step, be that step marriage or education or whatever. There is a great deal of that kind of movement in Bright Meadows. It does leave its mark in the waste of effort, the duplication of effort, the discontinuity of development, the contraproductiveness to some aspects of the goal. Surely hiring good people, even if they stay only a year, is a chance one takes, especially if one wants the school to reflect what is happening in the world around the school. Jim Sever is a representative of this group of people in education.

28. Bill Evelyn

Bill Evelyn, a slight, crewcut man in his middle thirties with a wife, three children, an 'almost Ph.D.,' a house in New Hampshire from which he commuted every day, came to Bright Meadows in the middle of 1963 and left the week before school started in 1965. A chain smoker, he would leave his social studies classes at a point when he had asked one of his provocative questions (he was a master at the Socratic method)
for a quick dash to the lounge; and return after his cigarette, to pull together all the thoughts the students had had in the meantime.

"I think the overriding goal (of the school) was to break loose the system, what was perceived as a coercive institutional excessively bureaucratic system, which maybe educated kids and maybe didn't but essentially its aim was to make them good citizens in a very authoritative way...break loose some of the structural mechanisms so the youngster could begin to choose and pick, to sort adults out, to sort his own life out, to develop what Ernie (Fitch) called a sense of agency. That was Elizabeth's goal which with her charisma she could state in an almost infinite variety, restate like a set of modules or blocks that she could put together all kinds of different ways and people would begin to put them together themselves."

He thinks that in so far as the goals worked, and they did not work with students from the Heights who could not read, write and figure and therefore could not afford the luxury of agency, it was mainly a function of the people who were attracted by the goals and able to relate to individual kids..."but also because I think a theoretical structure and a philosophical structure really do guide and inform an institution."

Bill had a great deal of experience in education before coming to Bright Meadows. "I felt very differently whenever I walked into Troop, and God knows Bright Meadows was different from the junior highs in Peterborough, New Hampshire, but a lot of it was the way Bright Meadows treated adults. I'm not sure it was different on the kids' level, but the way that adults were respected and treated, they were called faculty (not
teachers and staff) we talked about courses (not classes) we talked about semesters...this all relates to the business of the goal, because the goal makes you talk this way and it attracts people who think this way. But I'm not sure through a younger's eyes it was a hell of a lot different."

"I think people were attracted there because they were going to be on the cutting edge of education, and of course when the school was split it caused all kinds of internal problems. I thought it was a great mistake for Elizabeth to go across the board with the program because I agree with Freidenberg when you are using most of your energy for defense there isn't much left over for creativity. Besides the kind of philosophy and way of looking at the world we were talking about is for a minority of people. I don't think it's for the majority."

"The gravest imperfection in the program is that it wasn't pluralistic. We were all the same, those of us who voluntarily taught there, we were homogeneous, I don't mean bland. We were interesting as people with distinct life styles, but we were homogeneous...Our sameness showed up in what we all disliked. We uniformly disliked a very authoritarian approach to things, we uniformly disliked ourselves to be told anything that we didn't want to do. We were really intellectuals in that ideas and ideologies governed what we did. We didn't teach parsing of sentences. We taught literature and called it that. We argued about theories, we tried to subvert each other with our own approaches to our own disciplines. None of us was very visceral or earthy."
"I finally left because I wanted for once to teach in the community where I make my home, I also wanted a different kind of child, I was burned out. The playfulness, the fun of work at Bright Meadows had begun to disappear. I wanted to return for a while to the old self-contained classroom where I could do whatever the hell I wanted to and as long as I didn't preach the Birch society nonsense or some other absurd doctrine I wouldn't be bothered by anybody...I could be left alone to work with kids. That was never possible at Bright Meadows. You always had these other voices to listen to (and they were sometimes vague about their expectations) and to compromise with and adjust to. Toward the end there were self-conscious voices, pontificating voices, justifying voices. I needed some time to listen to my inner voices, but Elizabeth said that financially she could not give me any released time since the whole school was going CL."

Bill and his subteam tried a number of unconventional approaches to the students and the curriculum. They team taught, using their rooms as large centers and all working together (although differentiating their tasks) with the students, involving them in ideas and themes that spread across disciplines. They did some large-medium-small group work and they tried to establish a 'demand system' where the students called the assignment, the purpose and the grouping for the following day's activities and the teachers would supply what they requested. "I think the Bright Meadows experience was instructive to me because for the first time I saw that one could have a pluralistic system, particularly if the kids had choice and could sort themselves out with different
adults and different environmental situations."

29. Commentary

Bill is the kind of 'free soul' who cannot remain in any setting which requires him to justify his existence (simply because someone demands that rationale) or which establishes rules for him (which he does not have some say in), for very long.

Because of his creative and analytical mind and his sound education, he is the kind of person Bright Meadows, or any school that wants to try what Bright Meadows attempted, needs, especially in its early, freer periods of their history when there are few precedents. He is an innovator but not someone who has the patience to see things through.

He would be a difficult man to keep on a faculty that was mindful of establishing guidelines and equal responsibilities for all of its members. Ironically, he is too much of an individualist (but not the same type as Jane Ellis) for Bright Meadows, certainly the Bright Meadows of today, and even of yesterday. He needs more degrees of freedom than Bright Meadows can provide.

30. Conclusions

The considerable degree to which these twelve teachers were articulate and concerned about the school, and the enthusiasm which they displayed in talking about Bright Meadows were characteristic of the total respondent sample. Everyone had thought hard about the school before anyone ever thought about interviewing them. What emerges immediately from this close look at twelve Bright Meadows teachers is that each of them has a distinct personality and each of them raises an
issue with respect to their relationship with the institution.

Ed Reardon is, for example, a sportsman who is not particularly intellectual. While that in itself is an attribute found in many schools, the fact that he is the ideal in a school which values inquiry, at least theoretically, and which is not a typical school, is an unique irony. There is a sense in which the institution denies its nature by selecting him. Greg Martin's wry and humorous comments mask practicing political acumen; but he is a man who is trapped for the future by his lack of credentials. While his competence has enabled him to go as far as he can go within the institution, there is a sense in which the institution has done all it can for him. Jane Baldwin is a young, outspoken, candid person for whom the school is the event in her life; but she has come too quickly to a position of leadership. In her case the institution did not do enough for her because it did not ensure that she learned what she needed to know about teaching. Lawrence Andrews is histrionic and has immense ego needs. He tends to use the institution to his own ends. Jane Ellis' unassuming manner covers a determined will. She has refused to engage with the institution, something which creates problems in an institution which requires constant interaction among its members. John Lovejoy is a disillusioned quiet man who cannot deal with the constant high power emitted by much of the staff. There is a sense in which the institution has passed him by. Sam Cross is a rhetorician with no follow-through who confuses people in the institution because of the discrepancy between what he says and what he does. In a way, he is an embodiment of one of the major imperfections
of the institution because he symbolizes the insufficiency of good will. Gladys Baum is a disciple, and as one who has gotten the word too often uses herself as the model of behavior and attitude for all other members of the institution. Shelley Grohman, an ambitious and analytical young woman also uses herself as a model, but a model through which the institution can be seen doing its job, which is to educate. Jim Sever is a young man still learning who he is. He is a very important element in the institution because he represents a group which taxes the institution's resources and gives in return less than it takes out. And finally, Bill Evelyn is a man who must be allowed to operate only under his constraints. The institution needs him but he cannot tolerate the restrictions it places on people. What is interesting about this catalogue of personalities and issues is that the institution is so wide open that twelve different people relate to it, benefit from it, use it, and give to it, each in a different way.

More modality is to be found among the twelve in some of the ideas, attitudes and feelings which they share. Even those who feel that the school has regressed or made mistakes as do Sam Cross, Gladys Baum, Jane Ells and Greg Martin, or is imperfect, as they all do, still contend that Bright Meadows is a school which is better than most and in which they feel good about working. The younger teachers who are extremely critical of the way the school is run, such as Jane Baldwin, Shelley Grohman and Jim Sever, nonetheless see the school as a place where they can be themselves as people, where they can learn and try out their competencies. John Lovejoy and Sandra Morris see the school's problems in
the context of the society's upheavals and therefore feel that they do not want to leave. They are essentially at "home." As Bill Evelyn suggests, the school treats teachers like important people.

One reason they all mention, which relates to why they feel positive about the school, is the factor or control, or authority, over what happens to them professionally in the school as a whole. (Only Jane Baldwin, Sandra Morris and John Lovejoy actually allude to control in the classroom by which they mean discipline in the classroom) But they, and everyone else, are more concerned with control in the school, control over themselves as people who have a hand in the decisions which effect them in the building. The issue of politics is one which is openly discussed by teachers who talk about the veto power of the principal, the autonomy of the teams and the inconsistency of treatment of students. There is a tension between the desire for freedom for teachers and for direction from the administration ( and concommitantly the desire to give students freedom while also providing guidelines as teachers) which has not been satisfactorily resolved. In fact, there is some question about whether teachers have as much control and authority as they feel they do. For example, Sandra Morris points out that a great deal that happens in the school happens "by default." Ed Reardon complains that "a vote by a group of teachers is said to be but is never final." Greg Martin says that teachers fritter their energies on unproductive activities. Jane Baldwin claims that only superficial answers are found to important questions. Lawrence Andrews feels that "matters of policy are further away than being [sic] where I can
influence them." And Jane Ells commiserates that today at Bright Meadows "so much is dependent on someone else's doing something." Nonetheless, they feel that they have control in a way they feel is not true elsewhere, and it is their perception, rather than the reality which is an important element in how they sense their power in the school.3

The fact that questions are raised about the degree to which teachers really do control what happens in the school indicates that some people eventually realize that there is a discrepancy between the perception and the reality. Some people who realize this, such as Bill Evelyn (who probably would have left a more repressive institution even earlier), leave; others who realize this, withdraw (or perhaps remain in) into the rhetoric, hoping that if they talk long enough and earnestly enough the gap will vanish. Still others, who understand and can tolerate limits and compromise, such as Greg Martin and Sandra Morris stay and try to work at change from within.

With the exception of Gladys Baum (and that can be explained by her particular relationship to the institution) the profile teachers feel they are working with competent people, that the staff is rather exceptional. They also feel that they have academic freedom. Jim Sever is the only one who felt the heavy hand of restriction upon him in a specific case and that really was a problem created by the external

3Zeigler, op.cit., p. 29. He implies that only men are concerned with control in the school. At Bright Meadows everyone is concerned with it.
community. On the whole they all feel as if teaching at Bright Meadows is more than a job. It is a commitment.

Most of the twelve (the exceptions are Ed Reardon and Galdys Baum: Ed perhaps because he does not feel strongly about curriculum and Gladys perhaps because she is a member of the community) refer to the criticism from the community as an intrusion into their teaching lives. Zeigler\textsuperscript{4} notes that it is usually the school and not the community which restricts teachers. It may be that the reason that teachers at Bright Meadows are so aware of the community is that the school puts so few restrictions on them. As Shelley Grohman says, "somehow at the very gut level in every teacher's mind when you think there's going to be a dissatisfied parent out there that suddenly you reel in what you ordinarily do or you cover up or you try and look tough or traditional, somehow you move closer to what they want, and also you feel they are out to get you, which they (the whole community) aren't but the ones who were making the noise are."

The teachers are also on the whole very aware of the socio-economic mix in the school and some even have some questions about the values of segments of the student population. This is very clear in Lawrence Andrews' comments about students and in Sandra Morris' statements about how the school is middle class.

The twelve all agree upon the school's goals even though they all state them differently. This is certainly due to the socialization which

\textsuperscript{4}Zeigler, op. cit., p. 143.
occurs at the school, which is more informal than formal. Only Gladys Baum and Lawrence Andrews actually use the term "agency" (and they, interestingly enough, are on the same team) and Bill Evelyn uses it but in its historical context. No one in the group mentions all four terms: agency, creativity, motivation and scholarship. But it is more than merely socialization which accounts for the agreement expressed by the twelve. These teachers really do believe that the goals are important, and they demonstrate that value in the way in which they deal with children. As John Lovejoy says, "Everybody here seems more intent on how we can help students learn better as individuals." Shelley Grohman also points out that in this school adults can use each other to help kids. Where the teachers have difficulty, and this is extremely important, is in devising new styles of instruction for the classroom. (It may be as Ed Reardon and Sandra Morris maintain that the people at the school don't really understand the goals.) All these teachers, even Sam Cross, are extremely humane in the classroom, but they are still running basically teacher-centered classrooms, despite the jargon of the school which claims that teachers should be facilitators and resource people. There are a few exceptions, not people, but courses. Shelley Grohman using the Moffet materials is less teacher centered. Sandra Morris in her individualized reading course is less teacher centered. Ed Reardon and Jim Sever in their open classroom tried to be less teacher centered but in effect because of the lack of materials ended up making students quite dependent upon them. Bill Evelyn's "demand schedule" put the responsibility on the students. At Bright Meadows, the classroom remains the arena
where students are treated humanely but not necessarily in an unorthodox manner. As Greg Martin and Jane Baldwin point out the school needs to do a lot of work in (re) training teachers. Even the teachers who are exploratory and try consciously to devise new technologies (in the sense in which Dreeben defines that term) in the classroom often unintentionally betray the goal of individualizing instruction. It is certainly not the fault of the teachers because we simply do not know enough about how children learn. As a group of teachers they are extremely self-critical (the comments of Shelley Grohman and Gladys Baum notwithstanding) and they are constantly trying to develop ways of improving the learning environment for students. There is very little of the mindlessness which Charles Silberman faults, and even less of the destruction of the hearts and minds which Kozol deplores.

While it is the men who speak about "the inelegance" or lack of status and money in teaching (and this parallels the total sample) it is not only the men in this group of twelve, who think about the effects of Bright Meadows on their careers. One of the interesting biases of this subset is that the women and the men are much more alike in intensity of feeling and quality of attitude than they are in the total respondent sample.

Then, of course, there are the particular issues, both positive and negative, which one or two people raise. For example, Shelley Grohman and Greg Martin speak of the pace of teaching at the school, the number of different emotional contacts one has to deal with in a day; and the lack of privacy which exists. Jane Ells and John Lovejoy comment on how
the school is not petty.

What clearly emerges from these profiles and from the data in the preceding chapter is that Bright Meadows is a school for teachers. Even though they work hard, sometimes suffering the pangs of insecurity vis-à-vis other teachers and students and are required to take risks that some are not ready for, most teachers thrive at that school.
Chapter Six: Conclusions

The years during which Bright Meadows has been consciously unconventional have been critical years in American education. Theodore Sizer, Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, pointed out in his report for the year 1969-70 that "too many problems identified and optimistically attacked in 1960 persist today, and many more have become virulent." He contends that the hope which marked the early 60's, that education could make changes from within by improving the quality of the "things" of education, is dying. "We begin to suspect that the materials of instruction are of secondary importance, that the conditions and settings for learning must be sound and humane before any formal curriculum can have meaning."¹ While he goes on to say that there cannot be change in American education while there is no parallel change in American society, Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner argue that perhaps what is needed in order to change American society is a new American education, an education which is centered on questions which are relevant to students, which they call the inquiry method. "We take it as axiomatic that the attitudes of teachers are the most important characteristic of the inquiry environment...There can be no significant innovation in education that does not have at its center the attitudes of teachers, and it is an illusion to think otherwise. The beliefs, feelings, and

the assumptions of teachers are the air of a learning environment; they
determine the quality of life within it. 2 This study is concerned with
that specific aspect of education. It is a study of teachers' "beliefs,
feelings and assumptions" in a particular unorthodox school.

In this study we learn that the goals which Bright Meadows has for
children, which are summarized by the terms agency, creativity, moti-
vation and scholarship, and the way in which the school is organized in
order to implement those goals, greatly effects the way the teachers see
themselves and their jobs. Perhaps, in fact, in terms of direct conse-
quences, it is the teachers who are more effected by the ideology of the
school, than the students; although, of course, students benefit from
their teachers' interpretations and implementations of the goals.

What we learn is that teachers need to feel that they have control
of what they teach and how they teach. Another way of saying it is
that they need to be free to be professional. At Bright Meadows even in
the subjects where there are guidelines, for example, in mathematics,
teachers are able to determine how they deal with the materials. Teachers
have to feel involved in the governance of the school. At Bright Meadows
teachers make policy decisions within the teams and in cross-school com-
mittees and meetings.3 They need to like and respect the people they

2Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, Teaching as a Subversive
Activity, p. 33.

3George Schaffer, the third principal, said after attending a dif-
ferentiated staff conference, that he would not make any staffing changes
without the consensus of the faculty. "There's no point. Without com-
mitment on the part of the people involved, nothing will happen anyway."
work with and they need to be able to work with them informally and continuously. At Bright Meadows, teachers are not isolated and school does not end at 3:10. They feel on the whole that the staff is extremely competent and helpful.

Teachers need to feel that they can learn new skills, either by virtue of teaching new courses or subjects (i.e. curriculum development) or by virtue of taking more courses. There is, in the atmosphere of that school, the encouragement to admit that a teacher is learning with the student. Many members of the faculty are enrolled in courses or programs at nearby universities, and courses offered to students reflect the influence of theory on practice. There are student teachers and other learner-teachers in the building at all times, again contributing to the concept that the school is a center of inquiry.

Teachers need to feel that there are alternatives to teaching in the school through which they can grow. For example, that there are leadership positions available for those who want to take advantage of them. Precedents abound of people who have left Bright Meadows and gone on to positions of power and influence in education. Any conclave of former Bright Meadows faculty will include several principals and superintendents, assistant principals, deans at colleges, consultants in curriculum, etc. There is no sense in the building that this is the end of the line. On the contrary, with the youth of the staff and the steady turnover, there is a feeling that Bright Meadows is only the beginning.

And finally teachers need to feel that what they are doing is im-
portant and will have a significant impact. Perhaps they even need to feel that what they are engaged in is different from most other such enterprises. Bright Meadows teachers feel, on the whole, that their relationships with individual students, the kind of openness, freedom, concern, honesty that they share with their students is something unique and very valuable.

Of course, the school is not Utopia. Teachers are quite aware and often complain about the problems or obstacles to the achievement of the goals. They realize they are trying to do more tasks than are humanly possible given the constraints upon the school. The tragedy of the institution, as Sandra Morris phrases it, is all the potential at Bright Meadows that has gone undeveloped. But because teachers are so close to the sources of power and they know how the institution operates, they can understand why the problems exist. Even if the school does not necessarily act totally differently about all of the issues of education (there is a schedule; resources are limited; teachers do keep track of students; teachers still have lunchroom duty; there are problems taking students out of the building) it does make people feel that schools can act differently than they have because Bright Meadows certainly has tried and often succeeded in behaving in unorthodox fashions. It is the process of Bright Meadows rather than the specific details that is important for teachers. The structure could be changed tomorrow and as long as teachers had been seriously involved in the change, the same percentage of faculty would still feel that they "owned" and approved of the school.
During the interviews a number of issues were raised which have to do with the present and future reality of teaching at Bright Meadows which need to be probed further by the faculty. For example, how does one define sense of control for a faculty, or, stated another way, if a faculty has only a limited amount of non-student-centered time, what areas should they be devoting their energies to so that they do feel they have control over their lives and are not simply harried and fragmented? When Bright Meadows initiated the Continuous Learning program such items as room use, scheduling, as well as curriculum were given as responsibilities to teachers as part of the "this is your school, run it" package. Now that the school is bigger and the student-teacher ratio is higher and teachers have proved that they can run the school, what are the significant issues of teacher control? Do they still need to negotiate the use of rooms, or would it be better for some one person, be he teacher or administrator, to make those determinations, subject, of course, to faculty consent?

As has been alluded to earlier, at Bright Meadows roles are not defined very clearly. For the personal growth of the adult in question, this is an extremely important element, an opportunity for him to learn what he is capable of doing. But in terms of the work of the institution, such lack of clarity about expectations presents a problem, or rather, occasionally creates a vacuum. For example, every time a paraprofessional is hired, someone with teaching credentials actually fills the position. Such people are not happy doing clerical work and soon the climate of the school infects them with the desire to work
only with students and the clerical aspects are left unguarded. There is a point of diminishing returns for the institution as a whole if no one is paying attention to the "stuff" of the school, especially if the school wants resources to be available to students. Both of these issues are closely connected with the idea of differentiated staffing, an issue which is of imminent importance to the school.

One last issue will help to make the point. Now that the school is so large and the facilities have not grown with the program, the issue of independence becomes problematic. Can teams really be autonomous? Can teachers really operate as individuals, not just in their classrooms but also in the school at large? If teams become more like each other, offer cross-school courses, share each other's materials can they still maintain a recognizable identity? Can teachers retain the feeling that they are in control if so much of the environment looks so much like the rest of the environment? These questions have to be grappled with by the school if the school is to secure the openness and support of the faculty which makes the faculty happy at Bright Meadows. The process cannot change even if the issues do.

Bright Meadows has a great deal to say about the education of teachers, both preservice and in-service. Because of the prevailing predominantly positive attitude toward teaching and the almost palpable sense of professionalism in the school, it is a very good environment for learning about teaching and learning. That is, it is a very good clinic for prospective teachers, be they juniors in college who want some exposure or graduate interns who are paid to be apprentice teachers, or any degree
of person in between. The constant discussion and questioning, the supportive quality of team relationships, the possibilities for all manner of educational experiences and the receptivity of the faculty to new ideas, all make the environment a good one in which to learn about being a teacher. It is the kind of school which a university interested in a clinical component to its educational program might seek to establish a relationship with. It is even the kind of school which a university, if it wanted to restructure its teacher training program, might adopt as a "teaching hospital" analogous to the medical model.

Bright Meadows has also produced some very sound informal instruments for socialization, the principal one of which is the teaching team, but also the various study and policy-making committees. While it is true that teachers very quickly internalize the goals of the school (probably partially because when they are hired they are already predisposed toward them), where there is some difficulty is in implementing the goals to the teachers' satisfaction. What this means is that informal socialization is not enough. New teachers need special attention and have special needs that more experienced teachers might not. As one teacher said, "Take House for example. Since this is something new to new teachers they start with a burst of energy, but I don't know how many times older teachers can listen to the philosophy and be aware that so much practicality (sic) has to take place." What the school needs is a program to teach teachers the various known ways to implement the goals as well as to explore the as yet unknown ways to
achieve the goals. Certainly there are many components for such a
program present already: the department seminars, the team teaching
partnerships, the new consulting teacher program, the study committees.
But Bright Meadows does need to take more rigorously its responsibility
as a training institution for its own teachers. But what has already
been established is a climate in which teachers feel like people who
are doing important jobs, who are in control of their jobs and who like
what they are doing and those with whom they are doing their work.
Appendix I

Bright Meadows' Metco Students, or What's Wrong With A Few Limits?

The Metco program, as people at Bright Meadows understand it, exists for a variety of reasons. Originally, it was a means of involving suburban communities in the critical problems of the severely inadequate educational opportunities afforded black children in the Easton schools. It was also felt that both the white suburban and the black urban children would benefit from an integrated education because association would dispell the stereotypes too often found among the various groups. There was a consensus that the Metco children should be screened so that the children who would be bussed out to the suburban communities would in fact be those children who could, by virtue of both intellectual and emotional preparation, derive the greatest good from the Metco experience.

It now seems, that with regard to Bright Meadows, as a specific school receiving Metco children (and receiving more Metco youngsters than any other school in Centerville), what screening has been done, employed criteria quite different from the ones originally proposed. It seems that Bright Meadows has, in fact, been accepting children who need the kind of special attention and therapeutic services which Bright Meadows cannot supply even to those children who are members of its territorial population. Bright Meadows--the staff and the resources--is being strained as it is. There is a real question about whether we can deal successfully or even adequately with the Metco children without additional investment in personnel, services and materials. This is clearly
demonstrated by the growing number of violent confrontations between the different groups of students in the school.

The problems, which everyone acknowledges as existing, are many. From the Metco students' point of view Bright Meadows is a new experience in their lives, whether they come from Centerville's elementary schools (in which case their transition issues are similar to all incoming students') or from the Easton Public schools. They are not used to being without clear and established limits; or, when there are limits, they are not accustomed to not being held accountable for disobeying the rules. They get some preferential treatment since they are black in a white school, and they have a great temptation to manipulate teachers so they can get their own way. They simply don't expect teachers to behave the way the Bright Meadows teachers do. And finally, Metco students are suffering through an identity crisis in which they always look to the group for direction. It is exceedingly difficult for any one of the Metco youngsters to defy the group. As a result, instead of eliminating the stereotypes, the program is in fact drawing them in bold lines. White students are getting the idea that blacks are troublemakers, violent and irresponsible and blacks are getting the idea that whites are spoiled, can do whatever they want and are pushovers.

From the teachers' point of view the situation is confounded by the fact that Bright Meadows has three distinct student populations but the same liberal goals for all students. Teachers get trapped by the assumption that learning can only obtain under conditions of complete freedom, that setting limits is inhumane, and by the apparent conflict
between group values and expectations and individualized treatment of students. However what is true is that Metco students need to feel competence in academic areas, as much, if not more than the rest of our students. Teaching them to think under specified conditions is not mistreating students. Neither is setting limits or giving direction. We are in fact not giving Metco students the kind of individualized attention if we ignore their group needs.

The position that Bright Meadows teachers find themselves in is not to be understood as one caused by malevolence or even mindlessness. Rather, it is one caused by ignorance. Most teachers at Bright Meadows have had no previous experience dealing with black students. They often do not read Metco students' responses accurately. In some cases they have not been aware of the kinds of expectations that accompany the Metco student to Bright Meadows, for example, parental pressure. According to Jane Jones, most parents' reactions could be summarized by the remark, "I don't understand why that school allows all that freedom to my child. Just make sure he's in class." And according to the Coleman study, the single most important factor in a student's success in school is his family background. Bussing creates all kinds of problems. (We must not, however, let the uniqueness of the Metco students' experience blind us to the fact that they are not the only students in our school who aren't "making it" in the school. There are many students wandering the corridors because there may not be enough for them in classes. The Metco phenomenon simply underlines our need to look at our total program.)

Finally, when we look at teachers' responses to the Metco program
we have to realize that Bright Meadows teachers tend to internalize a lot of guilt. In this case they are accepting the sins the society has perpetrated on the black community. More than anything else they don't want to be called racist and so they go overboard to be humane and don't realize that in doing this they are in fact doing Metco students an injustice. We are "killing them with kindness."

Finding ourselves in such a quagmire of conflicting feelings about what is happening to the school and the students because of the Metco program, we look to several kinds of action. One kind involves putting the Bright Meadows Metco experience in context and waiting to see what we can learn. We want to know what kinds of evaluation Metco has done on its program and how other schools are faring. Perhaps we should be doing some documentation ourselves (some people at Bright Meadows have looked at the problem a little bit already).

Another kind of action, which is more radical, suggests that if we cannot get the additional support we require, we request another placement for those Metco students for whom we see no possibility of success in our school, and ask that they be replaced with others whose potential for personal and academic growth is more predictable. Not only must we think of what we can do for our Metco students, but also what they can do for each other. A few problem children can threaten the behavior of the rest of the group, and also of the rest of the school. We as faculty must consider the entire institution.
Children's Literature

This course was also taught last term. In it, we read picture-story books for young children, and we studied how these books appeal to the young. We practiced reading aloud with appropriate expression. We learned how books were printed and put together. We saw films about some children's book writers, and we spoke with some professional authors. And then we wrote our own children's stories, and read them to children in the elementary schools.

Miss Schwartz

Composition Workshop

This is the standard writing course which will be taught each term this year. Students should plan to take a composition course once this year. The assignments in this course have been carefully designed to help students develop ways of sorting out their ideas and of using words to communicate them. Students who don't like to write or who have trouble finding something to say can make a fresh start in this course. Students who enjoy writing will also find it profitable.

Miss Schwartz

Reading Novels

Many students have asked for a course in which they can read and discuss novels. This course will allow you to do just that. You may select your reading from a wide variety of books such as Ethan Frome, Johnny Tremain, Animal Farm, Shane, The Red Pony, A Separate Peace, Good-Bye, Mr. Chips, The Incredible Journey, To Kill a Mockingbird, Lord of the Flies, Joy in the Morning, The Chosen, and All Quiet on the Western Front. Each student will keep a brief written record of his readings and will have periodic individual conferences with the teacher.

Miss Schwartz

Film Study

Film Study will examine the movie as a medium of communication and of artistic expression. The emphasis will be on viewing and discussing short, serious films and on developing visual literacy. There will be opportunity for supplementary activities and projects, including making photo-essays and short films.

The course is open to all students. Note, however, that it is a repeat of the Term I course.

Mr. Andrews
Journalism

This course will be a continuation of last term's journalism course, and will be devoted to the ongoing production of the Sigma Enquirer. Students without previous experience in journalism may, with Mr. Andrews' permission, join the course.

Mr. Andrews

Novels

Students will read novels from many fields of interest. The course will help students develop their ability to understand such aspects of fiction as point of view, characterization, and plot. The course will begin with a common reading of a single novel—to be chosen later—after which students will choose novels from an up-to-date list, and will, finally, read freely. The most important purpose of the course is to help students to enjoy reading novels.

Mr. Andrews

Composition Workshop II

Open to those students who have completed satisfactorily Composition Workshop I (during Term I) or a Sigma composition course during Term II or III last year. This course will provide continued opportunities for learning how to use writing to communicate. Assignments, concepts, and skills (punctuation, for example) will be adapted to the needs and interests of the class. (Ninth graders should give this course serious consideration.)

Mr. Andrews

Photocomp (Photography and Writing)

This time we will combine two ways of telling it like we see it. We will try to improve our abilities to see and record details which are important to us. We will use photography, our own and others, to improve our ability to communicate visually and will use writing about pictures to make the task of finding the words to say what we want a bit easier. It is not necessary to own a camera for this course.

Mr. Kevin
Speaking and Listening

Do you know that 65 - 70 percent of our learning comes from our speaking and listening to others? This learning is found not only in formal classroom lectures but also through conversation, movies, television, radio and many other experiences. In addition, we are often expected to present the worth of ourselves through some kind of formal interview (college, employment) or a classroom speaking assignment (any class). Did you know that anyone can apply the principles of good speech and good listening to make his skills in these areas far more effective?

The purpose of this course is to enable each student to handle any speaking or listening challenge easily and effectively. Students will be taught to take notes, to organize a speaker's ideas, and to prepare speeches for their own presentation. Voice production, choral speaking, formal reading, principles of diction, listening techniques, interview techniques, and note taking will be included in the program. All students should bring to this choice a willingness to participate in the full dimensions of the course.

Mr. Cross

Developmental Reading

The reading level of the student will determine the precise program, but generally the course will provide the opportunity for each student to improve his reading speed and comprehension. In addition there will be a regular program of outside reading, either on an individual or group basis. Students may choose to concentrate on biography, autobiography, historical fiction, science fiction, or what they will. Regular group discussions and class discussions will be held on outside reading programs. If a student wishes, he may concentrate his attention on word building or word analysis. It is hoped that each student will learn the necessary tools in this program to be able to continue his growth in reading as a pleasurable pastime when the course is completed.

Mr. Cross
AFTERLIFE IN THE UNDERWORLD

This is a literature course based on readings about the devil, hell and afterlife. We will read selections from the Bible and modernized versions of those stories, including the play, J.B. Students may choose their readings from a wide variety of possible selections: mythology, epics such as The Iliad, Dante’s Inferno, plays such as No Exit, The Tenth Man, short stories, novels, poems and even operas.

Miss Schwartz

MAN AND NATURE

From the beginning man has been involved with nature. He has worshipped the sun, fought the seas and the winds, and been lured to explore unknown lands. He has written poetry and prose about all that surrounds him in nature. In this course students will read books by Jack London, John Steinbeck, Pearl Buck and others; they can also examine what work is being done today in conservation and exploration. An introductory unit of three weeks will touch upon the main ideas in the course, after which students may specialize in one or more aspects.

Mrs. Smith

PSYCHOLOGY IN LITERATURE

Psychology is the study of human behavior, of why people act the way they do. In this course, we will discuss the problems of children and young adults who were unable to deal with their lives in a satisfactory manner. We will read some essays, short stories and novels such as David and Lisa and Jordi. Some students may choose to read Dibb and I Never Promised You a Rose Garden.

Miss Schwartz

School Days

The purpose of this course is to examine the assumptions underlying the various modes of education in our civilization. What attitudes toward teaching and learning are represented in our schools? To study these attitudes we will read from Charlotte Bronte, Dickens, Kipling and Orwell. We will also look at contemporary descriptions of education such as Summerhill and Up The Down Staircase and To Sir, With Love. For his final project a student will design an “ideal” school and dramatize a day in its life.

Miss Schwartz
Protestant, Catholic, Jew

What is religion and why is it so important in our society? What ideas and customs do the great religions share? In what ways are these religions different? These are some of the questions we will deal with in this course. We will read selections from Our Religion and Our Neighbors, and from What the Great Religions Believe by Joseph Gaer. (Gaer's book should be purchased for 60¢.) We will also attend services at Catholic, Protestant and Jewish congregations in Centerville.

Miss Schwartz

Monkey Trial: Evolution and Literature

In 1925, a biology teacher by the name of Scopes was arrested in Tennessee for teaching the theory of evolution. We will study Darwin's theory of evolution from a scientific point of view, and will compare it briefly with the story of Creation as told in Genesis. We will then study the legalities of the trial itself. And we will read the famous play based on the trial, Inherit the Wind. This play is in paperback and should be purchased for 50¢.

This course will fulfill either your social studies or English requirement.

Miss Schwartz

Process of Thinking

Man is called a thinking animal. The purpose of this course is to examine how he proceeds in this thinking process, and how much he is limited or inhibited by his animal heritage. The course will move through the steps of reasoning from the inductive to deductive levels through fallacies in reasoning at the cognitive level, and then to the impact of emotional appeals on our reasoning. We shall examine as a class project the nature of violence in our society, and how the news media, books, schools, comics, toys, and institutions effect out thinking toward violence. Advertising techniques, propagands techniques, thought control at the national level will be examined and discussed.

A demanding course, but one which will have a great impact on each student who participates willingly and fully in the program.

Mr. Cross
CAMPAIGN '68

We will study the process of election, the issues and candidates in the current presidential contest, and various contests for Senate, House and Governor seats. Information will come from the news media and from the candidates. We will be as much concerned with the process of election as with the particular campaign of 1968.

Mr. Kevin

INDEPENDENT STUDY PROJECTS

This course gives students who have a desire to study specific topics not otherwise available to them in the SSE program. Each student may pursue his own area of interest for a specified period of time. He will then be expected to share his information and ideas with the rest of the group—the object being to interest them in his topic. Topics for study must have the approval of the subject advisor.

Mr. Kevin

WHAT IS SOCIETY?

Man faces certain universal problems: How should goods be produced and distributed? Who should have power? How should responsibility for different tasks be divided? What is beautiful and what is ugly? What should be considered good and bad? And what is the meaning of life? Answers to these questions are not the same everywhere. Societies have different sets of values and develop different institutions to support their value systems. This course will examine the ways values and institutions are related. We will see different answers to the universal questions and then study a society in a time of change to see what happened to its values and institutions.

Mr. Kevin

YOUTH TODAY

In this course you will be reading about young people—some real and some imaginary—who had problems and coped with them in different ways. As you read these stories, you will be considering: What is the problem? How was it solved? Was it a good solution? Will you ever be faced with a problem like that? What would you do?

Although no two people are wholly alike, learning to understand the characters in stories is one way to learn about people in life. You will be required to write about what you read. Students will work both individually and in groups. (This course is designed for those students who would like to improve their reading and writing skills.)

You may have to purchase a paperback book during the course.

Mrs. Maloney
Oriental Studies

If there is a "Wave of the Future," it seems now that it will have to be a wave out of the East, the Orient. The history of this century seems to suggest a kind of decline of Western culture and institutions and a rise of Oriental culture. The purpose of this course is to introduce the students to the cultures of the Orient. We shall learn through reading, through observation and through listening about the art, music, religion, manners and customs of many of the Oriental countries. We shall study many of the institutions of the countries of the East. We shall read literature not only as it is written by Western writers about the East, but also authors of the Orient who write about themselves.

It is to be hoped that at the end of the term each student will have opened his eyes to the beauty, the richness, and the dynamism of Oriental culture, and that with opened eyes, he will want to continue his study of Oriental culture in future years.

Mrs. Smith and Mr. Cross

Africa - Rise to Development

Dealing with the problems of underdeveloped countries, this course will center on the responsibilities of colonial powers, the types of leadership which are best, the difficulties in developing industries and a strong currency, and the breakdown of the social structure. No term report will be required but each student will be responsible for one African nation and short papers will be assigned at approximately two-week intervals. It will be necessary to keep track of your nation in the newspaper.

Mrs. Smith

Economics in Action

In an effort to understand the world around us, this course will deal with items from the newspapers which are economic in nature. International trade, devaluation, taxes, stocks, and the common market will undoubtedly be discussed. Case studies and problems will help to increase understanding.

Mrs. Smith

Girls to Women

This course is open to all girls including those who took the course last term. Homemaking crafts such as embroidery, meal planning, budgeting and knitting will be mixed with writing and speaking. In addition, the role of women in today's society will be examined.

Mrs. Smith
Afro-American History - Part II (Civil War to the Present)

The era of Civil War and reconstruction was a major turning point in American history and in the history of Afro-Americans. It settled once and for all the question of whether a state could secede from the Union; and it ended almost two hundred and fifty years of Negro slavery. The Civil War and its aftermath have left a legacy of hatred and bitterness that continues to divide the American people. The war left unsettled the question which had troubled many Americans in the years before the conflict: Can America be a land of freedom and equality for all its people?

In this course we will be looking for answers to the following questions:

1. How did the black people help the North to win the Civil War?

2. How did the black people lose ground in the post reconstruction era?

3. How was strict racial segregation established in the South?

4. How did World War I and World War II affect the black man's quest for freedom?

5. How have the NAACP and the National Urban League furthered the black man's search for equal rights?

6. How did the nation respond to the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions?

7. What problems stem from life in the ghettos?

8. How have the black people contributed to social and cultural progress?

Mrs. Maloney

American History: World War II to the Present

Twice during the past fifty years most of the nations of the world and their people have been involved in "world wars." We will see how both World Wars have touched - even changed - the lives of each of us, young and old. In this course we will seek answers to the following questions:

1. What events after World War I destroyed hopes for world peace?

2. What was the nature of Mussolini's facism for Italy?

3. How did Hitler's nazism cause World War II?

4. What was the militarism of the Japanese empire?

5. How did the United States and its allies gain victory in World War II?
American History: World War II to the Present - continued

6. What are the repercussions of war?

7. How did a "cold war" develop between the United States and the Soviet Union?

8. What are the positive ways in which the people of the world have and can now work for peace?

In this course each student or group of students will select a research topic, research it, write up the findings and present them to the class. The purchase of a paperback may be required.

Mrs. Malory

Elizabethan England

The issues and problems of one of the most exciting and important periods of history (1558-1603) will be presented for the delight and instruction of students. The course has been constructed (by E.S.I.) to maximize student activity and participation. Students will, for example, make investments in exploratory ventures, try religious dissenters, and refight the battle of the Spanish Armada. Some of the reading is not easy.

Mr. Andrews

Growing up Greek (or whatever you were born to be)

This course deals with many of the same ideas as did last year's Individual in Society so that it is not recommended for people who took that course. The course will study the ways different societies train young people to live in and be part of their community. Examples of this process will come from such places and times as Ancient Greece, Colonial and Modern America. Such study should help us to learn to recognize similarities and differences among different groups, to ask useful questions about information we receive, and to draw reasonable conclusions from that information.

Mr. Kevin

When Groups Collide

This course will look at what happens when the needs and desires of one social group run into those of another. Strikes, riots, resistance and rebellion are becoming main features of life in modern society. Some people feel we will destroy ourselves with such fighting unless we can find better ways to resolve our problems. We will study several of these clashes (young vs. old, rich vs. poor, hawk vs. dove, black vs. white, etc.) to see what kinds of things people fight about and why they feel they must fight to get what they want and need. Much of our work will take us outside of the classroom to find out what the people involved in these struggles think.

Mr. Kevin and Mrs. Malory
Elementary Chemistry

This will be a basic course in chemistry covering such topics as matter, the periodic table of elements, symbols, formulas, equations, chemical reactions, solutions, acids, bases, salts, and nuclear chemistry. Laboratory activities will be included.
(Priority will be given to advanced students.)

Miss Gordon

The World of Mini Things

This will be a very elementary biology course including laboratory activities. Topics will be the cell as the structural unit of living things, the crystal as the structural unit of non-living things, and small things seen only with the microscope.

Miss Gordon

Pond and Forest Life

This will be a biology course involving a study of animal life in ponds and forests--from microscopic organisms to the most advanced forms of animals. Much out-of-doors work is planned.
(By invitation only.)

Miss Gordon

Astronomy

The motions of objects in the sky have been a puzzle and a challenge to the minds of men since the beginning of recorded history. Why do the planets and stars stay up there? Why do they change their position? What are shadows? We will be attacking these problems ourselves, observing and recording our own experimental data. A good knowledge of math is advisable.
(Open to all students.)

Miss Gordon
The Human Body

In this course, students will choose to study one of the body's systems such as the muscular, nervous, endocrine, digestive, reproductive, or respiratory systems. Students will work in groups on that topic and each group will be responsible for teaching the class about his topic.

Mrs. Farrell

Weather

What is weather? What is wind? What causes air to move? How can we forecast tomorrow's temperature?...humidity? Most of the earth is covered with water. How does this affect the earth's climate?

We will start off with basic questions like these about heat and air and finally discuss air masses, weather fronts and specific kinds of weather conditions. Most class time will be spent doing experiments to demonstrate principles important to our understanding of the earth's atmosphere and weather.

Mrs. Farrell

The Mathematics of Physics

The course will have a dual purpose: 1) To provide a physical reality to concepts of mathematics that, to the casual observer, appear to have no relevance to our own lives; 2) To improve the predictability of physical phenomena using the power of mathematics.

Interested students need permission from Mr. Mann or Mr. Mahoney.

Mrs. Farrell and Mr. Mann
Appendix III

Interview Schedule One

Lead Questions

1. What is the Bright Meadows goal for students?

7. Can the goal be achieved?

11. How does the Bright Meadows goal for students affect teachers?

12. Given what you've said so far, what is the ideal Bright Meadows teacher?

How do you feel about teaching at Bright Meadows?

Possible Follow-up Questions

2. Is it different from other schools?
3. How do you know that?
4. Is the goal being achieved? How and why?
5. What do you feel is the value of such a goal?
6. Do you think the goal has ever been achieved at Bright Meadows or anywhere else?

8. What is lacking that is necessary for the goal to be achieved?
9. What are the most serious imperfections in the school? Why?
10. What does Bright Meadows do best?

13. Who on the staff is most suited to teaching at Bright Meadows? Who least? Why? Are there people here who shouldn't be here? Who? What percentage?

15. Do you like it? Why or why not?
   a. Nature of the goal of the school
   b. Components of the teaching role
   c. Acquisition of new skills and competencies and knowledge
   d. Opportunity for leadership among teachers
   e. Opportunity for curriculum development
   f. Training for future position in education (or other career)
   g. Quality of staff
   h. Staff relations
   i. Quality of administration
   j. Staff-administration relations
   k. Number of responsibilities (demands)
   l. Nature of students/parents/community
   m. Relationship with students/community
   n. Quality of resources (people and materials and equipment)
   o. Structure of school: time and space
   p. Discipline of students
In so far as Bright Meadows has been a successful experience for you, what has made it that?

7. How has Bright Meadows failed you?

What kind of teacher training did you receive?

Have your career plans changed as a result of being at Bright Meadows?

5: How has the school changed since you've been here?

18. How has it disappointed you?
19. How did you get to Bright Meadows? What expectations did you have? Have your expectations been lived up to?
20. Have you changed since you've been here? How?

22. Undergraduate college and major graduate school What kinds of degrees? What past teaching experiences? If you had it to do over again what would you have studied and/or done to be prepared to teach in Bright Meadows?

24. When are you planning to leave? Why?
25. What do you expect to be doing when you leave? In five years? in ten?

27. Can you recall any particular events that you can point to that you would call significant in marking the changes? e.g. transition to entire school CL Kozol Traveler articles election of Frank to school committee original principal leaving new superintendent Title III, etc.
Appendix III

Interview Schedule Two

1. What is the goal of Bright Meadows? Do you know if it has changed since you were there? What do you think is the value of such a goal? Do you think the goal has ever been achieved at Bright Meadows or anywhere else?

2. Can the goal be achieved? What was lacking at Bright Meadows when you were there that you think was necessary for the goal to be achieved? How close was the ideal to the reality? What were the school's most serious imperfections? Why?

3. How did the Bright Meadows' goal affect teachers while you were there?

4. Given what you've said so far, what is the ideal Bright Meadows teacher?

5. How did you feel about teaching at Bright Meadows? Did you like it? Why or why not?
   (Some ideas for you to consider in answering this question:
   Nature of the goal of the school.
   Components of the teaching role.
   Acquisition of new skills and competencies and knowledge.
   Opportunity for leadership.
   Opportunity for curriculum development.
   Training for future position in education.
   Training for other career.
   Quality of staff.
   Staff relations.
   Quality of administration.
   Staff-administration relations.
   Number of responsibilities or demands.
   Nature of students/community.
   Relationship with students/community.
   Quality of resources.
   Discipline of students.)

6. In so far as Bright Meadows was a successful experience for you, what made it so?

7. How did Bright Meadows fail you? How did it disappoint you? How do you account for the discrepancy in expectations? Did you change while you were there? How?

8. What kind of teacher training did you receive? If you had it do do over again, what kind of training do you think you should have had to teach in a school like Bright Meadows?

9. Did your career plans alter as a result of your being at Bright Meadows? When did you leave? Why? What kind of work did you go to from Bright Meadows? Why? What other things have you done since?

   How did the school change while you were there? Were there any particular events that stand out in your mind as crucial to the changes?
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Interview Schedule Three

1. What is the goal (idea) of Bright Meadows?
2. How did the idea of Bright Meadows originate and develop?
3. Is Bright Meadows different from other schools? How?
4. How did you get to be principal (assistant principal, other relationship) of Bright Meadows?
5. What role have the superintendents played in the implementation of the Bright Meadows idea?
6. Did Bright Meadows receive any "special treatment" as a school, from the city?
7. Who were your principal advisers? Why?
8. Was the Bright Meadows goal achieved?
9. What was lacking for the goal to be achieved?
10. What kind of people did you try to hire for Bright Meadows as teachers?
11. What assistance did you get from the Central Staff?
12. What assistance did you ask from other members of the staff at Bright Meadows?
13. Did you expect the kind of turnover that has characterized Bright Meadows when you were doing the hiring?
14. What is the ideal Bright Meadows teacher?
15. How did you evaluate teachers?
16. Did you ever fire or ask teachers to leave?
17. How did you make that decision?
18. How would you define the role of a teacher at Bright Meadows?
19. What expectations did you have of teachers in terms of the quality of their participation in Bright Meadows affairs?
20. What are the advantages and disadvantages of teaching at Bright Meadows?
21. How did you decide who got merit pay?
22. Was there a reason why men were encouraged to be team leaders? and women department chairmen?
Did you consider that there might be a level of frustration (work, demands) that prevented teachers from being as creative as you wanted them to be?

What do you consider to be the maximum size for a school with Bright Meadows' goals?

What are your thoughts on differentiated staffing for Bright Meadows?

What created the dissension in the community?

What effect did the community concern have on the teachers and on you?

How much did you expect teachers to have to deal with political issues in the community and elsewhere?

What was the effect of Franck's election on the community and the school?

Why did we not involve the community in the planning of Bright Meadows?

Did the school change while you were there? (Has it changed since you've left? How and why?)

How and why was your successor selected?

Has he done what you would have done?
Modification of Interview Schedule Three

- Bright Meadows as an unorthodox junior high school was in existence before you became superintendent (or whatever). Did you change anything about the operation? or the goals?

- To what extent did you as a superintendent (or whatever) control or direct what went on in the school?

- Did Bright Meadows receive any special treatment as a school in Centerville?

- It has been alleged that Bright Meadows had more money spent on it than did the other junior highs. If that is true, why and what?

- What was the nature of the community reaction to the school? When did it start and how was it dealt with and why?

- Why did Elizabeth Crown resign?

- Why was Jerry Gross selected as her successor?

- Did you consider CL to have been a valid experiment? Do you feel that Bright Meadows has been successful?

- Were Bright Meadows teachers different from the other schools: treatment, work load, nature of backgrounds, etc.?

- Why did the pilot project last only one year?

- Why did Bright Meadows have so little impact upon the city? Or did it?

- Have you kept abreast of the changes at Bright Meadows over the years? How do you account for them?
At last!

I am about to start collecting data for my thesis. It will deal with the thoughts and feelings of teachers toward their jobs and toward the school in which they work. As you can imagine, I am particularly interested in Bright Meadows.

However, in order to gather this information, I would like to talk with you. Would you be willing to be interviewed? Or would you prefer to write your responses on paper? Or would you rather not respond at all? If possible I would like to have a taped interview.

Of course, your name will never be connected with the answers you give. The interview data will be used only for the purposes of my thesis. I am going to play author and create names for the school and the people in it.

I would appreciate your answer to this letter in my mailbox.

Sincerely,

Isa K. Zimmerman
I hope you won't regard this letter as just another request in the mail simply because it is a form letter. Since I am trying to reach all the people who have taught at Bright Meadows since 1962, and who are no longer there, I had to resort to the "formal" approach.

As part of my thesis I am studying the thoughts and feelings of teachers toward their jobs and toward the school in which they work. As you can gather I am especially interested in Bright Meadows and want to follow the attitudes of teachers toward it over the past eight years.

Since you were at Bright Meadows I hope that you will be willing to reach back into your memories and write your reactions to your experiences there, using the questions which are attached as guidelines. You may respond directly to the questions or use them as points of departure, or you may use any other way you can think of to say what you want to say about Bright Meadows. There is no limit to the length and any of the three ways mentioned above is acceptable. If you have access to a cassette tape recorder, I will be happy to send you some tapes and have you answer the questions into the recorder.

Of course, I will never use your name in connection with the answers you give. The data will be used solely for my thesis. I am going to play author and create names for the school and for all the people connected with it. How does Bright Meadows strike you? (It is a translation of the name of Tolstoy's experimental school in the 19th century.)

I really do appreciate your help and if I can ever do a similar service for you I will be only too glad.

Sincerely,

Isa Kaultal Zimmerman

P.S. Let me know, if it were possible for me to visit you, whether you would be willing to let me do that. Or if you come to the Boston area, won't you let me know?
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Entry #14  Teaching Status at Bright Meadows

Card 1  Col 22 (37)

1. Ex Bright Meadows teacher
2. Left June 1970
3. Presently teaching
4. Left and returned/presently teaching
5. Left/returned/Left
6. Taught only in Tri Delta
### Appendix IV

**Entry #29 School goals' effects on teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col 70 (20)</th>
<th>Col 71</th>
<th>Col 72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. involved</td>
<td>1. sense of community with Bright Meadows teachers</td>
<td>1. enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. committed</td>
<td>2. work, talk with Bright Meadows teachers</td>
<td>2. alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. take school home with them</td>
<td>3. sense of control over professional fate</td>
<td>3. challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>card 2</td>
<td>4. inadequate, insecure</td>
<td>4. enriched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. a place to escape to (a home)</td>
<td>5. happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. too palsy with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col 73</th>
<th>Col 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. guilty (internalize collective burden of school)</td>
<td>1. get away with murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. frustrated</td>
<td>2. changed way they teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. alienated from Centerville teachers</td>
<td>3. teachers don't perceive goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. under pressure (from students)</td>
<td>4. false pride, intellectual dishonesty, hypocrisy, deceit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. strain (overwork)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. anger at the mythical ideal Bright Meadows as the administration saw it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Entry #39 Quality of staff

Card 2 Col 106 (56)

1. yes
2. ambivalent
3. indifferent
4. no

Entry #55 Bright Meadows as successful experience

Card 3 Col 172 (57) Col 173 (58)

1. variety of roles
2. people working with
3. personal growth
4. students (relationships with)
5. freedom as teacher
6. informality of institution
7. curriculum development
8. opportunity for leadership
9. humanizing environment
0. facilities/ opportunity for creativity
1. variety of roles
2. people working with
3. personal growth
4. students (relationships with)
5. freedom as teacher
6. informality of institution
7. curriculum development
8. opportunity for leadership
9. humanizing environment
0. facilities/ opportunity for creativity
Bibliography


Bibliography


Bibliography


Bibliography


______. "Remaking the World of the Career Teacher." NCTEPS, 1966.

Bibliography


   1. Blowing on a Candle.
   2. The Whole Ball of Wax.
   3. The Meadowbrook Experience.


Bibliography


1956-1960 Cornell University A. B., June 1960
1961-1962 Editor/Writer, Housewares Review (a trade publication), N.Y.C.
1962 Summer Harvard-Newton Summer Program
1962 Fall English Intern, Wayland H. S., Wayland, Mass.
1962-1963 Graduate School of Education Harvard University M.A.T., June 1963
1963-1969 Newton Public Schools Summer Curriculum Development
1965-1967 Chairman, English Department Meadowbrook Junior High School
1967-1971 Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
1968 Teaching Fellow, English Curriculum and Methods Course
1968-1970 Director of Research in Curriculum, Meadowbrook Junior High School
1969-1971 Consultant/Writer/Speaker in Education

Publications

1966 Team Teaching in the Theater Arts, Title III Dissemination Program
1969 The Middle East Game, or How to Play Social Studies, with Theodora Wei, Title III Dissemination Program
School Days (A Course of Study), with Theodora Wei, Title III Dissemination Program
1970 On The Urban Scene, a compilation of "urbanalia" resources, Educational Collaborative of Greater Boston